



Legislature of Ontario Debates

Tuesday, January 25, 1966—Friday, March 11, 1966



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, January 25, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, January, 25, 1966

Speech from the Throne, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor	3
Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	9
Extending sympathy on the death of Mr. Leo Troy, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Thompson, Mr. MacDonald	10
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	10

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

Tuesday, January 25, 1966, being the first day of the Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Parliament of the Province of Ontario for the despatch of business pursuant to a proclamation of the Honourable W. Earl Rowe, Lieutenant-Governor of the province.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 25, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

The Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, having entered the House and, being seated upon the Throne, was pleased to open the session with the following gracious speech.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Mr. Speaker and members of the legislative assembly of Ontario.

On the opening of the Fourth Session of the 27th Parliament of Ontario, to each of you I express warm greetings and extend a sincere welcome.

Your duties are manifold. To your constituents you have obligations, and to all of the people of Ontario you have responsibilities, as you give earnest consideration to the legislative programme, to the policies of reform in keeping with today's changing tempo and to the financial and other implications of the Budget and the estimates of each department, which will be presented during the current session by my government.

MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO

Legislation will be introduced to further the federation of the municipalities in the Toronto metropolitan area by bringing their structure and functions into line with modern practices and current needs.

AGRICULTURE

Crop Insurance: There will be presented to hon. members a comprehensive crop insurance programme to meet the needs of Ontario farmers and Ontario production conditions. It will be predicated on an arrangement being effected with the government of Canada for the amendment of federal crop insurance legislation.

Northern Ontario: All agricultural programmes in the north will be co-ordinated. For this purpose a senior bilingual administrator will be appointed with headquarters at Sudbury.

Activities in northern Ontario will be expanded. The necessary action will be taken to ensure adequate veterinary services for livestock and poultry owners. The New Liskeard agricultural farm will provide additional programmes for the training of young people and adults in the most recently developed techniques in agriculture suited to northern climatic conditions.

Farm Labour: My government is deeply concerned that Ontario farmers are faced with a continued shortage of qualified agricultural labour. The pilot programme initiated last summer to deal with this problem will be expanded.

Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act: Regional development officers will be appointed to work with county agricultural representatives and other local county ARDA committees. The ARDA directorate staff will be strengthened by the appointment of senior officers experienced in rural economics and living conditions.

The consolidation of abandoned or uneconomic farm units will be continued in northern Ontario. The programme, where applicable, will be extended to eastern Ontario.

Changes in Agriculture: The farmer has become involved in both the service and marketing field, as a very substantial percentage of Ontario's agricultural products is now disposed of through marketing boards. In consequence of that trend, farmers are taking an increasing interest in the broad aspects of production and handling of food products through to the eventual consumer. The Department of Agriculture has fostered, and will continue to promote, closer co-operation between all such groups. In recognition of the increasing importance of the broad-based agricultural industry and food production, legislation will be introduced to provide that The Department of Agriculture be continued under the name "Department of Food and Agriculture".

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE, LAW AND ORDER
Legal Aid: A comprehensive plan for legal aid in Ontario arising out of recommendations by the joint committee of the Attorney General and the Law Society of Upper Canada, will be brought before this House.

Corporate and Securities Legislation: Many of the recommendations of the committee on securities legislation will be placed before you through amendments to The Securities Act and The Corporations Act. These amendments provide for fuller disclosure of the financial and trading affairs of companies seeking funds from the public, including the control of insider trading, and takeover bids. Such legislation will also reflect the consideration which has been given to the report of the commissioner appointed to investigate trading in the shares of Windfall Mines and Oils Limited and other related matters.

The provisions of The Loan and Trust Corporations Act also have been reviewed. Legislative proposals will be placed before you to provide more effective supervision in this area of our jurisdiction and economy.

In every possible way and to the extent of its jurisdictional powers, my government will co-operate with the federal authorities in any consultations which may be initiated for the improvement of corporate and securities legislation.

Consumer Credit: The report of the committee on consumer credit has provided the basis for a programme which will be placed before you for consideration.

Personal Property Security: The needs of the business community will be recognized in a proposed bill dealing with personal property security which has been under consideration for many months by legal and commercial authorities. The importance of this detailed new approach to securing credit transactions will be a major step forward in facilitating the progress of our commercial ventures.

Establishment of New Ministry: The programmes introduced by the government in recent years have been prominent in the administration of justice and law enforcement. These developing services, however, have placed an ever-increasing burden upon the chief law officer of the Crown. In order that still greater consideration may be given by the government to these responsibilities, you will be asked to consider recommendations for the establishment of a new ministry to assume responsibility for certain areas outside of the administration of justice relating to the protection of the individual in financial and commercial affairs.

PRODUCTIVITY AND GROWTH OF THE ECONOMY
Regional Development and Growth: My government will put forward proposals and introduce legislation which will substantially expand the techniques and processes of dealing with present regional needs and planning for future regional growth.

Economic Development: To assist in the full economic development of all parts of the province of Ontario, the Ontario development corporation will be established by legislation. The objectives of this corporation will be to extend financial aid presently available under The Economic Development Loans Guarantee Act to provide capital financing to small businesses in those areas of the province where mortgage or other capital funds are not readily available on reasonable terms and conditions.

Immigration Programme: To meet the need for industrial workers and other labour required by employers, an accelerated immigration programme will be promoted to attract new citizens with skills.

Housing Programme: Through the Ontario housing corporation, my government has established a long-term programme to provide decent accommodation for the citizens of Ontario who cannot obtain the same within their means on the private market. Great strides have been made since the inception of this scheme and it will continue to be vigorously pursued.

EDUCATION

Educational requirements continue to have first priority upon the resources of the province.

In the elementary and secondary schools of Ontario, after some 20 years of phenomenal expansion of the school system, approximately 1.75 million pupils are now enrolled. During that time the general population of the province increased by about 61 per cent, the elementary school enrolment by 137 per cent, the secondary by 218 per cent. The construction of new classrooms has kept pace with the increase, and the necessary supply of elementary and secondary school teachers continues to be recruited.

Revision of School Programmes: At the present time, attention is being given to revision of school programmes. Under the distinguished chairmanship of Justice Emmett Hall, a largely lay committee was appointed last April to report upon the aims and objectives in the schools of Ontario, both in general and with specific reference to the revision of courses from kindergarten to grade 6. In this

new approach to meeting curricular problems the committee is moving with energy and competence.

Special Language Classes: Ontario continues to receive the largest portion of the immigrants to Canada, and they are making a great contribution to the economic and social development of our province. To assist in the removal of any language barrier that the children of recent arrivals entering the schools might have, and to ensure that their talents are utilized to the maximum, certain financial assistance will be provided to school boards establishing special language classes.

Opportunities for Indian Children: Improved educational opportunities for Indian children and youth have become a joint concern of both the federal and provincial governments. At Moosonee the construction of an education and community centre to be used co-operatively by pupils of the public and separate schools, and by adults of the community, will effect a new partnership involving the Indian people and the federal and provincial governments. The centre will provide educational services for the Indian and non-Indian population of the area. It will also include facilities for occupational training, pre-school classes, adult programmes, and recreation.

Larger Units to Promote Needs of Community: Plans for the decentralization of education into areas throughout the province will proceed. Five areas were established last year, covering half of the province, and plans are under way for the completion of the project. County consultative committees have been at work during the past year and the results of their work may be seen in the establishment of larger units of administration. The movement to larger units able to plan for the educational needs of the whole community will be encouraged in order that the goal of equal educational opportunity for all may be more nearly realized.

Post-Secondary Programmes: The plan to provide new programmes in post-secondary education through the establishment of colleges of applied arts and technology has stirred wide interest across the province. The preparatory work has been done, the Council of Regents has been appointed. Substantial sums of money will be required to be voted in this House to implement this programme.

Important Studies: Under the direction of the Ontario library association, in co-operation with The Department of Education, a survey of library services in Ontario is nearing completion. Another important study now being made is that of a committee dealing with

short-term and long-term planning with respect to the education of elementary school teachers. On the receipt of the reports on both studies, the necessary action will be taken.

UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS

Expansion of university facilities has continued at a rapid rate. It is noteworthy that all students who met the minimum admission requirements were enrolled in September, 1965. My government will continue its substantial support to our universities to enable them to provide for the increase of approximately 10,000 students each year through to 1970-71 when the total enrolment is expected to reach 100,000. In this connection my government welcomes the interim measure on the part of the federal government to increase support to higher education, and reaffirms its desire and willingness to discuss with federal authorities financial support for higher education.

ENERGY AND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

Ontario Energy Board: To clarify and strengthen the authority of the board in respect of the fixing of rates to be charged for natural gas, hon. members will be asked to approve an amendment to The Ontario Energy Board Act to require the board's approval of any sale or merger of gas utility systems.

Inventory of Northern Waters: The inventory of northern Ontario waters that drain into Hudson Bay, initiated during 1965, will be actively undertaken this summer. The five river basins currently included in this programme are the Winisk, the Attawapiskat, the Albany, the Severn and the Moose. The aim of the project is to gather water resources data of value in assessing the current water needs in the area and the future water needs of Ontario. This long-term programme of investigation is being carried on in co-operation with The Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources of the government of Canada.

Expansion of Water Pollution Control Studies: The Ontario Water Resources Commission, in co-operation with the international joint commission, is conducting extensive pollution monitoring studies in the Great Lakes system. A preliminary start was made on this programme during the latter part of 1965 in the western end of Lake Erie. The importance of this work has justified its extension to cover the whole of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario, the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers, sections of Lake Huron and the connecting channels.

Industrial Waste Pollution Control: The commission will expand its activities in 1966 in the field of industrial waste pollution control.

Provincial Projects: Amendments to The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act will be proposed to provide that the approval of the commission be required prior to the establishment of sanitary landfill and refuse disposal sites. Other revisions will encompass the new financing policy for the construction of water and sewage facilities authorizing the commission to provide the necessary works for municipalities. The cost of services so provided is to be recovered from water and sewage rates.

Energy Legislation: There will be a revision of The Gasoline Handling Act.

HEALTH

The increasing involvement of the government in the varied field of health services has resulted in a complete reorganization of The Department of Health. Entering into this planning is the development of administrative patterns which are concerned with co-ordination, co-operation, long-range planning, and priorities and phasing.

Ontario Council of Health: It is proposed to establish a senior advisory body on health matters. It will be known as the Ontario Council of Health and will undertake continuing studies, research and planning.

Air Pollution Control: The programme of air pollution control will be expanded by bringing under regulation existing sources of pollution.

Nursing Homes Legislation: Legislation will provide for government approval, licensing, and control of all nursing homes in Ontario to achieve uniformity in standards and safety.

Radiation Protection: You will be asked to approve legislation to establish radiation protection services to be administered by The Department of Health.

The Healing Arts: It is the purpose of my government to establish a committee to inquire into all matters pertaining to the preparation, education, training, licensing, control, and disciplining of all those involved in the practice of the healing arts.

Medical Services Insurance Act: The Medical Services Insurance Act will be expanded.

Boards of Review: My government will propose the establishment of boards of review,

empowered to consider and rule on applications for release made by, or on behalf of, patients in mental hospitals.

HIGHWAYS

Ontario's Road Requirements: The programme of The Department of Highways in 1966 will be geared to anticipate and to meet rapidly-developing changes in the road requirements of the province. The department's scheduling of work will continue to ensure the maximum improvement in the level of service rendered by Ontario's road network, in which the King's Highway mileage and municipal roads and streets complement each other.

The Counties: With the co-operation of the counties, the road needs studies of these jurisdictions are now completed. This will enable the department to achieve a more equitable distribution of direct aid through a broadened development road programme, and to provide for more effective integration of all road systems of the province.

St. Clair Parkway: An important piece of legislation arises out of the work of a committee, established over a year ago, composed of officials of Lambton county, the city of Sarnia, the town of Wallaceburg and others interested in preserving the scenic beauty and developing the recreational resources bordering the St. Clair river. You will be asked to approve an Act to establish the St. Clair parkway commission.

LABOUR

In the past three years virtually all legislation administered by The Department of Labour in the areas of training, safety, labour standards and labour relations has been thoroughly reviewed to bring it into line with present-day requirements.

Legislation: There will be laid before hon. members, however, several important new enactments.

Proposals will be made concerning certain provisions of The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act to bring them into line with modern community standards.

The Older Worker: The House will be asked to approve a special programme, to be administered by the Ontario Human Rights Commission, designed to remove barriers and enlarge opportunities for persons in the older-worker category.

On-the-Job Training Programme: Hon. members, you will be asked to approve the

expansion of the on-the-job training programme launched by The Department of Labour in co-operation with industry, labour, and agencies of government. Acceptance of the programme has been outstanding and it has demonstrated the highest degree of effectiveness, with several thousand persons being trained in trades or occupations on the job.

LANDS AND FORESTS

Forest Regeneration: Under The Crown Timber Act, the Minister of Lands and Forests may enter into an agreement with a licensee for the protection and maintenance of the productivity of the licensed area. Redoubled efforts have been made to reach agreement with all the major licence-holders in the province whereby forest regeneration will take place at such a rate as to assure continuous yields. As a consequence of discussions and meetings recently held with the larger licence-holders, formal agreements with them are in process of being executed.

Tree planting on a major scale will this year be supplemented in several districts by tubed seedling programmes. This should result in a very substantial increase in the number of trees planted. By other recognized methods of regeneration, including aerial seeding, still greater progress in forest regeneration will occur in 1966.

A new Act will be introduced respecting private forestry. It will provide for government assistance in regeneration and stand improvement of private lands through agreement with the owners of the lands.

Northern Indians in the Forest Protection Service: The policy of The Department of Lands and Forests for training our northern Indian citizens in forest protection and management is expanding rapidly, and in 1966 will be continued particularly in the further development of standby fire crews. A force of 300 Indians was maintained during the 1965 season. In the past three years 890 Indians have completed a 10-day training programme to qualify as "certified fire-fighters". Approximately 1,000 Indians were employed in tree-planting last year.

Junior Rangers — Bilingual Experiment: Last summer, at a camp at Racine Lake in the Chapleau district, the department designated as junior rangers 12 English-speaking youths from Ontario with some knowledge of French, and 12 French-speaking youths from several points in Quebec province with similar knowledge of English. This first bilingual experiment in the ranger programme was so successful that it will be extended.

Legislation: Amendments will be proposed to The Public Lands Act, The Crown Timber Act, The Game and Fish Act, The Provincial Land Tax Act, and The Provincial Parks Act.

Proposals will be laid before the House to amend The Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company Act.

PROGRESS IN MINING

The value of Ontario's mineral production in 1965 exceeded that of any previous year as new mines came into production. The interest in prospecting and exploration activity continued at a high level, stimulated by the programme of geological surveys and geological reports through which information was provided, by The Department of Mines, on the geological structure and mineral-bearing potential of the province.

An area of some 20,000 square miles in northeastern Ontario, containing few rock exposures and difficult of access, appears to have considerable merit because of proximity to an important mining area. This will be one of the many areas to be examined geologically this year.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

Legislation affecting municipal administration will be introduced to amend The Municipal Act, The Assessment Act, and certain other Acts, having regard to the important recommendations of The Select Committee on The Municipal Act and Other Related Acts.

You will also be asked to approve a bill introducing a new concept in municipal government. This legislation will establish a development board as a municipal corporation to provide services in Moosonee and other northern areas so that the needs of these communities may be met.

CITIZENSHIP PROGRAMME

The citizenship division of The Department of the Provincial Secretary and Citizenship will continue its programme for the successful integration of immigrants into the life of Ontario. Field staff will be provided for the area outside of Metropolitan Toronto. You will be asked to approve the extension of the highly successful and expanding summer school programme, embracing language and citizenship training for adult newcomers, and the training of persons to teach a second language.

PUBLIC WELFARE

Bed Construction Grants for Charitable Institutions: The Charitable Institutions Act will be amended to authorize The Department of

Public Welfare to share capital costs on the basis of \$5,000 per bed, in place of the present grant of \$2,500 per bed.

Broader Welfare Services: You will be asked to approve the enactment of a comprehensive Welfare Act. This legislation will consolidate and extend the present benefits of old age assistance, disabled persons', and blind persons' allowances, on which many of the present restrictions will be eliminated.

Financial Support for Rest Home Construction: An amendment to The Homes for the Aged Act will be submitted giving authority to the municipalities of Ontario to construct rest homes and to receive financial support from the provincial government. The rest homes will serve adult persons of any age who require long-term care and a measure of nursing services.

Programme Concerning Older Citizens: You will be asked to approve the establishment of a new branch of The Department of Public Welfare, to be known as the Office on Aging. This branch will concern itself with the general social conditions, and treatment, of our older citizens.

REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Progressive Measures: The Department of Reform Institutions will continue its progress in the reorganization of correctional services, and hon. members of the Legislature will be asked to support the establishment, development and maintenance of a number of varied programmes and institutions.

Further emphasis will be placed upon the continuance of the policy of reducing the size of larger institutions, and of diversifying programmes in all localities of the province. Training centres will be established in association with all reform institutions. Forestry camp activities will be enlarged.

A trades and industries advisory committee will be established to evaluate the existing vocational training, and industrial and farm production in reform institutions. The principal purpose is to update these areas of the rehabilitation programmes to bring them in line with present-day methods and needs in industry and the labour market.

A new 60-bed dormitory for the treatment of offenders with alcoholism and drug addiction problems will be constructed. An extension and consolidation will be made of the in-patient forensic clinic for the treatment of sex deviates, which was opened in 1965.

A new staff school will be constructed for the more effective use of available professional and clinical personnel in the training

and orientation of the staffs of The Department of Reform Institutions and the new regional detention centres.

To keep pace with the changing pattern of institutions and to enable men with indeterminate sentences to take advantage of training programmes in institutions in their own locality, the parole and rehabilitation service will be extended. Hon. members will be asked to approve amendments to The Parole Act.

Additional agreements will be signed to establish regional detention centres to replace local jails in many areas of the province.

Construction of the new rehabilitation centre for women will commence this year.

TOURISM

There will be an expanded programme to increase and encourage tourism in our province. Your approval of such programme, and the appropriation thereof of additional expenditures, will be sought.

The consolidation of The Tourist Establishment Act and The Tourism and Information Act will be proposed. Such legislation will include provision for the licensing of privately-operated information centres and a system of rate filing for tourist establishments.

Centennial Centre of Science and Technology: Work will continue on the construction of The Ontario Centennial Centre of Science and Technology. Present plans are to have the first two of five phases completed in 1967 for Centennial Year celebrations.

It is anticipated that, by 1970, over 1.5 million people will visit the centre each year.

Particular attention is being paid to the educational aspects of the centre. It is expected that approximately 3,000 school children per day will visit the centre by 1975.

TRANSPORTATION IN ONTARIO

Need for Improved Driving Habits: The motor vehicle population explosion in Ontario in the last 20 years has quadrupled the number of automobiles, in use on the highways, to a total of 2.5 million. During the same period the number of licensed drivers has increased to almost three million who drove more than 22 billion miles in 1965.

As a consequence of this explosive growth in road transportation, there has been a corresponding increase in traffic accidents. The Department of Transport has developed a vigorous programme aimed at persuading the motorist to improve his driving habits and attitudes.

Important new measures in the interest of safety will be introduced in the coming year.

Compulsory Motor Vehicle Inspection: Compulsory motor vehicle inspection, introduced last spring, will operate at 80 locations this year, fully utilizing the department's enlarged fleet of mobile safety check units.

High School Driver Instruction: The rapidly growing interest in driver instruction in the high schools is indicated with the course being now provided in almost 150 schools. The driver-training programme is endorsed by the Departments of Education and Transport.

Metropolitan Toronto and Region Transportation Study: The report on the examination of the transportation problems of our provincial capital and its environs, being conducted by the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study, is scheduled for completion this year. The first concrete product of the study was a recommendation that a lakeshore rail service for commuters be introduced on a trial basis. This was approved and is now being implemented with starting date planned for early in 1967.

MANPOWER RESOURCES

In recent years there have developed in Ontario many practical forms of educational training to improve the skill of our workers.

Continuing study has been given to aspects of the problems of training and retraining to meet the demands for skilled manpower.

It is my government's intention to provide a formal means of co-ordinating the development of manpower resources in all departments of government, particularly the Departments of Education, Labour, Economics and Development, and Agriculture. Through this co-ordinated effort, and in collaboration with other government agencies, active progress will be made during the ensuing year to initiate new programmes relating to manpower development.

REDISTRIBUTION

Legislation respecting electoral boundaries of the legislative assembly will be laid before hon. members following receipt of the final report of the redistribution commission.

CULTURAL EXCHANGES

My government intends to join in discussions with the government of Quebec for arrangements respecting cultural exchanges. Visits of a cultural nature with personal contact should lead to deeper mutual understanding.

The many streams of culture in our country have lent a special character to our national life. All Canadians have become much more conscious than formerly of the richness of this unique quality of our society.

It is desirable that a greater degree of awareness be brought about amongst the people of all provinces in the realm of their cultural achievements and traditions, and thus enhance a spirit of national unity and goodwill.

OTHER LEGISLATION

During the session, further legislative measures and proposals will be placed before you for your consideration and approval.

May Divine Providence guide you in your deliberations.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire from the chamber.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of His Honour's speech, which I will now read.

(Reading dispensed with)

THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to correct certain typographical errors which appear in the bill that now is on the statute books.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), that the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor to this House be taken into consideration tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, there is no further business for this day—

Mr. Speaker: Pardon me, Mr. Prime Minister, at this time I beg to inform the House of a vacancy that has occurred in the membership of the House by reason of the death of Mr. Leo Troy, member for Nipissing.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, in regard to your remark I would like to say that Mr. Troy was a very great friend of all hon. members of this House, on both sides, and was well known to me personally for a good many years. We would extend our sympathy to his family and simply say how much we will miss him.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister in speaking of the late Leo Troy. I believe that the Ontario Legislature and, indeed, the public of Ontario have lost a devoted and valuable public servant. I think all of us, not only on this side of the House but throughout the House, had a very real respect for this unusual man. He was a man with a warmth towards humanity, with a tolerance towards people and with a firm dedication to public service. And I also would like to extend heartfelt sympathy to his wife and to his family at this time of deepest sorrow.

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could move to mention a happier situation in that I am sure it is apparent to everyone in the House that there is a remarkable man here, the Dean of this Legislature, and this year will be his fortieth year in the Legislature. This to me is remarkable because I was aged one when he came into the Legislature. But in case anyone on the other side should think that because of his venerable time in the House he has lost any of the insight and the youthfulness that he first brought to the House I can assure them that that is not the case.

He sits on my left and he has an instinct for any Machiavellian approach either by my colleagues on the left here or by the government. He is a very trusted and worthy adviser with a deep wisdom, and I think principally the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is a man who has stood for the aspirations and hopes of the people of this province and on all sides of the House I know that we would wish to congratulate him on his 40th anniversary.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, it is a tradition in this House, that on the opening day there should be a spirit of warmth and cordiality. For my part I would like to also bring to the attention of the House that it is Robbie Burns' birthday. I am glad that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has come

back again. I notice he was tending two pages. I should say that Robbie Burns has demonstrated in poetry the dignity, the soul and the welfare of the common man and, despite which party we belong to, I think that in our legislation these are the objectives that we have for the people of Ontario.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, there is little more that I could add in paying tribute to the late Leo Troy, than the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition have said. He was, in a very true sense, a gentleman; a man, but a gentle man, and I do not know that I have ever met a person in whom the milk of human kindness flowed in such generous proportions, as in Leo Troy. We miss everyone who departs from this House. None will be missed more than he.

I would also like to join with the hon. leader of the Opposition in paying tribute to the Dean of the House. I hope it is not indicative of the Opposition leader's problem that he has to reach back that distance to bolster his position today, but he has got Grey South with him at the present time.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, I noted with satisfaction—with even a touch of Scottish arrogance—that the Irish have joined us today in paying tribute to Robbie Burns.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself in offering congratulations to the hon. member for Grey South. He has been a personal friend of mine, as well as a doughty opponent across this space for many years, and I hope he will remain right in his present seat for many years to come.

In that regard, it is pure coincidence, but nonetheless interesting, to note that 61 years ago today, on January 25, 1905, there was a general election which brought to an end the rule of Liberal government. Now some people say we have been here too long, Mr. Speaker, but that Liberal government was elected first in 1872 and was defeated in 1905, so even to beat that Liberal record, we have some time to go.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 3.55 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Wednesday, January 26, 1966

Introducing Mr. George Ben and Mr. Richard Stanley Smith, Mr. Robarts	13
Reading and receiving petitions	14
Motion for provision for printing reports, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	15
Motion to appoint select committee re standing committees, Mr. White, agreed to	15
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company Act, 1941, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	26
Public Lands Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	26
Railway Fire Charge Act, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	26
Provincial Land Tax Act, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	26
Statement re agreement between Steep Rock Iron Mines Ltd. and Algoma Steel Corpora- tion, Mr. Wardrobe	37
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	38

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received during the recess notification of a vacancy which had occurred in the membership of the House by reason of the death of Joseph M. Gould, member for the electoral district of Bracondale.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk had received from the chief election officer, and laid upon the table, the certificate of a by-election held since the last session of the House:

Electoral district of Bracondale: George Ben.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that in view of a writ of election dated the 5th day of August, 1965, issued by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario and addressed to Mrs. E. L. Antler, returning officer for the electoral district of Bracondale, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Bracondale in the legislative assembly of this province, in the room of Joseph M. Gould, Esq., who since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Bracondale, hath departed this life, George Ben, Esq., has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated the 24th day of September, 1965, which is now lodged of record in my office.

(Signed)
RODERICK LEWIS
Chief Election Officer

Toronto, January 26, 1966.

George Ben, Esquire, member-elect for the electoral district of Bracondale, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took his seat.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that the Clerk had received from the chief election officer, and laid upon the table, the certificate of a by-election held since the last session of the House:

Electoral district of Nipissing: Richard Stanley Smith.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that in view of a writ of election dated the 5th day of August, 1965, issued by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Ontario and addressed to James I. Martin, Esq., returning officer for the electoral district of Nipissing, for the election of a member to represent the said electoral district of Nipissing in the legislative assembly of this province, in the room of Leo Troy, Esq., who since his election as representative of the said electoral district of Nipissing, hath departed this

life, Richard Stanley Smith, Esq., has been returned as duly elected as appears by the return of the said writ of election, dated the 24th day of September, 1965, which is now lodged of record in my office.

(Signed)
RODERICK LEWIS
Chief Election Officer

Toronto, January 26, 1966.

Richard Stanley Smith, Esquire, member-elect for the electoral district of Nipissing, having taken the oaths and subscribed the roll, took his seat.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of extending a very warm welcome to these two new hon. members and to wish them well in their life in this Legislature. We did our level best to keep them out of this Legislature, but not having succeeded, we welcome them with a warm, friendly welcome. We will expect that they will take full part in the affairs of this Legislature and I would wish for them a fulfilling and a happy life, as far as that is possible in a forum such as this.

Welcome to our Legislature.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to concur with the hon. Prime Minister's remarks. I appreciate very much that he has expressed these warm sentiments, despite the fact that they are sitting on this side of the House. I know that all hon. members here get a deep satisfaction from the obligations and the responsibility which they have to assume and I am sure that these two hon. members will fulfil that responsibility and obligation as the rest of us do.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Well, Mr. Speaker, my position is somewhat similar to that of the hon. Prime Minister. We did our level best to keep them out and we failed too.

However, someone has once described a parliament or a legislature as a sort of select club. We are all members of that club who meet as individuals and we have, I know, warm relationships as individuals. I do not think that should be altered, even though we may engage rather quickly in the cut and thrust of debate which is part of democracy.

I join in the welcome to them and I hope their stay in the House—I will not say that I hope it is a long one, but while they are here I hope they find it very enjoyable.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the Kenora Rink Company praying that an Act may pass dissolving the company and transferring its assets to the corporation of the town of Kenora.

Of the Toronto Aged Men's and Women's Homes praying that an Act may pass enabling it to hold real property at 43-55 Belmont Street and 102 Davenport Road in the city of Toronto; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass to enable it to issue and sell sinking fund debentures and to make provision for the management of the sinking fund.

Of the Tilbury Public School Board praying that an Act may pass enabling it to establish and vest certain property denied to it in the "William J. Miller Trust".

Of the Strathroy Middlesex General Hospital praying that an Act may pass to change the name of the Strathroy General Hospital to the Strathroy Middlesex General Hospital.

Of the corporation of the city of Port Arthur praying that an Act may pass dissolving the board of park management and establishing a board to be known as the Parks, Recreation and Community Centres Board of the city of Port Arthur.

Of the board of trustees of the continuation school of the township of Pelee praying that an Act may pass permitting it to pay a certain sum per day to the parent or guardian of each pupil of grades 11, 12 and 13 attending a secondary school outside the township of Pelee in lieu of providing daily transportation to and from such school.

Of the corporation of the city of Brantford praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Brantford and district civic centre commission.

Of Huntington University praying that an Act may pass to permit the board of regents to increase its membership.

Of the corporation of the township of Michipicoten praying that an Act may pass authorizing a fixed assessment for the Wawa curling club.

Of the board of education for the city of Guelph and the public school board of the

township school area of the township of Guelph praying that an Act may pass to establish the Guelph district board of education.

Of the corporation of the township of Pickering praying that an Act may pass to enable it to establish an area for the supply of power for the use of the inhabitants thereof.

Of L'Institut Canadien-Français praying that an Act may pass to increase its powers to hold property and its honouring privileges.

Of the Canadian National Exhibition Association praying that an Act may pass enabling it to change its membership; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Charlotteville praying that an Act may pass confirming a by-law to issue debentures for school renovation and equipment.

Of the corporation of the town of Waterloo praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to lease or license certain portions of untravelled highways for parking purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of London praying that an Act may pass to authorize the corporation to refund certain business and property taxes; and for other purposes.

Of the board of education of the city of London praying that an Act may pass vesting certain lands in the board in fee simple; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Thorold praying that an Act may pass to relieve the corporation from any further obligation imposed on it by the plan of refunding of the corporation's debenture debt; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Gananoque and the corporation of the united counties of Leeds and Grenville praying that an Act may pass to enlarge the Gananoque high school district.

Of the corporation of the city of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass to increase the membership of the Hamilton transit commission; and for other purposes.

Of the Excelsior Life Insurance Company praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to apply to the Parliament of Canada for a special Act continuing the company as if it had been incorporated by special Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Of the corporation of the city of Kitchener praying that an Act may pass permitting certain by-laws compelling completion of proposed apartment buildings; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to enter into certain agreements for the purpose of maintaining and operating a community television system; and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves, seconded by hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer), that during the present session of the legislative assembly provision be made for the taking and printing of reports of debates and speeches, and to that end that Mr. Speaker be authorized to employ an editor of debates and speeches and the necessary stenographers at such rates of compensation as may be agreed to by him. Also that Mr. Speaker be authorized to arrange for the printing of the reports in the amount of 1,800 copies daily, copies of such printed reports to be supplied to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, to Mr. Speaker, to the Clerk of the legislative assembly, to the legislative library, to each hon. member of the assembly, to the reference libraries of the province, to the press gallery, to the newspapers of the province approved by Mr. Speaker, and the balance to be distributed by the Clerk of the assembly as directed by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion to the hon. Prime Minister that he have the size of *Hansard* cut down one-quarter of an inch at the top and bottom so that it would fit in a normal envelope instead of using the larger manila type of envelope? It would not detract from *Hansard*; it would still leave the printing as is, but it would be a convenience possibly to your office and likewise to hon. members on this side of the House when it comes to sending out copies of *Hansard*.

May I also ask that he include at least post-secondary schools in those that should be receiving copies of *Hansard*, as well as radio and television stations?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will take both points into consideration.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Might I ask the hon. Prime Minister if anything can be done in speeding up the process of delivery of *Hansard* to the hon. members? Once the session gets a month or so old, the *Hansards* become quite old, too. We do not get them for sometimes pretty nearly a week after the debate has taken place. Is there a question of money involved, or what is the problem here? Why can it not be speeded up?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Daily editions get larger.

Mr. Oliver: It may get larger but in Ottawa I think they get their copy of *Hansard* the next day. And here, I remember last session, it was almost a week behind. If anything can be done to speed it up, I think it should be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would be very happy to go into it. We are all in the same position of wanting *Hansard* as quickly as possible. I was not really aware that it was a week behind. We have installed tape recorders and we have lots of people working on it. I do not see any reason why there should be that amount of delay, and I will check into it and see if we cannot speed it up.

Mr. Oliver: They were at least a week behind last year; I know that.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves, seconded by Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches), that the standing committees of the House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes: 1. On agriculture; 2. On education, and university affairs; 3. On government commissions; 4. On health and welfare; 5. On highways and tourism; 6. On legal bills and labour; 7. On municipal affairs; 8. On natural resources, wildlife and mining; 9. On private bills; 10. On privileges and elections; 11. On public accounts; 12. On standing orders and printing; which said committees shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon with the power to send for persons, papers and records.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of setting up standing committees; last year I spoke and I want to speak again at this time. I can appreciate that the hon. member for London South has been trying to bring an order and an arrangement into the committees, but I still think that some of the committees which should be considered to be formed are not formed—I, in the last session, had raised the question that I hoped that someone from the University of Toronto, or some other university, would have a look at the whole rules of procedures and committee work. And I was very grateful that a Professor Fred Schindeler has done a study on that. I could go into that at length, but I want to talk particularly about the committees.

My own feeling is that there should be

a scrutiny committee, and I have raised this before. The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden), when it was raised last year, also suggested that there is a need for a scrutiny committee, and to look at what is done in Manitoba.

I cannot help thinking as we look at the background of regulations and orders-in-council and the independence of boards, that more and more we want to have the delegated power returned to this Legislature. For that reason, a scrutiny committee should be set up, not perhaps as in Britain—I agree with what the hon. member for Woodbine has said—but certainly we should have a look at the situation in Manitoba.

I am concerned that this Legislature is really a façade of democratic rule and that we are handing over far too much to boards and commissions. The only way we can assess that, is if we have a scrutiny committee that is examining the regulations and orders-in-council. I say the only way—at least it is one way to do it.

I am concerned, sir, that in the estimates there should be a closer look at some departments and I think there should be consideration of an estimates committee. Now I know that the last time we discussed this, the hon. Prime Minister pointed out that in the committee of supply, we had the opportunity to discuss the estimates in great detail, and he hoped that I was not suggesting that we move away from having that examination on the floor of the House in having a committee.

I agree with his point on this. I would hope that we keep to our approach of committee of supply, where we have, in my opinion, very good scrutiny of estimates. On the other hand, I have known that there are government hon. members and hon. Cabinet members, who sometimes complained about the questions which we in the Opposition have asked, and the length of time that we have taken in scrutiny of their estimates. They have said, you do not have enough knowledge of this particular department.

I feel, sir, that if we were to take one department in an estimate committee, and I think, for example, of The Department of Education, where we could be looking at this in depth and then come back into the House, that all of us who had been part of that committee would be more informed and would feel that there had been a thorough scrutiny and examination of that department.

I am a little concerned, although we have the examination in the committee of supply, that sometimes there has not been a full opportunity to analyze each item on the esti-

mate. There are two opposition parties. One may be asking the questions, then the next opposition party will get up and pursue another subject and we lose track of getting into depth in some particular area. And we have the Chicago gang behind here, trying to push us along and hurry us. For me, in an estimate committee, apart from the committee of supply, there would be a calmer, and more objective discussion probably, than we have when we are in the House here.

I think, sir, and I say this again, that there should be a committee on rules and procedures. I am sure if any of the hon. members had looked at this article of the facts found by Professor Schindeler, they would be deeply concerned about the abuse that is taking place in this forum: The traditional rights that are being ignored, or else being twisted in some way. And it seems to me that we have to bring the procedure of parliament up to date and have a re-examination of it. We have not really had one since 1939. I again press that there could be a committee, starting as a standing committee, on rules and procedures, which then might go into a select committee during the summer.

Another area which I am concerned about, which was overlooked by the hon. member for London South, is that of the reform of justice. As I have looked at some areas, I feel, and my party feels they are in need of reform—I think of the bail system and others—surely to keep constantly up to date with this, we should have a standing committee on justice, where both individuals and organizations, can come to members on a committee of Parliament to inform them about injustices or need for reform.

It is for these reasons, sir, that I would have hoped, having spoken last year on this, that the whip, through the hon. Prime Minister, might have considered a scrutiny committee, would have considered an estimates committee, certainly a committee on rules and procedures and a committee on justice.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments with regard to this perennial issue of committees and how we can make them more effective. In my view, the hon. leader of the Opposition has ranged over quite a number of issues that clearly, at some time or another, we might take a look at; but, with respect, I think he has missed the main point on which we should focus attention this afternoon.

In ranging, for example, I would agree with him that the time has come when we perhaps should take a look at rules and procedures in

this House. Indeed, at some other time—it does not appropriately, within the rules of the House, come under a discussion of committees—there are some things with regard to rules of the House that I think should be raised early in this session. But that is another matter. He has dealt at considerable length, for example, with the committee on estimates. It is true that in Great Britain they have a committee on estimates, but they have a committee on estimates precisely because of the fact that their procedure and their timetable, their heavy agenda, does not permit the detailed kind of examination of estimates that we are able to give here in this House. Therefore, I personally am not persuaded that a committee on estimates is one of our top priority needs.

There was also, for example, the suggestion that there is a tendency for the responsibilities of the elected representatives of the people to be taken away in boards and commissions. This again is an issue that we are examining all the time. We have a standing committee on government commissions and I would concede immediately it has not done an effective job, but it seems to me that within that standing committee we should seek ways and means of making it more effective in terms of a careful scrutiny of the operations at the policy level with regard to these boards and commissions.

In short, it seems to me in the area of estimates and in the area of boards and commissions, we have at least some sort of a structure within our procedures in this House, or within our standing committees, to be able to deal with it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you there is another area even more important than this; the hon. leader of the Opposition alluded to it, but he said nothing specific and I want to focus the attention of the House on it. He made reference, for example, to the number of times that the hon. member for Woodbine has raised this issue in the House, and the fact that the hon. member for Woodbine has pointed to the practice established in recent years in the province of Manitoba whereby every order-in-council—instead of remaining a secret document; for practical purposes it is secret because people perhaps never learn of it, or learn of it only when suddenly it impinges upon their lives—must be reviewed by a standing committee of this Legislature. Indeed, the committee is known as a committee on statutory instruments.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that here is where you can zero in on the area in which the rights of this Legislature are being

eroded away. We pass bills, many a time, which are nothing but skeletons. The government sometimes argues that it cannot at this stage spell out, and flesh out, the whole of the bill, that they have to play it by ear and use experience as a guide. Then they come forth with regulations with regards to the implementation of that bill. In fact, these regulations are the law. In fact, they are passed by the Cabinet. In fact, they never come before the House unless we choose at some time or another, in a succeeding session, to raise them because of the impact they may have had on the lives of the people within this province.

I suggest that if we want to come to grips with the problem of modern government, namely, a concentration of power in the executive so that parliament is reduced to a rubber stamp, the government side as well as the Opposition side, if we want to examine how you can restore power to the place where it rightly rests, with the elected representatives of the people to review what in fact is law, the effective law, the regulations passed in accordance with a certain bill—then this has to be reviewed constantly by some body of this Legislature. And I think the time has come when we should establish a statutory committee on instruments—call it what you will. Therefore, I would like to move, seconded by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman), that the motion should be amended by adding to the first paragraph thereof the words:

13. On orders-in-council and regulations.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that if this committee then begins on a regular basis during the course of the session—and indeed it will have to become a committee which meets 12 months of the year in reviewing the regulations which are passed—then that committee will be in a position to report to the House and will recall to the representatives of the people some of the powers that have gradually been taken away.

Not only do we have the precedent that the hon. member for Woodbine has referred to in reference to Manitoba but, as the hon. leader of the Opposition said, you have it in Great Britain. For example, Prime Minister Wilson can rise in the British House of Commons and say that an order-in-council has been passed with regard to sanctions in Rhodesia, as important an issue as that. The fact of the matter is that order-in-council must go before a standing committee; it must be reviewed by that standing committee. If it is not approved within one month the order-in-council becomes null and void.

If the committee sees fit to return this order-in-council for debate in the House, then it has the power to do that. In other words, if it deems it important enough that the elected representatives of the people should have an opportunity to debate it, it is so ordered and it comes back to the House. And if it does not come back to the House within a prescribed time, once again, it becomes null and void.

This, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is the way in which you can halt this gradual erosion of the powers of the elected representatives of the people and, I think, incidentally give some protection to the government which often gets itself into difficulty by orders-in-council which are passed, in effect, secretly and applied on people without any prior notice or without any prior opportunity for debate by them or the people whom they send to this Legislature.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, if I may comment—

Mr. Speaker: I will put the motion and then the hon. member can speak to the amendment as well as the main motion, if he cares to.

Moved by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Freeman, that the motion be amended by adding to the first paragraph thereof the words:

13. On orders-in-council and regulations.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make some comments in regard to this amendment. In the first place in dealing with the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition, I am of the opinion that our present committees can be utilized in various ways of which, perhaps, little thought has been given. I remember, for instance, some years ago, when the committee on education examined the complete function of The Department of Education in a series of meetings which took place over a period, I think, of two years, and the committee brought various departments before it—remember the curriculum department and so on—it served two purposes.

One, it provided for the members of that committee who were interested, a complete examination of the departmental functioning. Second, it gave the committee itself some constructive work to do.

I see no reason why this principle could not be applied in other committees as far as that is concerned. To my mind it really is a question of a committee organizing itself, and the members of the committee from both

sides of the House taking enough interest to arrange the meetings and attend them.

As far as the government and the departments are concerned, they are only too pleased to submit themselves to this scrutiny. In the last two or three years we have begun to examine the finances, department by department, in the public accounts committee. This is functioning very well, and that committee is going into the financial affairs of the various departments in some detail.

So, while we have this discussion every year, there was some prior discussion this year, I believe, between the whips, in order that we could expand the number of committees. There are two or three more this year than there were last year. This was done in consultation, in order to make the committee system more effective.

I do not agree, of course, with the proposition of an estimates committee for the same reasons that my hon. friend put forward. I think this is better accomplished in committee of the whole House. Then there is the fact that occasionally there might be a little heckling or some signs of impatience, but I think that is brought on more by the length of the sitting. I have never noticed that any indication of that kind from this side of the House had any marked effect upon the questioning or the length of time taken by the Opposition—

Mr. MacDonald: It did not frighten us.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, I am quite certain it did not. So I really do not think that is much of a point.

I do think that the examination we give the estimates here really is an examination, not only of the estimates of money to be spent, but it has turned into a complete examination of the entire function of government. I would not want to see that disturbed; nor would I want to see this passed over to another committee.

I think we already have various bodies sitting doing reform work. The law reform committee, which submits a report periodically—these matters are debated here. If the hon. member had some idea of something which needed to be explored, perhaps these standing committees could assume these duties because they are all set out in fairly broad functions.

My point really is this: It is a matter of making our present arrangements work; I think the committees are there and can be made to function to achieve some of the objectives to which my hon. friend is drawing

attention. We have tried to revise the committee system periodically, in order to make it more effective. We have accepted ideas from all sides of the House, and from all parties. We have made changes in consultation and we are quite prepared to make further changes.

In regard to the amendment, I want to speak against the amendment as such but I do not want to speak against the idea the hon. member is attempting to highlight in making this amendment. I do not think a standing committee of this House is the place to conduct the examination that could lead to some action in this area.

I would be very pleased to agree to forming a group from all parties to do the research on this matter, but this is not a function for a standing committee. Then we could see—you have mentioned what is done in several other jurisdictions—there would be a good deal of research necessary to see if we can find some means of meeting these objections which you raise. In actual fact, the regulations are all published in the *Ontario Gazette*. The real problem is, of course, they are long and are complicated and very complex. I think this is one reason that people do not read them, because when the regulations come out in the *Ontario Gazette*, quite often they are very frightening to the average person.

The orders-in-council are posted. Perhaps our procedures are not exactly what we would want—and I would be quite happy to go into this matter, and I would be quite happy to do it on an all-party basis—but, first of all, we have to examine what is done and we have to examine the various courses of action that would lie open to us. Then we could formalize it, if this is the answer, by appointing a committee such as you say; but as for appointing a committee at this stage, in my opinion I would not be prepared to turn that over to a committee until we have done a considerable amount of research, which I think we can do.

Mr. MacDonald: They did the research in Manitoba, they have got it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would want to have a look at what was done in Manitoba, and I would like to examine it myself, before I just go ahead blindly and say that is what would be proposed to be done. Because these procedures in other jurisdictions are not always suitable to this jurisdiction, I certainly would not accept it out of hand; and in voting against this amendment I am quite prepared, to assure the House that I will see we go into

this matter on an all-party basis, to see if we cannot evolve some method.

We do not wish to hide what is in the regulations. There is no desire on the part of this government to conceal what we are doing. It really is a question of devising a means of getting at it. So, in opposing your amendment, I am accepting, and I will tell you that we will take steps to see what we can do about making these things somewhat more—well, they are available now—it really is a question of some method of examining them more closely.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, speaking on the amendment, I am simply rather amused at the hon. Prime Minister's remarks that he now says that he would be prepared to have some research, and get together and sort of look at things. At least we have got a change of heart there, because last year I proposed a resolution to discuss this whole area and he did not see fit to bring that resolution before us. Another area I want to discuss, at some point, is the way the Opposition is muzzled.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Well, did we discuss it last year? Why did you not bring the resolution forward?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: We could not discuss it. It was not brought forward.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the leader of the Opposition to stick to the amendment before the House, please.

Mr. Thompson: I would say, sir, there is irony in that the hon. Prime Minister should blandly tell us: Well, you know, you have this procedure working now, and let us have a look at it. Some of us are deeply concerned with the way that this operation is performing, and have already looked at it, and I would have hoped that the hon. Prime Minister would have done the same.

Let me just take the *Ontario Gazette*. The regulations, he says, are published. They are published when these regulations actually come in force, but there is no examination before. May I say I would have thought this government would have been particularly sensitive to any regulation which might abuse the rights of the people; and I do not need to recall the police bill to hon. members, for example, to make them feel a certain sense of uneasiness, that perhaps they do step over the rights of the people.

One of the safeguards we could have to ensure that boards are not making regulations which are *ultra vires* of the intent of the Legislature would be to set up a scrutiny committee. I refer to a scrutiny committee, which is what it is called in Great Britain. I feel that the machinery is obvious. Hon. members have a legal officer to help with this detail, to help with the complication of regulations, and to explain it to the committee. There have been set down certain ground rules which a committee made up of representatives of the Legislature, have to watch for—such as the discretionary power of Ministers, taxation being abused, use of taxation, and so on. This has been explained and has been examined in almost every democratic country throughout the world.

The growth of boards and commissions was becoming an alarming thing to the previous Prime Minister, Mr. Frost. He got together the Gordon Commission to have a look at it and they came through with certain recommendations. Now, after a period in office, the present hon. Prime Minister tells us: Well, I am prepared to have a look at this thing on an all-party committee or something, it is still vague to us. Not even until now has he considered an all-party committee to examine it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are talking about different things. We have a committee of this House on government commissions. Once again, that committee is free to call before it any commission, any board, any emanation of this government. If it does not do it, it is the committee's fault. The committee is there, and it has this function, and hon. members of all parties sit on it. I do not really know what closer scrutiny you can have of the boards and commissions. But my point remains, that the machinery is there and the members of the committees have the power. This is why they are set up.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say, sir, that the machinery may be there, but if the hon. Prime Minister should look at the scrutiny committee in Manitoba he will find that orders-in-council, many of them, with this government, are passed when parliament is no longer sitting. He will find also that, in the scrutiny committee in Manitoba, they have, in order to help the committee, a legal representative to explain orders-in-council. He will find a number of areas such as this.

One of the real concerns that the people of Ontario have, I think, is that many orders-in-council and regulations are being passed when parliament is not in session. We are

concerned whether this parliament is a façade concerning rulings and decision-making here; whether it is done by boards and commissions. It is for this reason that I would press, even though we have an existing committee, that it does not have much of the apparatus to do the job properly.

If we look at the publication, for example, of the *Ontario Gazette* and regulations during this summer, look at The Canada Pension Act, with the OMERS regulations which came out under Mr. Cass, regulations slipped through, published in the *Gazette* when parliament was not sitting. It is our concern that, with so many boards, over 100 boards and commissions, we need a scrutiny committee with full responsibility and with assistance from the civil service to help it.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, if I may make some general comments on the organization of committees, I assume you have invited debate on both the motion and the amendment?

Mr. Speaker: On the amendment.

Mr. White: You are restricting debate to the amendment? I will make my remarks—

Mr. Speaker: Please include the amendment in your remarks.

Mr. White: Oh, very good. The only objective of the government in the organization and scheduling of committees and committee work has been to make this aspect of the work of the legislative branch of the government more effective. To this end we have made a number of changes once again this year. The committees consist of a smaller membership on the basis that smaller committees are more effective committees. We have split off two new committees: namely, the committee on education from the committee on education, health and welfare because of the heavy load of work that is expected in these important areas of government; and we have split off municipal affairs from the committee on labour and legal bills because of the heavy legislative load anticipated in this area.

Each hon. member is on a smaller number of committees so that he can specialize and make a more effective contribution to the work of standing committees. A great deal of thought was given to the scheduling of committees and we on our side have ensured that a particular member will not be on two committees which meet at the same time. We assume that the whips on the other side will follow that practice also.

We are getting off to a very fast start, and there will be a notice sent later today concerning the meeting of the striking committee tomorrow.

Finally, I would like to say that we have endeavoured to have continuity of membership and continuity of chairmanship, unless there is a good reason not to do so. Incidentally, this last suggestion came from the speech which the hon. leader of the Opposition made at this time last year.

The point I would like to stress to the House, sir, is this: The suggestions made in the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition a year ago and the suggestions which came from the meetings of their caucus were given consideration and, I think without exception, adopted. The executive assistant to the hon. leader of the Opposition attended these meetings as did the hon. member for York South.

I say with some sorrow, sir, that I think these last-minute suggestions are offered in this House at this time not to effect improvement in the committee system but to give the public a wholly unrealistic impression so far as the government is concerned. If these suggestions are being made in good faith, why did they not come in to those meetings where these changes were made, where every suggestion offered, I think, was accepted, where there was complete unanimity from the representatives of each of the three parties.

Now it may be that some of the suggestions offered at this time can be incorporated in the work of the committees this year or next year so that they will be given careful consideration. I would hope that in 11 months, or thereabouts, when we sit down once again with representatives from the other side to consider changes in the committee system they will have the integrity to offer their suggestions at a time when they can be implemented.

Mr. Thompson: I raised that last year.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for London South may speak with any degree of sorrow that he wishes, we do not intend in this party to participate constantly in private meetings with government about matters which are of grave and serious concern in any responsible democracy. I would like simply to highlight in a very simple way, in support of the motion made by my hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald), what has in fact happened on this question of delegation of legislation. This Legislature passed, in 1962, an Act entitled The Ontario

Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act, commonly known as OMERS. This particular statute provided in the wording of the statute—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid we are getting a little far afield from the topic before the House. We have an amendment before the House at the present time and I would like the hon. members to speak to the amendment moved by Mr. MacDonald, adding No. 13 to the list of number of committees, naming it "on orders-in-council and regulations". I do not mind if you come back to the original motion in your remarks, but I would not like members discussing other specific subjects regarding former legislation at this time.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I was just leading up to direct relationship in the remarks that I intend to make on the amendment put by my hon. leader.

In that statute specific provision was made that the government may make regulations prescribing the composition of the board—that is, the Ontario municipal employees' retirement board—and the appointment of the members of that board. Under that authority the government saw fit to pass a regulation, which was published—and I agree with the hon. Prime Minister there was no wish on his part, and indeed the statute of this Legislature prohibits him from hiding what is passed by way of regulation. But, the regulation specifically provided that the board shall be composed of the Minister of Municipal Affairs for such period of time as the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council determines. It then proceeds by stating that after the period of time determined by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council the board shall be composed of three officials of the province of Ontario, and so on, to set up the board at some indefinite time in the future.

Now I make this point, not for any simple or gymnastic legal purpose, but to point out how in fact, by means of this regulation, the government has defeated the whole purpose of that bill. The purpose of that bill was to establish a board divorced to some extent from the government for the administration of that system.

This was, of course, in line with the recommendations made some years ago by the report of the committee on the organization of government in Ontario, which specifically stated in its recommendations that it was inadvisable and unwise for a Minister to be a member of any board. The reason given in that report was that if a Minister was

a member of any board and found himself outvoted by other members of the board he would find difficulty in putting the recommendations of such a board to the government for implementation by regulation. In this case, of course, the government solved that problem entirely by simply having one person, a Minister, the member of the board. Even the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) may disagree with himself on occasions, but in this case it would be difficult for him to disagree when he was placing his own views before the government to decide whether or not regulations would be passed to implement it.

Now I would simply suggest that the purpose of that statute was in fact to provide for a board. The regulations which were authorized by that statute do not provide for a board, it provides for the Minister being the board. That is not, in my language, what a board is supposed to be composed of. It is not to be composed solely of the Minister.

I will leave it for lawyers in this House to tell me whether or not the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, by passing such a regulation, has in fact determined the period of time during which the Minister of Municipal Affairs will continue as the board. In my particular opinion I do not think the Lieutenant-Governor in Council has determined the period during which the Minister of Municipal Affairs will be that board, and therefore in a very real sense there is a serious question as to the validity of any actions taken by the Minister of Municipal Affairs purporting to act in the name of the board under a regulation which I believe was not passed within the framework that was intended by the statute itself.

I would think, in speaking to the amendment of my hon. leader, that at least in this kind of instance such a committee as he proposes would have an opportunity over a period of time to direct attention to this kind of misuse of the regulatory power conferred by this assembly on the government in enacting statutes of general application.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I think there is much more at stake in this debate than just what is embodied in this amendment. For several years now, since I have had the privilege of being here and taking part in these debates, this sort of discussion has taken place on the second day of the sittings; it is almost traditional.

We always have the air of sweet reasonableness emanating from the hon. Prime

Minister's desk and he appears to cast himself in the role of being reasonable and fair and honourable and so on. He is all of those things, but nothing changes. The committee system has remained substantially the same to my knowledge; over the last six years it has not changed and there is no real intention of making a change.

The hon. member for London South, I presume speaking on behalf of the government, gives us his assurance—and I did not know that he had the right; perhaps this is the way it is worked over there; I did not know that the hon. member had the right to say, next year we will consider it.

Now the hon. member for London South, undoubtedly, if he speaks with authority, in this field, must speak with authority given to him by the hon. Prime Minister. The hon. member for London South is determining the procedures of this House and I think he should be given a Cabinet appointment that befits his rank to make such decisions.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think there are a number of very important issues at stake here. The hon. Prime Minister states the committees can do what they want. This year we separated legal and labour bills from municipal affairs. This is going to give ample time to study these two fields. To listen to the remarks from the Speech from the Throne, it is obvious that our friend the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has a lengthy and complicated programme of legislation. We are going to have bills dealing with loan and trust matters, legal aid, cost of credit, personal property, securities, the re-assignment and redivision of this department, and so on.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is going to be a very full programme for any committee just to examine the legislation and talk about it. But surely the point my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) was making is that we need, for the proper review of administration of justice in this province, a standing committee on justice so that we can have come before that committee, the very civil servants in The Department of the Attorney General, to find out in a meaningful way what they do.

What does the superintendent of insurance do? What does the man in charge of loan and trust companies do? We have the law reform commission, someone mentioned that. Some of us here have grave doubts about whether or not the law reform commission is functioning in the way it was intended to function or it is desired that it should function.

Surely if we had a standing committee on justice this sort of thing could be inquired into. I think it is of substantial importance, Mr. Speaker, and I do not think I can overstate this, I think it is of substantial importance that we, as private members of this House, be given an opportunity to inquire directly from civil servants who have to come before these committees, what their role is, what their duties are; and also bring members of the public before the standing committee on justice and find out what are the complaints about the bail system, for instance.

This is a very current and a very serious problem. Do we have to sit back and wait, Mr. Speaker, until the hon. Attorney General in his own good time decides either he is going to change it by legislation or he is not, or do we attempt to get at it in the comparatively limited time we have when his estimates come before this House? Surely this sort of suggestion makes good common sense and would mean something insofar as the functions of private members are concerned.

Sweet reasonableness again! How many times have we suggested that the chairman of the public accounts committee be a member of the Opposition, and there is ample precedent for this in Ottawa and the United Kingdom and so on. I have not heard the hon. member for London South give his decision on this but I would be interested in hearing somebody on that side of the House say whether or not this is one of the reasonable steps that is likely to be taken. Surely it makes some sense, and it has been proven in other jurisdictions, that having a member of the Opposition as chairman of the committee on public accounts might have a salutary effect in the examination of those accounts.

We could go on and on, Mr. Speaker, about staff for these committees, about the appointment of chairmen. The appointment as a chairman of these standing committees is a plum that is passed around among the back benchers on the government side. Now I do not know if the invitation is directed by reason of long service or good fellowship or by knowledge of the particular person who is put in charge of each particular committee. It would seem to me that if we had a standing committee on justice that the chairman of that committee could and should be the best lawyer they have over there on those back benches.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Oh, none of them could make a living at that.

Mr. Singer: It would seem to me that if we have a standing committee on education which is going to conduct this sort of inquiry, that the person in charge of that could be someone who has had some experience—and there are a number of them—in the teaching profession. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this air of sweet reasonableness that we get every second day of each succeeding session really means nothing.

We are going to have the same committee system; we are going to have the same sort of meetings; the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) is going to come in and show his films—and say “What a grand fellow I am—I built another highway”—that’s the film that went on TV on the free time broadcast. Somebody else is going to come in with an organization chart saying, “Look, I have got seven deputies and six assistants and four personnel men and three publicity men, am I not a grand fellow” and this is all that is going to happen out of these committees.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the time has come, if the government wants to make these committees work, that they listen to some of these suggestions made here year after year, and do something about them.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, I find that I cannot reach your eye, sir, because of a super-vening obstruction.

Surely, sir, it is a mistake for the hon. member for York South to focus on one aspect of this problem and denote it, in his opinion, as being the most important. He says that—if I understood him correctly—the scrutiny of orders-in-council and regulations was far and away above in importance in demanding our time than any of the matters that were mentioned by my hon. leader. Sir, for my own part I would say to you that everything that has been said today has been said ably by the hon. members who have spoken and is part and parcel of the composite picture as to how this democratic process within this House shall function.

It may just be that since there was a substantial pay increase last year to all hon. members that the public of this province will expect that the democratic process in this Legislature shall function more efficiently and expeditiously in exercising its scrutiny, promoting its criticisms, and doing all things else that are part of the parliamentary process.

Sir, I would take the opportunity to focus on one aspect myself, and I do not protest that it is in any way more important than those aspects that have been delineated by the other hon. members.

On the last day of the session, last year, sir, I drew to the attention of the House how there had come to be eroded from the procedures of this House the right of the Opposition to amend motions for supply. And I pointed out to your Honour that some years ago within this House it was the custom for Ministers and usually the Treasurer himself that he move that your Honour leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply. I showed, sir, how that practice had fallen into disuse in the House.

I say this in line with the urging of my hon. leader that a standing committee of the House be set up to study the rules and procedures of this House. The hon. Prime Minister rises and, as my hon. friend from Downsview very aptly put it, with an attitude of sweet reasonableness, which I think is more or less politely described as being a formula for dealing with matters of this kind, he says we will study these things.

Well, I would ask if that important matter has been studied over the summer vacation, to preclude the necessity of a member getting up on a point of order as one will, I can assure you the first time, the first time, sir, the Clerk intones from his place "the House in committee of supply." Are we instead going to return to the practice that existed in this House for many decades until a year or two ago, where you left the chair, on a motion that you leave the chair, and the House resolved itself into committee of supply; that you do not impel yourself out of the chair, because the Clerk reads from the order paper a number? That is how you have been going into committee.

I have pointed out, and it is a matter of serious import to me, that a Stuart king had to come with the troops, to get your predecessor out of the chair, to force him out. Now, you leave the chair, vacate your business as the Speaker of the House, because the Clerk, in his very resonant and glowing tone, says, "House in committee of supply." In other words, we may want to amend that motion some days.

In Ottawa, by agreement, they do it six times a year. The Opposition is able to bring current problems, current griefs, contemporary matters as recent as this morning's newspaper, before the floor of the House, six times a year, at Ottawa.

Just this morning, I wandered into the hon. Attorney General's library, the only one open around here now incidentally, and looked at *May* and observed that in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, it is done three times a year, but they are more busy than we are.

We trace our rules to the Parliament at Westminster; we are not able to do it at all. We cannot amend a motion. Yes, we can do it once. That is true. We can do it once, the very first time that the Provincial Treasurer moves the motion. Otherwise, we are stricken dumb, if one can imagine that, we are stricken into silence—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, we are stricken silent, but not dumb. I will adopt that correction, because the motion disappeared. Mr. Frost used to move it, but when he departed, it was moved only a couple of times by the present incumbent of the office of first citizen, and now it has fallen into disuse entirely.

Now, sir, finally, to avoid a row next week or the week after about this, let us come to an agreement in the meantime, that we are going to be able to amend our motion for supply, to submit to this House, grievances that we may have or may occur to us or may arise through the dexterity and the ingenuity and the energy of the gentlemen in the press gallery.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to address myself for a few moments at this point to the specific amendment which my hon. leader has moved.

I agree with the hon. Prime Minister of this House that the statutory regulations as published in the *Ontario Gazette* are complex indeed and fascinating to the hon. members and to the public. I for one feel perfectly free to say in this Legislature that they contain much more of substance and content than much of the legislation which comes under the scrutiny at these sittings. That, of course, is completely without justification in the context of the way this Legislature works.

My hon. colleague from Riverdale, Mr. Speaker, cited one major example of a piece of legislation totally defeated in intent by the regulations which followed it. I want to remind this House of a major debate which took place in the session last year, when we vested in the smiling, beneficent, expansive "Papa Louis," as he was then called, the parental rights for 14,000 children in the province of Ontario. The entire gist of debate under The Child Welfare Act related to extending that Act to protective services; we were not dealing merely in the extremities of care and neglect, but in protecting situations of care and neglect from arising.

Throughout the debate in this House, and in committee, and with back benchers of the Conservative Party, we were assured that the

regulations would define protection, would delineate what was meant, and would give some substance to the Act.

The regulations came out at the end of October, 1965. I would challenge the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) in this House to show where the protection services are guaranteed by regulation. Again, because of the absence of regulations, we have betrayal of the principles of a very fundamental piece of legislation.

Now incidentally, Mr. Speaker, that is also true of The Children's Institutions Act, which was not defined in regulations, particularly that portion of it relating to the 75 per cent per diem subsidy. We never saw in the scrutiny in this House or in any committee, the regulations that might relate to The Training Schools Act.

In all major fields of health and welfare and reform institutions legislation, the regulations are fundamental.

They were never submitted to this Legislature, we are presented with a *fait accompli*. In many instances they are more important than the Act itself; in many instances they vitiate the content and intent of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we in this party cannot accept with equanimity the blandishments of the hon. Prime Minister. We appreciate that he will study the matter, but we sense that there is a certain unnecessary delay about it. We have offered a specific alternative which we deem will work and would therefore wish a division of the House on the matter.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the amendment as proposed by Mr. Macdonald, will please say "aye".

All those opposed, will please say "nay".

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

The vote is on the amendment moved by Mr. MacDonald.

All those in favour of the amendment, will please rise.

All those opposed, will please rise.

AYES	NAYS
Ben	Allan
Braithwaite	Apps
Bukator	Auld
Davison	Bales
Farquhar	Beckett
Freeman	Brown
Gaunt	Brunelle
Gisborn	Carton

AYES	NAYS
Lewis	Cecile
(Scarborough West)	Cowling
MacDonald	Davis
Newman	Demers
Nixon	Downer
Oliver	Dunlop
Paterson	Dymond
Renwick	Edwards
Sargent	Evans
Singer	Ewen
Smith	Gomme
Sopha	Grossman
Thompson	Guindon
Trotter	Hamilton
Whicher—22.	Harris
	Haskett
	Henderson
	Hodgson
	(Scarborough East)
	Hodgson (Victoria)
	Johnston (Carleton)
	Kerr
	Knox
	Lawrence (Russell)
	Lawrence (St. George)
	Letherby
	Lewis (Humber)
	Mackenzie
	MacNaughton
	Morningstar
	McKeough
	McNeil
	Noden
	Olde
	Peck
	Pittock
	Price
	Pritchard
	Randall
	Reilly
	Reuter
	Robarts
	Roberts
	Rollins
	Rowe
	Rowntree
	Sandcock
	Simonett
	Spooner
	Stewart
	Villeneuve
	Walker
	Wardrope
	Welch
	Wells
	White
	Whitney
	Wishart
	Yakubski
	Yaremko—67.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" 67.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the amendment lost.

All those in favour of the main motion moved by Mr. White, will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. White moves, seconded by Mr. Harris, that a select committee of 15 members be appointed to despatch lists of the members to compose standing committees ordered by the House, such committee to be composed as follows:

Mr. MacKenzie, Chairman; Messrs. Carton, Cowling, Ewen, Farquhar, Gisbourn, Johnston (Parry Sound), Knox, Letherby, McNeil, Oliver, Reuter, Root, Sandercock, Thrasher. The quorum of the said committee to consist of four members.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE ALGOMA CENTRAL AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY ACT, 1941

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company Act, 1941.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend the Act of 1941. The effect of the bill is to remove exemptions from assessment and taxation under The Provincial Land Tax Act of lands owned by the company on March 18, 1940, an exemption which the company has enjoyed since that time, and to permit fire charges under The Railway Fire Charge Act to be assessed and levied upon the company in the lands granted as railway subsidy lands retained by the company from which the company has been exempt since January 1, 1940.

I may say that the company's officials were told by me several months ago, as far back as August 5 last, of my intention to recommend this action at the coming sitting of the Legislature.

I will be pleased to give the House a full explanation of the purposes of the Act and the history of various transactions in relation to the subject matter on second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, this bill to amend The Public Lands Act will permit the granting of a title in cases of sale or free grants of agricultural land where there has been substantial compliance with the conditions of the sale or free grant, and also provides for the continuance of easements in certain cases where forfeitures occur and for voiding a reservation in a letters patent dated February 22, 1866, granting land situate in the town of Niagara, this latter amendment being at the request of the local authorities.

THE RAILWAY FIRE CHARGE ACT

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Railway Fire Charge Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, this amendment proposes to prohibit a patentee or related company of subsidy land from setting up a licensee system including charging of fees for the use of such railway lands for the purpose of hunting or fishing, except in accordance with a system established or approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, and will permit the department to establish a system for the use of such lands for hunting or fishing.

THE PROVINCIAL LAND TAX ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Provincial Land Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, this bill to amend The Provincial Land Tax Act, 1961-1962, provides for a prescribed form for complaints in relation to assessments and, instead of compounding the interest monthly on the penalty on the outstanding liability for taxes, provides for compounding the interest on a yearly basis.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question, notice of which has been given to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). Would the hon.

Minister inform this House what per capita subsidy from the federal government would be required by the government of Ontario for the implementation of a universal, comprehensive, government-operated medical care plan?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer the hon. member's question at this time. I can only advise the hon. leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, that this is one facet of this broad and complex problem that is under extensive study and is to be brought forward for further discussion with the federal authorities.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question? Would another facet under study be the qualifications which the federal government are asking, the four basic qualifications? Do they cause the hon. Minister difficulty; or if he had financial negotiations that are satisfactory would he go along with the other qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would only say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole matter is under discussion with the federal authorities.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer, notice of which has been given.

Can the hon. Provincial Treasurer give a breakdown on rates he received for the civil service medical insurance and fringe benefit package recently awarded to a syndicate headed by London Life?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, you will realize these tenders were very complicated. I do not have this information at the present time. It would require a great deal of study, so therefore I will take the question as notice.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask: Will the hon. Provincial Treasurer table these at some point?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will be glad to look into the whole matter.

Mr. Thompson: Could I be told how many there were?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, I did not get this question until—

Mr. Thompson: Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer tell me how many tenders have been submitted?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I could not say.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, notice of which has been given. Can he report on the negotiations, if any, he is having with unions who want to stack rather than integrate their pension plans with the Canada pension plan?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I received notice of this question very late in the day and I have not yet had a chance to read it. I will give the hon. leader of the Opposition an answer within the next few days.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister could tell us if he has had any negotiation with unions about the question of stacking—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will examine my files and report the complete negotiations I have had with the people who represent unions.

Mr. Sopha: Just a travesty of parliament.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day—

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the Minister would speak after the questions? I thought perhaps we should complete the questions and then the Minister could make his statement, if that is satisfactory.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to the hon. Prime Minister. I might say first, sir, with your indulgence, that the question was originally submitted by my hon. colleague from Woodbine but he was called out of the House because of a previous unavoidable commitment, and I would submit the question on his behalf.

Has Mr. Charles Daley, chairman of the Niagara parks commission, declared that the commission will not discuss salaries and working conditions with representatives of the civil service association or allow grievance arbitration, as alleged recently by the civil service association of Ontario? If so, what is the position of the government on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I have not been able to. There is only one man who could answer the question as it is phrased and that is Mr. Daley himself, and I have not been able to get in touch with him to find out whether he did or did not make such a declaration as is contained herein.

I might say that the employees of the Niagara parks commission are not public servants, and I would think there, as in other

boards and commissions, it is a question of relationship between the board itself and the employees. Grievance procedures have been worked out to apply to employees of other boards, and of course there are always negotiations taking place concerning salaries, and no doubt there are the necessary arrangements for these people to deal with the commission itself, which is their employer. But I just simply cannot answer the question as to whether Mr. Daley did in fact make this declaration; but I will find out, I am checking it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I have four questions, dealing with Indian affairs, that I would like to put to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare since he made the original announcement concerning this matter.

1. Will the implementation of the plan transfer the responsibility for Ontario Indians from the federal government to the government of this province?

2. Is the government working towards the elimination of the reserve system as stated previously by the hon. Minister?

3. What Indian groups were consulted by the province before his announcement?

4. Are any steps being taken to improve the quality of the advice available from the government departments to the Cabinet committee on Indian affairs?

An hon. member: That is a good question.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I really received two questions: First of all, number three here is answered in the first question, so I will deal with number three while answering the first question.

The proposal not only provides for consultation and consent by individual bands for the extension of provincial services, it includes consultation between the two governments through a joint federal-provincial co-ordinating committee, four members from the Canadian government and four from the provincial government, the chairman being an Ontario representative, with the province taking responsibility for the administration of the programme.

2. The proposal implied acceptance of the reserve Indian communities. The objectives are to bring reserves to social and economic parity with neighbouring non-Indian communities.

I will answer 4. now and will come to the third one later. The Cabinet committee has benefited from advice given to it by

specialists with a background in Indian life, the Indian-Eskimo association, the chairman of the national Indian council, various Indian associations, and designated officials in the four departments of government having major responsibility for Indians.

As far as 3. is concerned, I have answered this here in a previous question. Individual Indian leaders and the Ontario Indian advisory committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Elliott Moses of the Six Nations Reserve, have been kept informed of all contemplated action by the province which might have a bearing on Indians. With respect to the federal-provincial programme recently announced, I am sure the following excerpts from a letter written by the former Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, under date of November 25, 1965, will explain the approach, and I quote:

Preliminary discussions have been held with a number of Indian advisory councils to obtain their views on the possibility of provincial involvement in welfare and community development programmes in Indian communities. The general response so far has been favourable, and indications are that most Indian people will be interested in the establishment in this way of a more meaningful relationship with the provincial administration. In the abdication of these agreements, however, it will be necessary to obtain the consent of each Indian band to whom the programmes are extended.

It should be noted that official action by the province to consult with individual bands has to be withheld until final assent to the proposals is given by the federal government.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Minister for his statement in this connection. I would like to ask him, supplementary to this, where the advice came from that prompted him to announce on a television network that the plan in fact envisaged the elimination of the reserve system.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, that was misunderstood; it certainly was not the implication that was meant. I might have stated that it might resolve into this, according to the Indians themselves, but as far as we were concerned, we had no views of eliminating anything because it is not within our jurisdiction to do so in the first place.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): The hon. Minister is confused.

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Oh, no, I am not confused. My hon. friend there should go back to school and learn how to read.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions—the first one for the hon. Minister of Health, a copy of which he has received.

Would the hon. Minister report to the House on the difficulties faced by certain foreign-born doctors to secure a licence to practise medicine in Ontario for the college of physicians and surgeons; and, secondly, does the government intend to bring in legislation at this session to clarify the powers granted to professional organizations when those powers appear to be in conflict with the rights of individuals established under the human rights code?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, under The Medical Act of Ontario, the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario is required to satisfy itself beyond any reasonable doubt that the applicant, wherever he or she may have come from, has had a basic medical education of a standard equal to that of a Canadian medical school. There are many universities throughout the world which grant degrees that are fully acceptable to the college, but in some countries there are certain colleges which have not been accepted by the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario. It is this last factor which presented the problem referred to in the hon. member's question. However, it is significant to note that of some 6,000 men and women who were granted licence for practice in Ontario over the past 15 years, about 2,000 had received their medical education outside the province.

In answer to the second part of the question from the hon. member, sir, I state it is not our intention to bring in any legislation at this session but, as announced in the Speech from the Throne yesterday, it is the purpose of government to establish a committee to inquire into the education and regulations relevant to the practice of the healing arts. This committee will be empowered to take under study all matters relating to entrance requirements, education, instruction, and training for the practice of any or all of the healing arts in the province of Ontario. It will also be empowered to consider the duties and regulations of any educational licensing or disciplinary body and any disciplinary body having any relation to the healing arts and the exercise of such powers, duties and regulations.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my second question is addressed to the hon. Attorney General and it is in two parts.

Does The Pension Benefits Act (1962-1963) apply to employees of the CNR and CPR in

Ontario; and, secondly, if there is any doubt on this issue, will the government take the matter as a test case to the courts in order to resolve the situation?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the question is as follows: It is the opinion of the law officers of the Crown that The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963, applied to employees of the CNR and CPR in Ontario to the extent that the Act does not conflict with legislation enacted by the Parliament of Canada in relation to pension schemes for the employees and subject to determining the portion of the undertaking of the company involved in this question.

I would like to enlarge, Mr. Speaker, upon that. That is really an answer to the question as framed. I propose to enlarge upon it, but perhaps I should answer question two before doing so.

The answer to the second part of the question, or question two, is that the government does not at this time contemplate instituting any litigation on this subject.

Mr. Speaker, I should add to that answer the information that a very full opinion was asked of our department in July, 1965, by the then chairman of the pension commission of Ontario, Mr. Coward. We furnished an opinion which I have before me, a four-page document. I do not propose to read it all, but it is a very thorough analysis of the situation with respect to a possible conflict, or a sharing really of jurisdiction in this area, between the government of Canada and that of the province.

I think I might like to put on record the last paragraph of the opinion, which is a summary. I might preface that by saying that, under the Constitution, railways, railway lines, shipping lines, banks, and banking, are within the field allotted to the government of Canada. There are, however, in such undertakings as the Canadian Pacific Railway, certain parts of the operation, such as hotels, which are not regarded as being railway operations. They are local, they are provincial, and they come within provincial jurisdiction.

There is another feature in the legislation here, that where any province has legislated in a field which is allotted to the federal government, then if the federal government comes into that field with legislation, such legislation becomes paramount, it takes precedence, and the provincial legislation becomes invalid or ineffective. I think some of that is said in the summary to this opinion and it was all set out at length in the full opinion

which we furnished to the pension commission.

I should like further to say that this whole matter has been the subject of negotiation over a period of months and I understand from the officials of the pension commission that it is still the subject of continuing negotiations. I think it is a subject in which negotiation and agreement is more desirable than litigation.

Now may I read the summary paragraph which is:

If the Parliament of Canada legislates upon the subject of pensions for employees of chartered banks, railways, and works for the general advantage of Canada, such legislation would be a valid exercise of the powers of Parliament; and if in fact the legislation covered the same area as the provincial statutes, the last mentioned statute would not apply—

that is, the last mentioned—the provincial statute:

—to employees engaged in those undertakings.

This does not mean that Parliament could affect by its legislation all employees of an undertaking as diverse as, for example, the Canadian Pacific Railway. Such a diverse undertaking, which transcends railways, airlines, ship lines, etc., is divisible and those particular operations which may be characterized as local, for example hotel operations, as contrasted with international shipping operations, would be subject to provincial legislation governing employee-employer relations with reference to pensions.

In case of such undertakings it may be difficult to determine whether or not they are part of the company's railway undertaking and the question will depend on the terms of the legislation authorizing such undertaking and the facts of each particular case. A court would have to be satisfied that a portion of the undertaking is: first, divisible; and second, local; and if so satisfied it would necessarily be bound to hold that the employees engaged therein would be subject to the provincial legislation. It is in this area that an agreement may be necessary with the federal authority in order to introduce an effective and comprehensive pension scheme.

As I have noted, this whole matter has been the subject of discussion and negotiation. I think I should mention, and I am not doing this except to correct the record a bit, the question refers to The Pension Benefits Act,

1962-1963, and I answered it in those terms. But I believe such Act no longer exists. The Pension Benefits Act, 1965, which I have in my hand, is now in force having, as I understand, been promulgated on July 1, last year, 1965, and it repealed, by section 27, the previous Pension Benefits Act. Section 27 says:

The Pension Benefits Act, 1962-1963, and The Pension Benefits Act, 1964, are repealed.

So that we should, for the record, refer to our Act now as The Pension Benefits Act, 1965.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. Attorney General for bringing me up to date. I did not realize that the 1962 Act had actually been repealed.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the hon. Attorney General if he would table the full statement, rather than just the last paragraph? I think I grasped what he said, but it is rather a complicated thing. By way of clarification, I wonder if I might ask him this supplementary question?

In the absence of the federal government passing any legislation to establish, for example, portability of private pensions for railway employees living in Ontario, do I correctly interpret the hon. Attorney General's statement to mean that the provincial legislation applies?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, it is our opinion, as we furnished it, and I think I am at liberty to table the full opinion—although it was given to the pensions commission, they will not object—it was our opinion that the provincial legislation applied, and we are still of that opinion.

I think I must say this: There is a difference of opinion on behalf of certain of the organizations such as railways and banks which are mentioned in the question and I understand they have eminent legal opinion contra to ours. That was without taking into account, I think, at that time any federal pension legislation.

Now it is quite clear that if the government of Canada moves into the pension field, that legislation would supersede and make invalid any provincial legislation bearing on the same area.

But as I pointed out, railway operations are divisible, and banks, too.

I shall table the opinion. Since we have now pension legislation of the government of Canada there is a field here for agreement and negotiation and I would hope certainly that

agreement would be achieved, and before long.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I raise a point of order?

I apologize to the hon. member. This is rather irregular, but I could not catch your eye before.

I wonder if the Speaker would allow me to revert to the hon. Minister of Health for a short supplementary question on this?

Mr. Speaker: No, I am afraid not. The member for Grey North has the floor.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to direct a couple of questions to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), in the absence of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor), who has submitted them.

The atomic energy commission has given the green light to the production of heavy water somewhere in Canada. What steps has the hon. Minister's department made in getting that production in Ontario?

Hon. S. J. Randall: (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, that is not the question that was submitted to me. The question as submitted to me is: Has The Department of Economics and Development made any studies with respect to the production of heavy water in Ontario; and the answer is no. At the moment none are contemplated.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, Owen Sound would be a good place for the plant.

I have another question submitted by the hon. member for Timiskaming.

Could the hon. Minister indicate how many persons the immigration branch of The Department of Economics and Development was able to bring to this province in the past year in order to relieve the shortage of skilled workers?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, before answering the second question I would just like to make a comment to the hon. member for Grey North that if he gets an energy plant up there he had better have a place where he can set it on top of a coal mine or a gas or oil well, because it is a very sophisticated plant requiring a great deal of btu, and it is a very costly operation. If he can find those three things we will do our best to get him a plant.

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the second question of the hon. member, the answer is: From January 1, 1965 to December 10, 1965 the immigration branch provided information to 11,890 potential immigrants. Of this number 4,460 attended for personal interview for specific job vacancies in Ontario. Of this number 1,775 skilled workers were selected for placement with 142 companies.

Of the remaining immigrants who inquired many made their own arrangements to migrate to Ontario, so we are not too sure where they went.

During the period to December 10 the branch worked closely with 171 industries for the recruitment of skilled workers. Of this number 94 companies spent \$95,000 of their own money on advertising in the United Kingdom. In checking with our federal immigration authorities before I came to the House, for the first nine months of 1965 108,400 immigrants arrived in Canada from all sources and 58,477 came to Ontario, approximately 54 per cent.

Mr. Sargent: Was it only from the U.K. that the hon. Minister had these skilled workers?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I was answering the question on the skilled workers from the U.K., yes. This is where we have our offices, in Ontario House in London and our immigration office in Glasgow. There were skilled workers, of course, from other offices through the Canadian immigration branch, but we would not have a record of those.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health, of which he has already had notice.

Would the hon. Minister inform this House what steps are being taken by his department to facilitate a speed-up of the construction of active treatment hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the steps taken by the department date back to 1964 when the government provided low-cost loans to help speed up the production of hospital beds in Metropolitan Toronto. As reported to the House at that time, several projects under contemplation in Metro Toronto then and in the very early planning stage were pushed forward vigorously. As reported to the House at the last session of the Legislature, several of these projects were brought into active construction and a detailed report of each hospital involved was placed on the public record.

The building and planning to provide beds to catch up the backlog and provide for need are on schedule as of now. During the year just ended, 323 beds were added; 788 new beds will be opened in 1966. Four new projects are under construction presently and will provide 1,481 beds scheduled to come into operation in 1967.

A complete report, bringing up to date all projects, will be placed before the House during this session, again noting every hospital involved.

In addition to the beds already mentioned, the new psychiatric institute in Toronto will be opened this spring and will provide 240 beds.

We are assured by contractors that everything possible is being done to push forward the construction of these projects, but as every hon. member must realize unavoidable delays do take place. Some of those have already taken place affecting in some measure some of the projects under construction, but actually they have been able to bring them up to schedule at the present time.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would answer a supplementary question. How many of these new beds can be credited to the low-cost loans?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot answer the question at the present time, but I believe just about every project under construction in Metro Toronto has taken advantage of the low-cost plan. I will undertake to get the definite information for the hon. member. I am quite certain that every project has taken advantage of the low-cost loan.

Mr. Trotter: I have one more question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), of which he has already had notice.

Can the hon. Minister say whether his department's air pollution control requirements for natural gas furnaces are more or less effective than those required by Metropolitan Toronto's air pollution inspectors?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, technically the department is not directly concerned with air pollution. This is of direct concern to the air pollution control section, industrial hygiene branch, of The Department of Health.

However, our regulations indirectly decrease pollution by gas-fired furnaces insofar as carbon monoxide content of the combustion gases is concerned. No gas furnace

can be installed or used if it is not approved by the Minister. One condition of approval limits the maximum content of carbon monoxide in the combustion gases to 0.04 per cent in an air-free sample of combustion gases.

This may sound technical but it means the practical elimination of emission of carbon monoxide into the atmosphere. This automatically precludes the emission of smoke. It is reasonable to say that the emission to the atmosphere from the gas furnace consists of carbon dioxide, oxygen, nitrogen and water vapour.

Mr. Sopha: I would like to ask the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) when may the legislative library be expected to re-open?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, the legislative library in fact has never been closed. From the time renovations began on June 25, 1965, the library and staff have been carrying on from room 153, in the main part of the main building. The work on the library assumed priority over any other uncompleted work in the north wing.

In the meantime the staff in fact has been able to provide most of the regular services to the hon. members of the House and to government departments, with the exception of the law library and the public reading room. We were compelled to completely dismantle these two sections, located outside the main stack area, to allow for structural changes. At that time the contents of the law library were put in storage.

I may say in an aside to the hon. member that my contact with the law library commenced some 30 years ago when as a law student, of a precursor of the course from which he graduated, I sat in the west side. It was then the side of the Opposition. In the lunch hour I used to retire to the law library to do my studies. That is not permissible now, but I am delighted that in the meantime, in accordance with a recommendation of one of the select committees, the library has been transferred from the Minister of Education to the Provincial Secretary.

The law volumes are now being re-assembled as a temporary measure in the "members' reading room to be" and they will be ready for the early part of next week. Servicing of this and the rest of the main library will be done from temporary facilities set up on the third floor, located approximately where this work was done previously. Current newspapers and periodicals—I repeat, current newspapers and

periodicals—will be available in room 153 of the main building opposite the offices of the bank.

With the help of the interior design centre of The Department of Public Works, there has been evolved outstanding plans for the renovation of the library which will provide: First, proper storage conditions for our valuable collection; second, adequate and comfortable reading rooms; third, efficient office space.

The cataloguing, government documents, circulation and reference sections will be grouped together with maximum efficiency around the central inquiry desk. From there four professional librarians will be within call for reference queries coming into the desk or by telephone. New and specialized equipment is being planned for this area. The hon. members' reading room will occupy the most pleasant and most spacious room and be equipped with work tables and comfortable chairs for study.

Adjoining the reading room will be the law room where the present shelving is to be replaced in order to increase book capacity by 50 per cent. Six study tables will also be provided here. These two areas will be kept in an atmosphere conducive to study, away from the telephones and the bustle of the inquiry area.

On the north side will be the office for the librarian.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Does the hon. member for Sudbury give up? He must have planted that question.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: A microfilm reading room, and a room for dictating and typing from volumes will also be provided. The east side of the library will house the newspaper and periodicals section; here, new display and storage shelving will allow us for the first time to have our 300 periodicals available to all. A new arrangement for 230 Ontario weeklies and dailies will permit the major part of the floor area to be used for reading tables and chairs. This is a much-used collection, and this is the only library in the city which has an adequate collection of newspapers on file.

In formulating these plans—plans which are being executed—the library staff and the interior designers have visited about 15 libraries, have read a great deal of library literature and have consulted many librarians and office equipment specialists. It is hoped that April will see the fruition of our efforts.

The foregoing, with new lighting, flooring, ventilation, communications and redecoration, should make the legislative library of Ontario one of the finest in the country, in keeping with the government policy of providing all the hon. members of this House with all the facilities necessary to assist them in discharging their responsibilities to their constituents and the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Minister be permitted to speak again on the Throne Debate?

Mr. MacDonald: That is his speech for the dedication of the new library.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), notice of which has been given. Is the hon. Minister prepared to make his recently announced crop insurance plan retroactive to cover losses in the past season? Second, when is the government going to initiate \$4 per 100 for manufactured milk?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, I believe that the hon. member, being quite a reasonable and astute man, would realize that to make any clause retroactive in any insurance programme would offend against the principles of insurance itself. So I am sure that he would accept the philosophy that there would be no retroactive clause in the contemplated crop insurance programme.

In reply to his second question—when will a \$4 price for milk be implemented by the government—I can only assume that he is referring to the promise of the federal government, made in the last November election campaign, of providing a \$4 price for manufactured milk. I can assure the hon. member that I am looking forward to that announcement by the federal government with as keen an anticipation as is he.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted a supplementary question? I understood that the \$4 per 100 milk was to be instituted in co-operation with the provinces. That was my understanding. May I ask, then: Has the federal hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Green) consulted with you as to how this might be done or when it might be done?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the hon. member, Mr. Green has not only consulted with me, I have consulted with him, asking when it is going to be done, and I would be more than pleased

to know when this will be done. I can say that the milk commission, and the milk producers' marketing board in the province, we hope—and I think this is just common sense and good logic—would be used by the national dairy commission which I believe the federal Minister proposes to establish, as was revealed in the federal Speech from the Throne, as the agents of the national commission, to implement whatever type of programme they develop relative to the dairy industry.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways, a copy of which has been submitted to him. What is the department doing to avert the possibility of a strike by Department of Highways employees in the Kent—Essex and Lambton county areas?

Mr. Speaker: Will the member go ahead with the second—

Mr. Newman: Well, the hon. Minister can answer this question.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I must ask the indulgence of the hon. member to allow me to take his question as notice. Again I might say that, having become accustomed to taking a little bite every day at lunch, I did not receive his question until I returned and there simply was not time to pursue it. So if he would allow me to take it as notice, I will comment on it as soon as I have the information.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister. The reason I asked, and I thought it was so urgent, is that the employees are having a meeting tonight and there may be a strike tomorrow.

An hon. member: While he is having a bite.

Mr. Newman: While he is having a bite.

The second question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister is: Can the hon. Minister explain why it was necessary to pay large bonuses to some engineers working on the Highway 401 Toronto by-pass this summer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question of the hon. member is that the department was and is experiencing a very large turnover in highly specialized trained staff necessary for the supervision of the complicated work involved on the expressways in the Toronto area, particularly the Toronto by-pass section of 401.

This turnover was brought about by the tremendously heavy construction activities in the metropolitan area outside of government; our personnel was very attractive to industry, consulting engineers, and construction companies. The only pool to which we could turn, to meet our requirements for these highly trained people, was in districts outside the metropolitan area; the moving of this staff meant much dislocation of a large proportion of our engineering personnel who otherwise could expect to stay in the districts where they were domiciled.

When personnel is living away from designated headquarters, regulations provide for the payment of living expenses. However, the modest premium paid, which was applied and to which the hon. member has reference, would approximate the living expenses the staff would normally be entitled to. The people receiving these bonuses were not eligible for living expenses. This also gave latitude in seeking accommodation, much of which would be on a short-time basis. I would also point out that paying this small bonus resulted in a marked reduction in administrative costs, and I am pleased to report that the staff turnover since we implemented this payment in the metropolitan area has been markedly reduced.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Did the Ontario water resources commission consult with the Metro Toronto, Ontario, planning board before announcing its sewage scheme for Peel county?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question of the hon. member is: Yes.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Can the hon. Minister say when he plans to appoint a board for the Ontario municipal employees' retirement system of the character envisaged in the legislation itself?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Is that the question?

Mr. Oliver: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I will be glad to answer. Mr. Speaker, The Ontario Municipal Employees' Retirement System Act was enacted in the spring of 1962, and the regulations thereunder were approved in the summer of that year. Since it was impossible

to accept participation in the system until January 1, 1963, it was not practicable for the government to appoint a board at that time among the employers and members of the system. The Minister of Municipal Affairs was responsible for the OMERS Act and therefore the government entrusted to him the responsibility for the establishment of the system and the policy problems associated with that.

Prior to the establishment of the Ontario municipal employees' retirement system, as the hon. members of the House are well aware, The Department of Municipal Affairs was responsible for the administration of the legislation which authorized municipalities to provide pensions for municipal employees. Because of the experience which certain of the department officers secured as the result of the administration of this legislation, and because these same officers were responsible for the studies which led to the establishment of OMERS, these officers were assigned extensive responsibility with regard to many of the organizational problems.

This was essential, because most of the problems which arose were related to the discontinuance of pension plans which had been approved under The Municipal Act and were terminated in order that the members could secure the more favourable benefits available from OMERS. Since the establishment of the system, the field of pensions has been an extremely active one. It has been necessary for the government to make a series of extended and difficult decisions with regard to OMERS, as the result of developments concerning the revision of pensions both in the private and the public sector.

The enactment by this Legislature of The Pension Benefits Act and the amendments to that Act, have had a direct effect on the benefit structure of OMERS. In addition, the enactment by the government of Canada of the Canada pension plan has required this government to make a major decision with regard to the pension benefits available from OMERS. Obviously, because of the many unforeseen problems of a policy-making nature which have arisen, and because of the heavy flow of day-to-day decisions, it has not been practicable to establish a board, many members of which would be appointed from across Ontario and would meet only several times a year, and would not be available for day-to-day decisions.

Let me assure hon. members of the House that OMERS is operating in a completely legal manner. The pension funds entrusted

to OMERS are invested in accordance with the requirements of the OMERS Act, approved unanimously by this Legislature. Annual and audited reports have been presented to this House each year, as required by the OMERS Act. Pension and other benefits are being paid, as provided for in the OMERS Act. And so, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I inform the hon. member that it is the opinion of the government that the time has not come, as yet, for the appointment of a board to administer the system as contemplated in the regulations under the OMERS Act.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, may I ask my hon. friend, in a supplementary way, if he foresees, in the not-too-distant future, the advisability of appointing such a board; or has he ruled it out for all time?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I think we must understand that the OMERS plan is still being built. There are some municipal employees to whom the benefits of OMERS were not applicable until January 1, 1966. There are other municipal employees to whom the benefits of OMERS are not yet applicable, and will not be for some time. Therefore it is my feeling that, while we are going through this period of building the system, it is not possible to operate with this particular board as envisaged in the Act when it was enacted in 1962. I would hope, however, that before too long, because I, personally, wish to be relieved of the responsibility, it would be possible to complete the organizational work and then proceed with the appointment of the board; but I cannot tell you that it is going to happen tomorrow morning.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question? I have noted that the hon. Minister speaks of OMERS with enthusiasm.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! I am sorry, the leader of the Opposition did not have a question. The member for Grey South has further questions for the Minister and it is he who is now posing the questions.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I clarify whether supplementary questions are permitted?

Mr. Speaker: No, I am sorry. I do not think it is in order at this time to have a debate on the subject. A question has been asked of the Minister and the Minister has replied. The member asking the question has asked a supplementary question.

Mr. Thompson: But no one else can ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: The question is not to be debated. It is for the member asking the question, if he wished another supplementary question; not anyone else to engage in the questioning of the Minister.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, might I try the hon. Provincial Treasurer for a question?

Would the hon. Minister explain whether or not the recent increase in the retail price of cigarettes was due to the government's new method of collecting provincial sales tax? Now be careful on that one.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to provide the information requested by the hon. member. May I say, at first, that there has been no increase in sales tax. In fact, tobacco products, which of course include cigarettes, were exempted from sales tax as of December 31 last. A tobacco tax was instituted in its place, effective January 1. The rate under the new tax, which is based on quantity, rather than value, is designed to be as nearly identical to those in effect under The Retail Sales Tax Act as possible. The tax on packages of 20 cigarettes was identical. The tobacco tax on packages of 25 cigarettes is 1.25 cents while, under the sales tax, it was one cent; this is the only difference of any consequence arising from the imposition of the new tax.

It would appear, therefore, that the increase in the price of cigarettes was not caused by the imposition of the tobacco tax.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, I have just one supplementary question. The adjustment that has taken place in the imposition of this tax, is it bringing in more money from this source than it was originally?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The first returns will be on February 15.

Mr. Oliver: The hon. Provincial Treasurer will let me know then?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I will let him know.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General.

Would the hon. Attorney-General advise the House:

First, has the government of Ontario received any detailed information from the Royal Canadian mounted police in relation to the remarks made by RCMP Commissioner George McClellan; and I am sure my friend,

the hon. Attorney-General, knows of the remarks to which I refer, even though they are not stated in the question? If not, has a formal request been made to the RCMP for such a report? If such a report has been received, to what extent does it affect the province of Ontario, and in what manner? And, finally, if such a report has been received, what steps are the law enforcement authorities of Ontario taking to safeguard the interests of the people of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I must say that the question is very vague regarding the remarks made by the RCMP commissioner, George McClellan. He made remarks, the only remarks I know of, running to six pages of typewritten material, all of which I have. These were made at the conference of Attorneys General in Ottawa on January 7 and 8. I think the hon. member has made reference to a story which appeared, attributing to someone in the mounted police statements that payoffs were made by organized criminal syndicates—

Mr. Singer: There was municipal corruption in the police and municipal organizations.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Very good. That appeared in one of the local papers, I believe. The remarks of the commissioner on that subject were made in the conference at Ottawa but there is no reason why they should not now be made public. What he actually said was, referring to organized crime:

They develop over the years to where they anticipate as a group an indefinite span of association in criminal activity. Therefore to operate successfully and continually they must have two factors in their favour: (a) inefficient enforcement of existing laws; and (b) immunity from prosecution and interference.

This is the only reference, the paragraph which follows, to the payoff:

A second factor is of great importance to the group. To obtain immunity they must ingratiate or make payoff to someone in authority, be it the police, civic authorities, politicians, or influential members of the community. The by-product of this action is corruption, a breakdown in the administration of justice, of government function and of the moral fibre of the community.

That was Commissioner McClellan's statement. I believe that someone in the Royal Canadian mounted police, at some other level—the report I read gave the source as Montreal—made some statement and named

Ontario and Quebec as places of payoff of this kind.

My answer to that section of the question, if that is what it refers to, is this: Representatives of the Ontario police commission and the Ontario provincial police have discussed in detail with the Royal Canadian mounted police representatives the remarks made by the commissioner of the RCMP and other remarks attributed to members of that force. The comment made by Commissioner McClellan is contained in a statement at the conference of the Attorneys General in Ottawa on January 6 and 7, 1966 and I have read the relevant parts of that statement. This was stated as being one of the factors that it is most important to organized criminal groups, and it will be seen that it is stated as a principle not as an allegation or suggestion, that such immunity or payoff exists in Ontario.

A subsequent comment attributed to a member of the RCMP purported to say that this sort of thing did exist in areas of Canada, including Ontario, but this has now been denied by the RCMP. All of the comments on this subject have been discussed with the RCMP; we have been assured that they have no knowledge that immunity has been or is being given to criminals in Ontario or that payoffs have been made in this province. We are further assured that the comments made were intended as statements of a principle; that there was no intention to suggest that these corrupt practices existed in Ontario.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that we were quick to ask the RCMP on the basis of the newspaper report if they had any such information and why had we not got it. They were quick to say they had no such instances to report or they would have reported them at once. May I assure this House, Mr. Speaker, that any information relating to this form of practice would have been conveyed to us through the existing intelligence system if the information had in fact existed. Thereupon the appropriate law enforcement agencies would have taken action.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Attorney General for his answer. It occurs to me to ask him as a supplementary question why this was not clarified, because this sort of statement is very disturbing to the citizens of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think, Mr. Speaker, that first of all it was a speculative newspaper report, picking up certain words saying there is payoff in Ontario and other places in Canada. Now it may be the way the story was pursued gave it almost as a

specific case that "we know there is a payoff in such and such a place." All that was being said was a general statement that through Canada, if criminal elements are to operate there will be payoffs and there have been. I think it was relating to a situation that was general.

However, the commissioner of the Ontario provincial police immediately contacted the RCMP and there was a complete denial at once. He went on television, the same day that the story appeared I believe, and broadcast the answer of the RCMP and stated that there was no basis for the story. I did not pursue it personally myself to that extent. However, I was interviewed by the press and I took occasion to say I have information from the top authority that there is no evidence of such payoff existing, and if the RCMP had it they would have given it to us and we would have been prosecuting. That was the best I thought I could do.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett). Does the hon. Minister have any intention of implementing the as yet unimplemented recommendations made by the select committee on automobile insurance?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, each of the few remaining or as yet unimplemented recommendations of the select committee on automobile insurance has been under detailed study in depth as regards both specific and general connotations and the disposition of each is now receiving active consideration.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question, could I have a yes or no answer?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: The answer is no.

Mr. Singer: Oh, no! Well, that is good.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister.

Hon. Mr. Wardrobe: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day and with your indulgence, I should like to read an announcement which was made public just a few minutes ago. It concerns an agreement between Steep Rock Iron Mines Limited and the Algoma Steel Corporation, an agreement which has been pending for several months and which I am happy to say has now been finalized.

It is an agreement which will have a beneficial effect on the economy of two parts of Ontario immediately, that is the Steep Rock-Lakehead area and Sault Ste. Marie, and

which could in the long run revolutionize the economic life of a large part of north-western Ontario. May I now quote from this statement which has been issued by the Steep Rock Iron Company:

The Algoma Steel Corporation Limited, Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, and Steep Rock Iron Mines Limited, Steep Rock Lake, Ontario, have signed joint venture agreements under which Algoma acquires title to substantial open pit hematite iron ore reserves at Steep Rock Lake which will be mined, pelletized and shipped to Algoma by Steep Rock. The agreements cover a minimum period of 22 years and involve installation by Steep Rock of a pelletizing plant at Steep Rock Lake for the production of 1.1 million tons of iron ore pellets annually for Algoma. Construction of the plant is underway with initial production scheduled for the spring of 1967.

Iron ore pellets produced from low grade taconite ores have proven to be efficient for blast furnace burning, and tests have established that pellets of equal quality can be produced at lower cost from the higher grade hematite ores at Steep Rock Lake.

Agreements also cover shipment by Steep Rock to Algoma of direct shipping open-pit iron ore from Algoma's reserves until the new pellet plant is in operation. Production of this ore for Algoma will be at a rate of approximately 600,000 tons per year until 1967. Under the agreements, Algoma also acquires a substantial interest in iron reserves at Steep Rock's Lake St. Joseph property which is somewhat north of there, approximately 170 miles north of Steep Rock Lake.

This magnetic taconite deposit is believed to be the largest known reserve of pelletizing-type iron ore in Ontario. These long-term agreements will augment Algoma's supply of iron ore from its producing mines on the Michipicoten iron range some 150 miles north of Sault Ste. Marie and will provide Steep Rock with a large tonnage outlet for iron ore pellets.

In addition to mining and pelletizing Algoma's reserves at Steep Rock Lake, Steep Rock plans to supply pellets to other North American steel producers from other reserves at Steep Rock Lake. A 20-year contract for the supply of 250,000 tons of iron ore pellets annually is under negoti-

ation by Steep Rock with another steel company.

With this in view, a pelletizing plant being installed by Steep Rock will have an initial capacity of 1,350,000 tons per year and is destined for expansion double this capacity. Algoma Steel is the second largest primary steel producer in Canada with steel ingot production capacity of 2,450,000 tons a year. Algoma's president, Mr. David S. Holdbrook, recently announced a major deeply integrated expansion programme estimated to cost about \$175 million and expected to increase Algoma's raw steel capacity to 3.75 million tons a year. The major additions include a new large battery of coke ovens, a new large blast furnace, a new basic oxygen steel producing plant with two 200-ton furnaces, a 160-inch wide plate mill and extended rolling capacity for sheet, strip and structures.

This programme, Mr. Speaker, is planned for completion by 1969 or 1970 and a large proportion of the increased iron ore requirements to support increased iron and steel production will be provided under the agreements with Steep Rock.

These agreements will be of great economic value to Ontario and Canada. They will reduce the amount of iron ore which would otherwise be imported, thus assisting in maintaining Canada's balance of trade, as well as increasing employment at Steep Rock Lake and Sault Ste. Marie.

I am pleased indeed, Mr. Speaker, to make this announcement to the House, as it assures the future stability, progress and prosperity of the northwestern area of Ontario which I have, along with my hon. friend across the way and the hon. member for Rainy River, the honour to represent, and also the area of the hon. Attorney General. The benefits of these developments will be felt not only in Ontario but throughout the whole of Canada.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will proceed with the first order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.50 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, January 27, 1966

Unveiling plaque commemorating Sir James Pliny Whitney, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Thompson, Mr. MacDonald	41
Reading and receiving petitions	42
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	43
Bailiffs Act, 1960-1961, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	44
Crown Administration of Estates Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	44
County Courts Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	44
Fire Marshals Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading.	44
Jurors Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	44
Public Trustee Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	44
Sheriffs Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	44
Mechanics' Lien Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	44
Presenting reports, Mr. Yaremko	57
Motion of thanks for Speech from the Throne, Mr. Knox, Mr. Carton	57
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Singer, agreed to	67
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	67

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the west gallery, students from Deer Park public school, Toronto.

Before the routine proceedings of the day, I thought it best that we have the ceremony of unveiling the plaque to my left, so that I could better see the members wishing to find the elusive eye of the Speaker, particularly during the questions before the orders of the day.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, may I ask if you would pull the cord? This is a rather unusual procedure; but the Speaker consented to permit us to do this in order that we might draw, to the attention of the hon. members of the House, this plaque which will be erected in what is now known as the east block—which will be re-named the Whitney Block in honour of Sir James Pliny Whitney, who was the sixth prime minister of this province.

He was born in Williamsburg, Upper Canada, in 1843, came to this House as the member for Dundas in 1888, led the Opposition from 1896 to 1905, when the government headed by the Hon. G. W. Ross, was defeated. Mr. Whitney formed the government in 1905. He remained prime minister until 1914 and, in going through the record, it has a somewhat familiar ring; this period was perhaps remembered for the introduction of extensive legislation relating to agriculture, labour, education, and public utilities. He was knighted in 1908.

Just for the information of the hon. members, the east block was started in 1924, completed in 1927. In re-naming it, and bringing some attention to this policy of naming the buildings here, we really propose to accomplish two things. This was first discussed in 1964 but, with the construction of the new complex to the east, we are going to have a

variety of buildings there. We are attempting to bring the government back to Queen's Park and this will mean that if these buildings are named they will be much easier to identify by the public, who will be using these buildings instead of the various places they now go to—which is pretty much all over Toronto at the present time.

Second, we feel that there is some virtue in perpetuating the names of those men who have gone before, and who have done so much to serve this province.

The new Treasury building will be named at a ceremony later on perhaps in this session, and it will be named the Frost Building in honour of Mr. Frost, who was the 16th prime minister; beyond that, too, his association with the Treasury stems from the fact he was prime minister from 1949 to 1961 and treasurer from 1943 until 1955, which is a long period, and again in 1958.

Then the building presently under construction just beyond the east block, upon its completion will be named the Hepburn Block in honour of the late Mitchell F. Hepburn, who was prime minister from July of 1934 until October of 1942.

Yesterday we had in the galleries some students from the Whitney public school, who came here to see the man for whom their school was named honoured in this way. Unfortunately, the events of yesterday just simply did not permit us to get to this very brief but very important function.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister in making some remarks about Sir James Pliny Whitney. Might I say at the start that I know I and my party appreciate the fact that the government is giving honour to the great sons of Ontario who played a distinguished and dedicated part in building our province. I believe that we can learn a great deal from looking back at these former prime ministers, and we get inspiration and confidence as we look ahead to the future of Ontario.

I noted that Sir James Whitney had served a period as leader of the Opposition and I think this is a good apprenticeship for anyone who is going to become the prime minister, because indeed he was a great prime minister. He was, perhaps, leader of the Opposition for a little longer than some of us would want to be, but then he had a pretty tough government to throw out. As we know, it was a Liberal government at the time.

I may say that, with the hon. Prime Minister, we recognize that Sir James Whitney left a legacy to all the people of Ontario and I would like to allude to other areas which have been of great importance to the people of Ontario. I am thinking of the hydro-electric power commission, which was started in 1906; and I am thinking of workmen's compensation, which was started in 1914. I think that perhaps the students from the school called after Sir James Whitney, would have appreciated being here at the commemoration of this plaque, and perhaps have also been stimulated from seeing parliament in action, which I am sure is somewhat similar to the days when Sir James Whitney was the prime minister.

I might say that, over the weekend, I was reading some excerpts from *Hansard*, and also from the comments made by the fourth estate concerning parliamentary debate during the time that Sir James Whitney was the prime minister. I am sometimes inclined to think that there is a bite and a sting to this public forum which has become unique in this 20th century, but I realize that they were tough and rugged men in those days before us. From reading both the newspaper reports and *Hansard* I would say that if we sometimes think the kitchen gets warm, it was steaming as far as they were concerned.

Sir, I congratulate the government on following and commemorating the great men who have gone before. We concur in paying respect to Sir James Whitney.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, there is nothing further that I could add in tribute to Sir James Whitney, beyond that said by the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition. His place in Ontario's history is well known and well established, and I think it is highly appropriate that one of the main buildings of our legislative complex should be named after him.

I think I am correct in saying that there is a rather interesting historical footnote with regard to this action today. I have been led to believe that at an earlier stage, the east block was half-named the Whitney building.

But for some reason or other, the name did not stick; it became lost in the shuffle of time and became the east block. So we really are just re-establishing what had been initiated at some earlier stage and which, for some some reason or other, did not become fixed as a part of history.

I would just like to add one further comment with regard to the general practice that the hon. Prime Minister has indicated today, that of naming these new buildings after the honoured sons of the province. I think it is a good idea. On earlier occasions I have expressed some misgivings with regard to a practice of naming outstanding spots in Ontario—buildings and others—after people who were living. In most instances, it is people who are dead. Every rule, I think, should have an exception and I would be the first one to concede that if you are going to name the Treasury building after anybody, it is appropriately named after a man who was Provincial Treasurer longer than any other in our history, namely, Leslie Mischampbell Frost. I hope that is the exception that will prove the rule; and that it will remain the only exception.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the corporation of the township of Saltfleet praying that an Act may pass empowering the corporation to relieve owners of farm lands from part of certain special assessments, yearly, so long as such lands continue to be used for farming.

Of the board of education of the township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass annulling certain trusts and permitting it to sell certain lands owned by it by virtue of The Township of Toronto Act, 1962-1963.

Of the Greater Niagara general hospital praying that an Act may pass establishing the terms of office of the board of governors.

Of the corporation of the county of Waterloo praying that an Act may pass providing for the re-establishment of the boundaries of the police village of Baden; also, of the corporation of the town of Hespeler praying that an Act may pass permitting it to pay the cost of certain curb and gutter work by a special rate.

Of the corporation of the town of Burlington praying that an Act may pass to defer frontage charges on storm sewers, curbs and sidewalks.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing it

to enter into certain agreements for the purpose of maintaining and operating a community television system; and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves, seconded by hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer), that tomorrow, Friday, and on each succeeding Friday for the present session, this House will meet at 10.30 o'clock a.m. and that rule 2 of the assembly be suspended so far as it might apply to this motion.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker; I would like to make a few brief remarks concerning this bill. I can assure you, sir, that it will not be controversial.

This amendment contains three basic changes in principle in the present Act, which are contained in sections 5 and 14 of the bill and also the schedule. The first basic change is that the standard medical services' insurance contract is to be supplied only by the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health. Accordingly, provisions dealing with the licensing and regulation of carriers in the medical services insurance programme have been repealed and complementary amendments have been made.

The second basic change is that the benefits under the standard contract are based upon 90 per cent of the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association rather than upon 100 per cent.

The third basic change relates to the removal of special waiting periods from maternity benefits under standard medical services insurance contracts.

An amendment to the schedule provides that certain surgical procedures performed by dental surgeons in hospital as specified in

the regulations will be covered by the standard medical services insurance contract. Limitations which were to be prescribed by the regulations for psychotherapy and well-baby care have been removed.

There are a few additional points which I am sure, sir, will be of great interest to the hon. members. The starting date of the programme for those receiving assistance under various welfare Acts is scheduled to begin on April 1, 1966. The general programme is to start on July 1, 1966. This phased approach is considered desirable to permit efficient administration and adequate time for general enrolment.

Enrolment of individuals receiving assistance under the various welfare Acts will be automatic. The open enrolment period for all others will be March 1 to May 1, 1966.

As for premium levels and assistance to low-income groups, people receiving benefits under any of the following Acts will not be required to pay a premium—The Blind Persons' Allowance Act, The Disabled Persons' Allowance Act, The General Welfare Assistance Act, The Mothers' Allowances Act, The Old Age Assistance Act, The Rehabilitation Services Act. In addition, the plan will automatically provide fully-paid coverage for all old-age security pensioners who are declared eligible for such coverage by The Department of Public Welfare in Ontario.

Assistance will also be given to the following people, provided they have been resident in Ontario for the past 12 months and make application to establish eligibility. To the single person, complete cost will be \$60 per year. The government pays \$30, the subscriber \$30. For a family of two, the total cost will be \$120 per year, the family paying \$60, the government paying \$60. For a family of three or more, the total cost will be \$150 per year; the family head will pay \$60 per year, and the government will pay \$90 per year.

As for premium payments for persons not receiving assistance, there are three categories in the following costs—the single person, \$60 per year; the family of two, \$120 per year; and the family of three or more, \$150 a year.

In summary, sir, with these amendments the plan will make available to those enrolled practically all physician services in home, office and hospital. It will also provide for specialists' services when referred, it will be publicly administered, and it provides for out-of-province benefit. It is so designed that portability can be arranged with other provinces.

THE BAILIFFS ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Bailiffs Act, 1960-1961.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): The purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to add provisions to the Act governing the handling of money by a bailiff.

THE CROWN ADMINISTRATION OF ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Administration of Estates Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to make it possible for the public trustee to apply for letters of administration and letters probate in estates where next of kin are out of Ontario and cannot be quickly discovered, and to prevent delay of the proceedings towards securing grants of letters of administration and letters probate.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the bill makes a very small change and is related only to the county court and the date of opening, moving the date of opening in Bracebridge from the second Monday in December to the last Monday in November. The late opening date makes for some difficulties in completing the work of the court.

THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: In explanation of this brief bill, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, at present, where a fire insurer re-insured with another company, the re-insurer paid the tax on the premium. The amendment would require the first insurer to pay the tax

and remove the obligation from the re-insurer, and the tax payable on fire insurance claims where the insurer is outside of the jurisdiction is deleted.

THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The reason for the amendment of The Jurors Act comes about by reason of the appointment of district assessors and county assessment commissioners, where the Act requires the local assessor to attend at meetings with other municipal officials to select jurors. This would be rather difficult where there is one district assessor or a commissioner, and it enables him to delegate such attendance to an appointee.

THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the amendment is brief. It simply makes it clear that the public trustee may act as executor or administrator of an estate, as well as a trustee.

THE SHERIFFS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Sheriffs Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the amendment is simply to define the duties of a deputy sheriff where, for one reason or another, the sheriff is absent or incapacitated and unable to act.

THE MECHANICS' LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to provide for some reasonable description in respect to discharges of

mechanics' liens, so that they may be more readily followed in The Registry Act and The Land Titles Act.

An hon. member: Why does the hon. Attorney General not do a job on that Act?

Another hon. member: He is doing a job on it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I might say, in response to the interruption, or question, that The Mechanics' Lien Act in general has been referred to the law reform commission, Mr. Speaker, and is receiving study there. This small amendment will clear up a situation that needs prompt attention. We are doing a job on it.

An hon. member: Too bad the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) did not know that.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, with respect to the question asked of me before the orders of the day yesterday, by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman), I would request your permission, sir, and the concurrence of the hon. member, to defer to the hon. Provincial Treasurer for the purpose of answering this question. I point out, in so doing, that the question involves a matter of negotiation at the civil service commission level, which department of government of course is administered by the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, if I may ask of the hon. Minister of Highways: Is he aware that the employees threatened to strike at the first sign of a fairly heavy snowfall and, as a result, he may find the highways in southwestern Ontario in a very bad condition? The employees have been negotiating with the government for two years now. Surely the hon. Minister knows that \$62.50-a-week, take-home pay is not right?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to give the following information to the House. The employees in question, approximately 100 in number, are chiefly employed in maintenance trades and service classes. The civil service association of Ontario has been given statutory recognition as the representative of these employees, for purposes of negotiating salaries and other terms and conditions of employment. Salaries for these classes, to-

gether with office and technical classes, involving over 22,000 persons in total, are scheduled for regular cyclical review on January 1, 1966 and negotiations are well advanced.

Representatives of the civil service association and of the government are meeting at this time, in an attempt to negotiate mutually acceptable salary revisions for these classes. Seven negotiation meetings have been held since December 1, 1965 and proposals have been made by both sides. Negotiations are continuing in accordance with procedures that have been mutually determined and accepted by the parties, and progress is being made. A further meeting has been scheduled. At such time as the new salaries are finally determined, they will be made retroactively effective to January 1, 1966. In the event that settlement is not reached in the negotiations now under way, The Public Service Act provides that the matter will be referred to the Ontario joint council for determination.

The final stage, if matters are not resolved, is a reference to the civil service arbitration board for adjudication in accordance with the provisions of The Public Service Act. I would add, however, that senior officials of the civil service association report satisfaction with the progress of negotiations to date.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, there was a question asked of me yesterday by the hon. leader of the Opposition and I am prepared to give an answer today.

This occasion gives me the opportunity to perhaps give the House some information in connection with the provision of pensions for municipal employees.

As the hon. members know, the field of pensions is difficult and complex. In recent years there has been an unprecedented development in the field of pensions, both in the private and in the public sectors. Some of these developments have been incredibly complicated. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that many of the problems with which we have been faced in recent months in the field of pensions is because of the complexity of pensions on the one hand and the very many developments which have been achieved, or are in the process of being achieved, on the other.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this government has played a leading part in many of these developments. For instance, insofar as the private sector is concerned, as the

hon. members of the House know, this government was responsible for the enactment of The Pension Benefits Act—which Act has, for the first time, established procedures designed not only to provide portability of pensions but also to ensure the financial stability of pension funds, and thus has ensured that when all employees in the province reach normal retirement age funds will be available to pay the pensions which have accrued to them.

Many of the provisions of The Pension Benefits Act apply not only in the private sector but in the public sector in Ontario.

Insofar as municipal pensions are concerned, as hon. members are aware, this government has enacted legislation which I am informed is the most progressive in this field of any provincial jurisdiction in Canada.

In 1960, the inadequacy of pensions for municipal employees became increasingly apparent to the government. It authorized a study. That study disclosed, for instance, that: (a) 97 per cent of the employees of villages, (b) 88 per cent of the employees of townships, and (c) 68 per cent of the employees of towns did not have pension benefits. The pension benefits available to the employees were becoming increasingly inadequate; there was no provision for portability from municipality to municipality and the cost of pensions to the smaller municipalities and local boards was prohibitive. Because of the interest, and at the same time the dissatisfaction, of the municipalities a great many were expressing their wish to present to this Legislature private legislation in order to secure more attractive pensions.

As a result of this situation, the government authorized an extensive study into the field of pensions for municipal employees. During this study the practices of the 50 American states, and those of the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand were examined. As the result of this study, the government recommended to the House the establishment of the Ontario municipal employees' retirement system. This system made available to the employees the following benefits: (a) A normal retirement pension at age 65; (b) a disability retirement pension after 10 years of service; (c) a pension to the employee's widow; (d) an early retirement pension; (e) a deferred pension; (f) immediate vesting—almost a first in Canada; and (g) a refund of employees' contributions with interest.

I can assure the House that this was a most progressive group of pension benefits and that, because of the financial, administrative and actuarial concepts, the system

could make available to the municipalities and local boards these benefits at rates slightly in excess of what was being paid by many of the municipalities at that time for lesser benefits.

The reception of OMERS by the municipalities speaks for itself. The system was established on January 1, 1963. At the end of that year, 9,900 municipal employees participated in the system. At the end of 1964 this figure stood at 19,000. Today it stands at 33,000.

I want to emphasize to the hon. members of the House that to these 33,000 employees OMERS represents a substantial increase in the level of their pension benefits. For instance, the wives of all of these men for the first time are protected by a widow's pension. All of these men benefit from immediate vesting in the employer contribution. I wish to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that OMERS is almost unique in this regard.

May I now make some brief comments on changes which have been made in the benefit structure of OMERS, as a result of discussions with either senior municipal officials or officials of one or other of the unions which represent the municipal employees? Under the terms of OMERS the normal retirement age of policemen and firemen is age 60. Under the terms of the Canada pension plan at the present time, on the other hand, an individual will not be entitled to a pension until age 65. As the result of the integration of OMERS with the Canada pension plan, a reduction in the contribution and the benefit structure of OMERS was made in relation to earnings up to \$5,000 per year. The reduction in the benefit structure will be more than offset by the increased benefit available from the Canada pension plan. However, a pension from OMERS was available at age 60, whereas the pension from the Canada pension plan will not be available until age 65.

As the hon. members of the House will recall, the statement of the hon. Prime Minister on December 14 last contained the following sentence:

This government has been especially concerned to ensure that whatever action is taken the retirement benefits will not be in any way reduced. I give my assurance that under integration absolutely no reduction in present pension benefits will occur.

Mr. Speaker, I have received many letters, telephone calls, and visits from individual members and officials of the unions which

represent the policemen and firemen of the province. I am happy to draw to the attention of the House that, as a result of the discussions which took place between these members, officials, and the actuarial advisers of the system, that the terms of the OMERS pension plan have been amended so that now, under OMERS, policemen and firemen who are entitled to receive their normal retirement pension at age 60 may now elect to receive from age 60 to age 65 the pension that was available before integration, and at age 65 the OMERS pension is proportionately reduced and this reduction at age 65 is offset by the pension the officers will receive from the Canada pension plan.

Another instance of a change in the benefits structure of OMERS, as the result of discussions with the officials of the municipalities and in particular those of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, is with regard to the widow's pension formula that was initially inserted in OMERS benefits. The initial terms contained a provision for certain reductions, depending upon the relative age of the widow of the member, and the member. This clause was considerably adjusted in order to eliminate what many municipal officials considered to be an onerous situation. Let me now make a few specific comments with regard to the problems associated with the integration of the pension benefits available from OMERS with those of the Canada pension plan.

As the hon. members know, the hon. Prime Minister issued a memorandum on this matter under date of December 14. I do not propose to elaborate on that statement at this particular time. However, I would like to make the point that this government is very much concerned with the development of trained and competent municipal officials. Obviously, in determining its position in the field of pensions for municipal employees, for instance, the government certainly does not wish to place the municipalities in a disadvantageous position insofar as pensions are concerned, with regard to the other employers in the community.

I can assure the hon. members of the House that the government will take whatever steps are necessary, as the record proves it has in the past, to ensure that the municipalities are placed in a position to offer attractive and competitive pension benefits to their employees. On the other hand, the government has an obligation to protect the financial stability of the municipalities and to examine very closely the impact of additional costs on the local taxpayer.

In completing my remarks, Mr. Speaker,

may I state that the government is constantly examining the problem of pensions for municipal employees, attempting to seek ways in which the requests of the representatives of the employees may be met within the financial resources of the employees involved and the economic capabilities of the municipalities and their ratepayers.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, a question for you. Mr. Speaker, could I be told what was the question that prompted this White Paper on OMERS?

Mr. Speaker: The question was asked yesterday, I believe, by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: I was really going to say, Mr. Speaker, that I have not had an answer to my question. It has been interesting to hear the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, but I would like to get an answer.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have a supplementary question?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well, it is the same question that was not answered. He is looking up his files.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman). Would the hon. Minister inform the House how extensively the attire referred to, in the CBC news last night, as "baby doll pyjamas" is used in the reform institutions?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, the protective clothing facetiously referred to as "baby doll pyjamas", by inmates and others, has the following history:

About five years ago the staff at Guelph were concerned with the possibility of an inmate doing violence to himself when placed in segregation while suffering an acute emotional disturbance.

Normal clothing in this regard is, of course, hazardous. It can be torn into strips and used for purposes of self-destruction.

The staff at Guelph consulted with the psychiatric staff of Homewood sanitarium and Dr. Burton of Homewood suggested a special garment which can be described as follows: It is of one piece, "V"-neck, with no sleeves and comes down to the knees. It is made of quilted cotton, which is difficult to tear.

These garments were tried with segregated inmates, who were emotionally disturbed.

They proved practical and appropriate to the purpose for which they were intended, namely, the safety of the inmates, and are used only in the case of an inmate who is emotionally disturbed to such a degree as to be a potential danger to himself, and then only when that inmate is in a segregated detention cell.

In this respect I quote a directive sent to all institutions, dated November 24, 1961, signed by the then deputy minister, and I quote:

From time to time we have all experienced considerable difficulty and anxiety in handling prisoners who exhibit suicidal and/or obstreperous characteristics.

Some time ago we had a particularly serious case at the Ontario reformatory, Guelph, and the psychiatrist recommended that all clothing be removed and the prisoner be issued with a jumper, two quilts and socks, all of special design to prevent the prisoner from harming himself. This special issue has proven so effective that we feel it should be available in all institutions. You should therefore submit a requisition to this office marked for the attention of Mr. F. V. Ott.

Signed, the deputy minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to how extensively they are used, a check-up this morning established the fact that in all our institutions, accommodating a total of 2,877, there are at this moment only eleven such items of protective clothing in use.

It should be made clear that no reference was made to this attire in the report of the Anglican Church committee set up to study charges made by Mr. West, who has made reference to the alleged abuse of the use of so-called pyjamas from time to time and on television last night. It should be clear to all that if Mr. West has any such evidence which he claims he has, to support the charges, it is his duty to present such evidence to his own church committee which was set up to investigate this charge, which he has, as I have said, repeated from time to time.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): They have not completed their study.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course they have not. Just exercise some control! One can only presume that either he has made these charges before the committee and was not upheld; or that the charges are still under investigation by that committee. In either

case, it seems highly inappropriate, to say the least, that a public statement should be made by this gentleman, in the face of the responsible actions of his own church committee which is attempting to deal with this matter in a proper and formal fashion.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: Granted.

Mr. Young: Then two categories of people were outlined who would use these particular garments—the people who might be in danger of committing suicide, and the obstreperous people? I wonder if the hon. Minister would tell us who determines who are the obstreperous people? Is this a matter of recommendation by the superintendent of the institution?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the superintendent of the institution, with the advice of the staff who are qualified to make this decision.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the hon. Attorney General. It is in two parts.

1. Will the hon. Attorney General confirm reports that the arrest of a Liberal member of the Quebec Legislature last week for influence peddling came as a result of "wheels set in motion by Ontario"?

2. What was the nature of the action from Ontario which led to this result?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, we have no report and have received no information that this arrest was as a result of wheels set in motion by Ontario, so therefore the second part of the question falls.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Attorney General a supplementary question? Can he explain, then, remarks credited to him in an article by Barry Zwicker in last Saturday's *Toronto Globe and Mail*, following an interview with the hon. Attorney General, to this effect?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I remember seeing an article by Barry Zwicker, but I do not recall that he attributed a statement of this nature to me. He may have got information from some other source, but I have no report.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), of which he has already had notice.

Is the hon. Minister considering any form of provincial help to raise the pay scales for visiting homemakers?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, as I am sure my hon. friend will recall, at the last session the regulations to The Homemakers and Nurses Services Act were changed to increase the shareable amount from \$8 a day to \$12 a day for a homemaker. As far as we are aware, the existing rate provides for this service, and I can assure the House, Mr. Speaker that consideration is constantly being given to any required changes to the allowances.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would accept a supplementary question. Is he aware that, even though they receive either \$8 or \$12 a day, no homemaker is receiving the minimum \$1.25 an hour here in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, the only answer I can give my hon. friend at the present moment is that I understand the people who give most of this service are the Red Cross; and their rate, so far as I am aware, is from \$8 to \$10 a day, and they are receiving it. I will be glad to take this under advisement and find out about it. As for the matter that the hon. member has raised, I am not aware that any representation has been made to me either by the municipalities or any of these groups up to the present time.

Mr. Ben: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. Minister comment on the charges made by the Anglican Church lay clergymen's committee on conditions at Millbrook reformatory?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, before I comment on this report I should explain to those not familiar with the Millbrook institution that it is the only adult maximum security reformatory in our system. It is used to house inmates who have shown violence in other of our institutions—upset the programme of training and treatment in those institutions—attacked staff members and other inmates, and so on. In general, the confirmed hard-core offender.

In addition, for purposes of security and segregation in Millbrook's individual cells, confirmed drug addicts and sex deviates are also housed there at the beginning of their sentence.

In the interest of clarity and for the information of the House, with your permission,

Mr. Speaker, I will read in detail the report to which the hon. member refers. It is entitled, "The Interim Report of the Committee set up by the Bishop of Toronto, Anglican Church of Canada, to study statements concerning Millbrook Reformatory by the Reverend S. G. West and the Peterborough *Examiner*."

While it has a great deal more study to do in certain areas, the committee has been able to validly establish in its mind the following:

Millbrook, by location, is unsuited to a programme of reform and rehabilitation. Most of the staff other than custodial officers must be sought in the city of Peterborough, which is some distance away. Any reform institution ought to be located in an area where specialized help is readily available. The greater number of inmates are in the institution only for short periods of time, so psychological, psychiatric, medical, sociological or educational help must be very close at hand. It must be noted that Millbrook was built before the present Minister of Reform Institutions assumed office, and so, no blame can be attached to him for its location. The fact remains, though, that it is badly located.

The educational standards demanded for custodial officers are too low. While no attempts should be made to remove any existing staff, a much higher educational standard than grade 10 should be demanded in future for the employment of a custodial officer.

Pay rates for custodial officers are too low. The Minister of Reform Institutions is conscious of this, and within the last two years has succeeded in obtaining salary increases. Thus, the new starting salary for custodial officers will be \$4,050 and the maximum salary will be \$5,000. In order to get people with higher educational standards, though, it will be necessary to increase salaries beyond this point.

There are some training programmes for custodial officers in progress, but these should be greatly increased. Also, on the successful completion of a course of training, the custodial officer ought to be given an increment in salary on a rated basis. A system similar to that used by local school boards who give increases to teachers taking extra training ought to be used.

The Minister of Reform Institutions is to be commended for his attempts to get the present system of consecutive sentencing abolished. Yet, church and public need to bring increasing pressure to bear on the

Minister of Justice to have the Act amended. The system of giving a man three consecutive sentences of two years less a day, which results in his spending six years in Millbrook, should be abolished. Anyone sentenced to over two years should be sent to a penitentiary and not a reformatory. Two inmates who were serving consecutive sentences at Millbrook started the fires in the summer of 1965. They did this to get themselves sent to Kingston.

The training of inmates at Millbrook leaves much to be desired. Whether a better system could be devised in view of the constant movement of inmates, may be open to question. But if it is wished to rehabilitate those confined to reform institutions the training at Millbrook is hardly likely to bring about the desired rehabilitation.

It is apparent that the church has not fulfilled her responsibility with regard to reform institutions. In this connection, the Anglican communion must accept its share of the blame. From talking to concerned persons, one gets the impression that the church, by and large, is not interested. While the director of chaplaincy of The Department of Reform Institutions, Dr. Flint, is to be commended for his work and the great improvement made in the chaplaincy while under his direction, the church outside has not shown enough interest. She has failed to study reform institutions sufficiently and to arouse public opinion in regard to ways in which reform institutions could be improved. She has also failed to provide enough visiting chaplains apart from those on the regular staff of The Department of Reform Institutions. Nor has she done enough in the matter of referral, to ensure that an inmate on release is made known to his local clergyman in a congregation, so that he can extend the hand of friendship to him.

This committee will continue its study on Millbrook, but feels that the church and public should be aware of its findings to date.

It is signed: G. W. B. Wheeler, Chairman, Bishop's committee on Millbrook.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will deal with points each in the order as they are raised in the report.

Insofar as the location is concerned, I have publicly stated that if we were building this institution today it would be at another location. However, I have investigated the

history of this building in an effort to establish the reason it was built on its present site.

One cannot avoid, sir, reaching the conclusion that the location was chosen because of its very isolation as a consequence of the findings of the select committee of the Legislature which inquired into the reform institutions system and which brought in its report in 1954. That committee, on which was represented all parties in this House, came to the unanimous conclusion that as many as 75 per cent of the inmates in our institutions were not amenable to reform. To quote directly from the report:

That the reformable inmates be kept separate from those not likely to reform and, further, that sentences of confirmed recidivists be long enough to bring real benefit to society; and that Burwash provincial prison be set aside exclusively for *non-reformable* recidivists.

Presumably, as a result of these findings and these recommendations, it was decided to build a new institution which would not only implement this recommendation but would also permit all other institutions to reduce their security measures.

The select committee in fact recommended that we should be directing our rehabilitation programme to only about 25 per cent, or less, of the inmate population. In this respect may I quote the words of a member of that committee, sitting in the House today. The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) stated to the House when this report was presented on March 8, 1954:

I am delighted to present a unanimous report.

and then went on to say:

The hon. member (Mr. Stewart), chairman of the committee mentioned—and it struck the committee very forcibly—that one cannot expect the money we are paying for rehabilitation, for psychiatrists, and all these people we send in to the prisoners to tell them how to live better, is going to be well used, unless it is directed primarily to the particular group which it is possible to reform. What is happening in our prisons and reformatories in this province is: we send these men in, paying them decent salaries and telling them to go in and sow the good seed, and reform those who have been bad. But when they go into the institutions they are dealing with 100 per cent of the institutional population. There are, I suppose—

I am still quoting the hon. member; these are not his opinions only, they are the unanimous opinions of the committee.

There are, I suppose, only between 20 and 25 per cent of that population whom it is possible to reform, yet our efforts are directed towards the 100 per cent.

I am still quoting the hon. member—

I suggest to the House, the hon. Prime Minister, and to the government this afternoon that we are not going to get the full benefit of our reformative efforts, unless we direct our money and our talents and our manpower to dealing with those whom it is possible to reform—that is, the 20 or 25 per cent. That is where segregation enters the picture again. It is just like pouring water over a dam, unless we segregate the prisoners to the degree that we know pretty well those who are capable of reformations and those on whom we are throwing money away in trying to reform them, it seems to me we have a very long way to go in this province in that regard.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this department, my staff and myself, refuse to take the view that there is such a large proportion of our inmates with whom no progress can be made, and it is interesting to note that even though Millbrook is somewhat removed from a built-up area where clinical staff might be more readily available, less than five per cent of our inmates are kept there and, aside from sex deviates and drug addicts, they are those who have been brought there from our other institutions.

As to educational standards for correctional officers being too low, the church committee in our view is placing too great an emphasis on purely educational standards, without taking into account the more important characteristics of personality, ability to learn and ability to help. In other words, academic qualifications alone, should not be the criteria for choice of correctional officers.

Pay rates, of course, are a matter for negotiations between the employees' representatives, the civil service association and the civil service commission, and we must be guided by whatever decision evolves from such negotiations.

As to training of correctional officers, we do have training programmes for correctional officers. These are detailed and they are effective, but we are constantly improving and reorganizing to improve their effectiveness. I doubt if we shall ever be satisfied no matter how far we have advanced in this field.

There is a suggestion made for an increment in salary on successful completion of a course of training. We deal with this by the better utilization of increased knowledge. The majority of our officers who have successfully completed the three-year course we arranged with McMaster University have been promoted with increases in salary.

Further, hon. members will note that in the Throne speech it was announced that a new staff training centre is to be constructed. This is a further example of our continuing progress in this field.

Now insofar as consecutive sentences are concerned, the report details this as one of the causes of difficulties we contend with in our institutions; the report itself commends me for the actions I have taken in an attempt to get this problem resolved at the federal level, the only place it can be resolved.

Inmates at Millbrook have all previously had opportunities for training—this remark has to do with a suggestion about training for inmates of Millbrook. They have been removed to Millbrook so as not to interfere with the training of other inmates. As soon as the social training they receive shows effect in their behaviour patterns, they are transferred back to another institution.

The Anglican committee, referring to the church and corrections, commends our director of chaplaincy services—who, incidentally, is a priest of the Anglican Church and of wide experience—saying “Dr. Flint is to be commended for his work and the great improvement in chaplaincy while under his direction,” which certainly gives little support to the earlier statements of the Rev. S. G. West, and I quote:

The administration has fairly successfully controlled all utterances by staff chaplains.

or “The Department of Reform Institutions has muzzled the church”, in his references to our chaplains as “trained seal” chaplains. The denominational chaplains who have served for long periods at Millbrook reformatory have accorded the following comments. This is from the Baptist resident chaplain:

May I personally urge you to present the case to those in authority in the Anglican diocese of Toronto to make them aware of the many factors that are involved in such work, and advise them not to become involved in emotional situations whereby, with no real depth of understanding, they can make statements that will destroy any therapeutic effect of Millbrook at all.

And from a Salvation Army chaplain with six years' experience at Millbrook; he states:

I have never seen an inmate ill treated. If I see anything going amiss or prisoners being ill treated, I would be the first to report it. As far as I am concerned, the newspaper reports are a gross exaggeration and, in many instances, direct falsehoods.

And another chaplain, Mr. Speaker:

I have been disturbed by some of these reports which, in my judgment, are both misleading and false. No one can fully estimate how much men in a reformatory are influenced by kindly and patient consideration, understanding and friendship. I can think of many whom I knew, and, I trust, helped to find new meaning for their life. Some went out of Millbrook to become law-abiding and useful citizens. I can tell you of men it was my privilege to help who are now in responsible positions; others are taking their place in society as good citizens. One young man has graduated from university and has an excellent position. I correspond with a number of these men and others come to see me some years later. I can tell you of some influenced to a new way of life, the Christian life; they were baptized, and a small group came to Holy Communion.

Mr. Speaker, this is from the United Church chaplain at Millbrook. I think I can say from that that we do reform some of those unreformables.

The Anglican visiting chaplain who has been in and out of Millbrook for three years, states:

Never have I been asked to speak with an officer on behalf of an inmate, nor heard of "dealings with an inmate" that seemed to warrant comment by me to anybody inside or outside the institution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this committee would appear to be unduly harsh on its own membership and the church as a whole. Its reflections upon the interest of the church and corrections in Ontario are not, in my view, supported by facts. We are happy and encouraged by growing support and increased interest. There are today 262 selected and appointed representatives from seven denominations visiting in Ontario institutions. The number of full-time staff chaplains has been increased by over 200 per cent in the past two years, and the number of part-time chaplains has also increased.

In Ontario alone, the Anglican Church has appointed 50 clergymen who are on instant

call by governors and superintendents in case of need.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, may I quote from a grand jury report dated October 6, 1965:

We were welcomed at the Millbrook reformatory by the superintendent, Mr. James Marsland and were shown through the administrative and custodial area by Mr. T. Brand, the assistant superintendent. Every part of the premises was made available for inspection and we were allowed unlimited access to the staff and inmates. There was no interference while we talked to many inmates, whether in the reformatory yard, cell blocks, detention cells or shops. Inmates received their noon meal during our visit and at the invitation of Mr. Marsland we ate and enjoyed the same meal given the prisoners. We consulted in particular with inmates at all levels regarding the alleged brutality and ridicule of inmates which was reported in the press and, in spite of a thorough questioning, could find no evidence that these conditions are present.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): If you will permit a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I think that was in answer to a previous question.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that the member who asked the initial question would have to ask the supplementary question. It is his question.

Mr. Bryden: Is it not permissible for other members to ask supplementary questions? I would naturally concede the floor to—

Mr. Speaker: There is not supposed to be any debate upon questions. It has always been my understanding that when a member asks a question and the Minister replies, the person asking the question can ask the Minister if he wishes to answer a supplementary question. But I have not taken note of any other members getting into the act, as it were, of asking questions on the same subject at that time.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, it has happened in this House. It certainly has happened in other similar bodies, including the British House of Commons and the House of Commons at Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to take it under advisement. Perhaps my memory has slipped on that particular point. I would like to look it up first. I would ask the member who asked the original question to ask the supple-

mentary question. I recall refusing the leader of the Opposition yesterday on the same point.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, do I assume from what you have just said that there is a rule or practice to the effect that only one supplementary question may be asked?

Mr. Speaker: No, I am of the opinion that the person asking the original question has the right to continue with supplementary questions, and not other members of the House on the particular point the original questioner is trying to raise with the Minister.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, may I address a supplementary question to the hon. Minister? I have two, actually. The first one is this: Does the hon. Minister subscribe to the views on penal reform as he ascribes to the select committee of 1954? That is the first question, Mr. Speaker.

The second question is this: In view of the answer to the hon. member for Yorkview as to the types of inmates who use these so-called "baby dolls", is the hon. Minister aware that in Guelph reformatory, where the young offenders are sent, the so-called baby dolls are the normal prescribed dress for all inmates in solitary confinement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not aware of that, and I deny it.

Mr. Ben: Thanks. And now the first question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member talking about the whole report of the select committee?

Mr. Ben: I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the statements made, which the hon. Minister describes as not excerpts from the report, that they should concentrate only on 25 per cent of the people in our prison.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I thought I made myself quite clear. We absolutely do not subscribe to that. We hope that any one of 100 per cent can be helped and, as a matter of fact, we have helped them.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

Can the hon. Minister comment on the future of grade 13 now that the Lakehead University and Waterloo Lutheran will accept grade 12 students, thus apparently eliminating the need for grade 13 work?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I think that to comment at any great length on grade 13 would take us all afternoon and most of the evening. I suggest that we deal with this during the estimates of the department. As the hon. members well know, certain studies have gone on with respect to grade 13. Certain steps have been taken and, of course, the recommendations are receiving further study at this time. I think, frankly, that the announcements by the two universities—Lakehead and Waterloo Lutheran—are somewhat out of perspective when you look at the type of programme they are proposing. When I say out of perspective to the total picture, the Lakehead, as we understand it, is proposing to accept some ten or 15 selected students from the northwestern area, and Waterloo Lutheran is anticipating accepting some 30 or 35 students. Both of these projects will be strictly on an experimental basis. Actually, Waterloo Lutheran is insisting on two summer courses—I believe in English and one language—before they can qualify for the first term in the fall. There has been some attention paid to this by the news media; I think I should comment because there was reference, I believe, to four institutions that were adopting this procedure.

This, of course, is not the case. Windsor is accepting students on the basis of the grade 12 recommended marks, but together with the grade 13 year, on an unconditional basis. They have to complete the full grade 13 year. And of course Guelph University, in order to implement the trimester system, after discussions with The Department of Education, is admitting students roughly at the Easter recess, or April, into the first semester. These students will have completed roughly two-thirds of the actual time, and perhaps 75 per cent of the course content, and the understanding between the department and the university is that the Ontario institute for studies will evaluate the type of progress these students make; so that I think in fairness I should point out that these two experimental projects could be helpful to us in the overall analysis, but they do not, as we understand it, indicate any general policy by either of those institutions as far as admitting students from grade 12 is concerned.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, do I understand from the hon. Minister that, when his estimates come out, he will have by that time arrived at the committee's decisions on the committee concerning the fate of grade 13?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I did not say that, Mr. Speaker. I said that I anticipated we would be discussing further the question of grade 13 and that I would report to the House on the progress that had been made as a result of the recommendations in the grade 13 committee report.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), proper notice of which has been given.

The first is: Can the hon. Minister report any success in trying to solve the province's trucking strike and lockout?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, may I point out that the problem of solving the trucking strike and lock-out rests, in the final analysis, with the parties themselves. This is an accepted fact of free collective bargaining. The responsibility of The Department of Labour in this situation lies in the most active endeavour on behalf of the public interest to assist the parties themselves to find the solution. This, too, is an accepted fact of free collective bargaining.

Now, I cannot speak for the parties themselves, but I can tell hon. members that I and my department recognize and accept our responsibility and are discharging it to the fullest extent. I would also point out that the government role in this particular dispute is shared by both the federal and Ontario Departments of Labour, for the majority of companies involved are under federal labour jurisdiction.

May I outline in general terms the steps that have been taken since January 18, when a vote of the members of the five teamsters locals authorized strike action? On January 19, the federal and provincial departments, acting in concert, brought the parties together at a meeting in the offices of The Ontario Department of Labour. This meeting continued for some four-and-a-half hours, but the parties were unable to find a basis upon which negotiations could proceed.

Since that date, I and my officials have been in contact every day, and several times a day, either by telephone or through personal meeting, with representatives of both sides of the dispute, in an effort to help them establish a basis for progress towards a resolution of their dispute.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the hon. Minister have any plans for attempting to bring the parties together in the very near future?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes, that thought is constantly in my mind, but the time is not opportune.

Mr. Braithwaite: I thank the hon. Minister. The second question, Mr. Speaker, is: Can the hon. Minister report any steps which he may be taking to reduce the number of construction accidents in the Metro Toronto area recently?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, the prevention of accidents and deaths in the construction industry is a matter which is receiving concentrated attention and the highest priority from my department. Last year, in this House, I declared war on the mounting toll of human suffering and death in this industry. At that time, I outlined a broad programme of attack, involving legislation, inspection, education in industry and labour co-operation. This programme is now operating in high gear and I am pleased to have this opportunity to tell the hon. members of the concrete steps that are being taken to reduce accidents, not only in Metro Toronto, but right across Ontario.

1. As the result of amendments made last year to The Construction Safety Act, (a) the maximum penalty for an offence is now \$5,000, as compared to only \$1,000 a year ago. The result has been a marked increase in the size of fines imposed by the courts. (b) The responsibility for safety and compliance with The Construction Safety Act has now been placed squarely with the owners or general contractors. Their responsibilities, and those of the sub-contractor, have been clearly defined. The door is now closed "on passing the buck"—if I may put it that way—with respect to safety matters. (c) All municipalities, including those in Metro Toronto, are now required to submit to our department, complete statistics on inspections, accidents and fatalities. This is helping us to root out and concentrate on problem areas. (d) We are now able to apply restraining orders prohibiting the continuance of unsafe practices while prosecution proceedings are pending.

2. The responsibility for enforcement rests with the municipalities, and over the past two years there has been a considerable increase in the number of municipal inspectors. Nearly 250 are now at work across this province.

In Metropolitan Toronto, in 1963 there were 60 inspectors, six of whom were involved full-time with construction safety. By last year, the figure had grown to 81, with 14 being full-time construction safety inspectors. I understand that the city of To-

ronto has recently approved the addition of six more full-time construction safety inspectors to its staff.

My own construction safety branch, Mr. Speaker, has doubled its staff since 1962 and is currently adding more safety engineers to its complement. I will be asking the hon. members to approve the funds for further additions during my department's estimates.

During 1965, the construction safety branch held training seminars for municipal inspectors in Metro Toronto and across the province. Regular monthly safety meetings were also held with the TTC and unions in connection with the subway construction here in Toronto. In addition, thousands of Ontario contractors and construction workers were made aware of their responsibilities under the Act through a direct mail programme. The construction safety branch is also organizing standby rescue units for underground tunneling and compressed air work.

3. Another weapon in the battle to reduce construction accidents is now being applied by the workmen's compensation board, in the form of penalty assessment for firms displaying habitually poor safety records. Assessments are being as much as doubled, often at the cost of tens of thousands of dollars, for firms who have neglected the cost of safety in their operation. To date 295 construction firms in Ontario have received penalty assessments amounting to nearly \$1 million in increased assessments.

4. A stepped-up safety education programme carried out by various safety associations is still another phase of our total programme. To help to co-ordinate and strengthen the activities of the safety associations, the workmen's compensation board has established a new safety education department. It has recently hired a qualified director of safety education to carry this programme forward. (a) This new department of the compensation board is supplying central statistical services relating to accident trends and frequencies to all agencies involved in the safety field. (b) It is reviewing and co-ordinating the programmes of safety associations in the light of accident trends in order to eliminate duplication and to expand coverage. (c) It is allocating funds and overseeing safety programme budgets. (d) It is developing new programmes, particularly for areas outside the individual concern of any one association. (e) It is co-ordinating the production of promotional materials for all the associations and promoting the interchange of ideas and technical personnel between the associations.

5. In addition to legislation, safety educa-

tion and enforcement, we have reconstituted the Ontario labour safety council—an advisory body of representatives from both management and labour. The inaugural meeting of the new council was held on January 17. The purpose of the organization will be to advise the Minister of Labour and the government on all matters pertaining to safety education, enforcement and accident prevention. It will be called upon to suggest improvements in programmes and co-ordination between programmes.

I have great hopes, Mr. Speaker, that this advisory council will be able to assist us in finding new ways and means of combating deaths and injuries not only in construction, but also in other phases of industry.

The full impact of the steps we are now taking has not yet been felt. However, there are a number of encouraging signs. During 1964, for example, there were five deaths in subway construction in Toronto; last year there were none.

I am confident that with the full co-operation of management, organized labour and individual workers, we will be able to substantially reduce the waste of human resources and productivity that result from construction and industrial accidents.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour, notice of which has been given him. Will nurses in the new bargaining unit at the Riverview hospital in Windsor now have the right to strike?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may recall that the Legislature passed an Act at the last session—The Hospital Labour Disputes Arbitration Act—which establishes a method of settling disputes and making collective agreements between hospitals and their employees without the need to resort to strike or lock-out action. This will apply to the nurses' bargaining unit at Riverview hospital.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister. Supposing the nurses do go to the limit such as he has mentioned and still do not get satisfaction as far as their problems are concerned? What recourse do they then have?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is a hypothetical question. I do not think I have any answer to it. We would have to meet the situation as it comes along. I am not sure just what the hon. member is specifically referring to.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given, in three parts.

One: Are there any countries which have no universities whose medical degree granting standards are acceptable to the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons?

Two: If so, would the hon. Minister name the countries?

Three: Among those foreign students whose degrees were acceptable to the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons during the past two years, which countries were represented?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer to the first part of the question, Mr. Speaker, is yes. The answer to the second part is Central America, communist China, Republic of China, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Korea, Pakistan, Philippines, Syria and Turkey.

The answer to the third part is the British Isles, Republic of Ireland, Haiti, Jamaica, United States, principally, and most European countries.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the hon. member for Parkdale—I am sorry he is not in his seat—asked for information which I did not have, but which I undertook to get for him.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the hon. Minister to ask a supplementary question before the question is diverted? Does the hon. Minister think it likely that there are no universities in any of the countries specifically excluded from the list which he read which would not have undergraduate degrees equivalent to those granted by universities in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Sir, I am not in a position to answer that question. I have never undertaken any study of their standards, and since the administration of this Act is delegated to the college of physicians and surgeons, nobody in my department has ever been directed to study this.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give this additional information which was asked by the hon. member for Parkdale concerning the hospital construction projects in Metro Toronto which had applied for and taken advantage of the low-interest loans provided by government. At the time the regulations were passed, three hospital projects were under construction in Metro Toronto. They applied for and were given loans. Three projects have since been given loans. The

total amount involved in these six was \$8.5 million. Three more projects are presently under construction; they have applied for loans which will total \$4.155 million. Ten further projects in various stages of planning which will come into being within the next two years are now actively inquiring concerning the loan, and it is anticipated that all of those will make use of the low-interest loan.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Parkdale, does the hon. Minister consider that there is still not a shortage of active treatment hospital beds in Metro Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is that there now is a shortage of beds. We have always been faced with this. But with the facilities that are under construction and will be constructed by, I believe, 1977, and a very small number in 1978, if I recall my figures rightly, the need for beds will be met, as I stated yesterday. The need is being met in active building now.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), notice of which has been given. Would the hon. Minister inform the House whether a settlement was reached with the employees' representatives of the Ontario Northland Railway after a meeting with them on January 18 respecting the integration of the Canada pension plan with the present pension plan for Ontario Northland Railway employees?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, agreement has been reached with the employees' representatives and the Ontario northland transportation commission and has been initialled as agreed upon by all parties concerned.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister? Is the settlement final, and have all the conditions of settlement been accepted unconditionally by the employees?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, the settlement is not final, but it has been accepted by the employees' representatives.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Could he advise what action, if any, he intends to take on the request of the mayor of the city of

Toronto about the reorganization of the Metropolitan Toronto police commission, particularly the appointment to it of more elected rather than judicial persons?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have not received any request from Mayor Philip Givens on this matter. If I receive such a request I will discuss it with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who is the Minister with jurisdiction in respect of the statute under which that commission is set up. I assure the hon. member that any submission I receive will receive prompt and full consideration.

I should point out that police commissions generally, in all municipalities, are designed under The Police Act, but the Act of Metropolitan Toronto is a special municipal Act and its police commission is set up there, so that it does not come strictly within my hands. I would be glad to discuss it with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General is aware that there is a news story that says that the mayor is seeking your opinion on this?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: He must have got to the newspaper to say he is seeking it, but he has not got to me yet.

Mr. Singer: We will have to tell him.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. Public accounts of the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1965.
2. Provincial Auditor's report, 1964-1965, for the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale), that an humble address be presented to the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, as follows: To the Honourable W. Earl Rowe, P.C., LL.D., D.S.C., S.O.C., Lieutenant-Governor of the province of Ontario:

May it please Your Honour:

We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects of the legislative assembly of the province of Ontario now assembled, beg leave to thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has addressed to us.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you on the way in which you have carried out your task in this House. During my time in the Legislature, you have carried your office with dignity and great honour and most of us here have nothing but praise for your skilful performance as Speaker of this House. At the same time, I am sure that not many of us would trade places with you, simply because we have advantages and privileges which you do not have, in that we are permitted to express in this assembly our own hopes and ideals for the areas of people we represent, which privilege is not accorded to yourself.

We have two new faces in the Legislature this session, and although they might not have been here had the party of which I am a member perhaps worked a little harder, still I offer warm congratulations to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith). As was stated in this House yesterday, we perhaps as politicians hope that their stay here is short, but in the meantime, we are very happy to have them in this House.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of the riding of Lambton West, and on my own behalf, may I express our thanks for the honour and distinction which has been conferred upon us, as a result of my being given the privilege of moving this motion and thereby opening the important debate which will follow. In fact, a search of records fails to disclose that anyone from our riding has ever moved acceptance of the Throne speech.

However, the records do disclose that Mr. Timothy Blair Pardee, representing our riding, did second the motion in the years: 1874, 1877, 1878, 1882, 1884, 1885, 1886, and 1887.

In 1916 Mr. William John Hanna from Lambton West was the seconder. I might say that it is an added honour to me to have my name associated in this way with the names of these honourable gentlemen from the Lambton West of former years.

The basis for the debate to which I referred is the Speech from the Throne which indicates the course over which we will be guided for the next few months by our great leader, the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Roberts), to whom all Progressive Conservative members of this House pledge their loyalty, and respect, and support.

Before I make further reference to a few of the ideas contained in this session's Throne speech, I am constrained to pause and reflect briefly on the tremendous contributions this government has made to the progress of our

society to keep step with today's ever-changing image and accelerated pace. Such measures as:

1. Creation of The Department of University Affairs;
2. Setting up of an Ontario University Capital Aid Corporation;
3. Minimum Wage Act;
4. Used Car Dealers Act;
5. Establishment of Sheridan Park Corporation;
6. The Ontario Housing Corporation;
7. The Ontario overseas trade opportunities missions;
8. The Ontario Development Agency;
9. The Ontario flag;
10. Extending Workmen's Compensation Act to cover farm workers;
11. A committee on Confederation;
12. Royal Commission on Redistribution;
13. Railway commuter service between Burlington and Dunbarton;
14. Voluntary medical health insurance plan;
15. Royal Commission on Civil Liberties; and there are many others.

Time will allow me to touch only on some of the ideas emanating from the Throne speech; and I would ask that you bear with me as I bring you up to date on plans and problems and, in short, the present situation that we in Lambton find ourselves, while applying to our ridings these new ideas from the Throne speech to which I am about to refer.

We always have need of government interest, encouragement, advice and financial support, and these we are getting and no doubt will continue to get where we have an entitlement. We need facilities and some of these we are getting. The reference in the Throne speech to improved county roads leads me to commend the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) for introducing the county roads needs studies. The inestimable value of this plan is just now beginning to be felt in Lambton West. We are getting our fair share of the highways programme from a department which is alert to the needs of rapidly expanding industrial traffic and the surety of a heavy flow of tourist traffic crowding in upon us. I want to say more about that in a few minutes.

Two years ago, in my maiden speech, I drew to the attention of this government the dire predicament we were just approaching

in our needs for potable water. My plea was heard, action followed, and on January 21, 1966, the OWRC with the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) in the chair, reported to Lambton the results of a year-long study of our water needs, and the ways and means of satisfying them. They left with us a choice of going ahead with their recommendations or of seeking some alternative answers with their help. This matter of the choice remaining with the people is, to me, Mr. Speaker, the essence of good government and should be applied wherever possible at all.

But we in Lambton West have need of other facilities, particularly at this time in the education field. Reference is made in the Throne speech to the colleges of applied arts and technology. His Honour is correct in saying that the introduction of these institutions has met with tremendous interest. Here is an exciting, progressive proposal and only on a very few occasions have I ever seen the people of all Lambton, including Sarnia city, so united as they are in their desire to have our county named as a site for such a college.

You see, from its very inception, the purpose of these colleges appears to have been conceived with the Lambton situation in mind. The whole concept is made-to-measure for the Lambton area, where the need for specially trained technicians and professionals becomes more acute daily; where there exists a large staff potential amongst our own people who can be recruited to teach those skills and requirements peculiar to an oil and petro-chemical complex such as ours, and unlikely to be taught elsewhere in the province.

At the earliest opportunity our people must communicate our story to the council of regents for these colleges in a way that will result in the naming of Lambton as a site quite early, and thereby ensuring that our college can open in September 1966 in facilities which are available to us until proper buildings can follow in the normal course of things.

This particular field of education comes easily to our attention but let us not overlook other ways in which this department is not just meeting the needs but is expanding to provide for future needs and making full education universally possible for our people.

The revision of school programmes; the special attention to areas where people are at a geographical disadvantage; those who have physical or psychological disabilities; those who lack academic capacity, or who

suffer economic handicaps; as well as departmental reorganization which is bringing administrative and academic help and advice right down to the local area. One cannot overemphasize the awareness of this government in the field of university training and the steps it is taking to be prepared to meet all exigencies to ensure self-fulfillment for the individual and the attainment of our economic and social goals.

Lambton county is, by acreage, largely an agricultural community, and three townships lie within the riding of Lambton West. Such measures as The Milk Act of last year; the proposed efforts to take a strong lead in helping to secure qualified farm labour; the bold new field of crop insurance into which the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) proposes to move will ensure thrilled attention to the agricultural phase of our programmes on the part of our very progressive farm people, some of whom have so far been unable to harvest important 1965 crops due to climatic conditions. All of us will watch closely the expanded programmes and policies developed to meet the needs of agriculture in the north. A glance at the Throne speech assures us that we can look forward to much far-reaching legislation being presented at this session—new, exciting, forward-moving, agriculture legislation.

In fact, as I view the programmes of this government and the proposals suggested in the Throne speech of last Tuesday, I am more certain than ever that no one can possibly use against us such words as "dry," "stodgy," or "dull." I see better than ever before how well chosen are the words Progressive Conservative. What can be more real and all-embracing in government than to send its select committees all over the province to sit with the people, meet them, and understand their local situations in such matters as mining, corporate law, consumer credit, conservation, not to mention bold new undertakings by the committees on aging and youth which have so captured the imagination of our people.

This is really a grass-roots approach and well-received by members of all parties in this House, I am sure, and very much appreciated by the people on the local levels. What is more progressive than a commission on human rights; than our bold new look at mass transportation facilities; colleges of applied arts and technology; the new emphasis on training in every department of our government; an awareness of the rights of the people to the beauties of nature and the active preservation of the best of these

and indeed creation of new ones? These things stir our imagination and make every citizen proud to be a part of today's exciting developments. No wonder people say we are the true reform party of this age.

Speaking of the preservation of the beauties of nature, we of Lambton county, and indeed of Kent as well—if the hon. members will allow—are very gratified to see mention in the Throne speech of the approaching creation of a St. Clair parkway commission. The St. Clair parkway as a project was announced by the hon. Minister of Highways last year and we have now progressed to this next important step. That you may have a better concept of this undertaking, let me spend a moment or two.

This parkway will stretch some 30 miles from Mitchell's Bay in Kent county along the whole shoreline of the beautiful St. Clair river to Point Edward and the Blue Water bridge. This is a new concept for a parkway, and it has been promoted by sacrifices in time and money by the municipalities and individuals of the counties of Lambton and Kent, and when supplemented by the resources of the province through this government, will guarantee to you and your children, and your children's children, a plethora of beauty unsurpassed in its kind anywhere. We will transform the chemical valley of Canada from a purely utilitarian complex to one which combines the supplying of oil, petro-chemical, gas and farm products so necessary to our burgeoning economy with beauty and recreation and opportunities to contemplate the wonders of nature and ponder on the scheme of things and the God who created them, or with brush and camera catch the magic of it all.

All of you know what an oil and petro-chemical complex looks like by day but in Lambton at night it becomes a fairyland with its hundreds of thousands of lights and its bright flares, all of them reflected in the blue waters of the St. Clair whereon the ships of the world pass by with lights aglow. I want to digress here for a second to remind you that the waters of the St. Clair, emptying from that large reservoir of potable water, Lake Huron, is pure; and because of its purity great industries have settled on its banks, one alone using several millions of gallons of water per hour for cooling purposes and returning the water undefiled to the river.

Needless to say, we ask the support of all of you, whenever the occasion arises, to fight any and all threats to its pollution from whatever direction this threat may come. We in

Lambton are dedicated to this proposition and to sparing no effort or expense to further purification projects as they become feasible.

To get back to the parkway. At Christmas time in this valley, the lights on our industrial towers and columns are changed to present colour schemes of breathtaking beauty, and every plant dresses up in ever-changing interpretations of the Christmas story. Now you can see how the decision of a wise government to establish a parkway right through the gates of the present industries, and along the most obvious route of their expansion and for new industries, stirs the imagination. It is a new idea, a new concept. See this in your mind right in the heart of our industry:

Beyond the tracks a long row of golden willows sweeps around the outside of the curve and is stopped abruptly by a large block of columnar English oaks in the border of the right-of-way. On the south side of the Hydro station a mass of Russian olives screens the lower portion of the plant area and leaves the upper and more interesting structures in view. The foreground of the Dow Chemical Company property is planted to screen lower portions of buildings and parking areas with ginkgos, sycamores, honey locusts, and specimen flowering trees.

It has stirred our people! Moore township, Lambton county, one of the townships of Kent county, the village of Point Edward, have all moved swiftly, at their own expense, spending large sums of money to secure blocks of land along the parkway for the public use, and 60 acres within the city of Sarnia have been purchased for the same purpose by the city at a cost of \$.25 million. As much more will be spent to develop it, and they are spending \$7,200 just to be told how to develop it to fit in with the parkway concept, thus reclaiming precious waterfront property on Sarnia Bay, lost to the public domain at a time of industrial expediency in the long ago.

Industry will continue to grow on, and with our parkway, for we intend to work with industry to give it room to reach its much-needed abundance of fresh water while industry, in turn, will present real tourist attractions in landscaping, in parks and recreational facilities, and in sightseeing opportunities. Presently we have under construction in our riding some \$350 million of new and expanding industry, most of it right on the parkway.

In fact, just in today's mail I received a news release which states that Dow Chemical of Canada Limited has announced a new chlorinated hydrocarbons complex to be built

at its Sarnia works. The engineering is already well advanced and construction will begin shortly. The plant, to be built at a cost of approximately \$6 millions, will produce a wide range of chlorinated hydrocarbons including methyl and methylene chloride, chloroform, carbon tetrachloride, perchloryl ethylene, and trichloryl ethylene. So, we continue. You may hear more from me on the parkway theme later in the session.

In other areas of interest, our riding is awaiting approval to undertake an urban renewal study that will embrace the city of Sarnia, Point Edward, Courtright, and the townships of Moore and Sarnia. A great part of their future depends on the outcome of this study. One township, Moore, is considering a council manager form of government similar to that of the city. In these days of railway line abandonment it is refreshing to relate that the CNR has just laid ten miles of new line in Moore and Sombra townships to take care of present and future industrial requirements. Thus does our riding progress, making full use of the welcome assistance and guidance afforded us by this government which recognizes local stimulation and progressive activity.

I would like to turn to a more philosophical vein at this time. As one who has spent a lifetime in the field of education, I have been disturbed by what I read in *Hansard*, in speeches in public, from newspaper articles and editorials, from conversations with individuals, old and young, in all walks of life, on the subject of training and education. In a day of real need for more and more trained people to fill specific needs, sometimes inadvertently, some times intentionally, I am afraid we stress learning of a skill because of the greater remuneration that will follow. The purpose is to fill a utilitarian need in society and the bait is a dollars-and-cents need in the mind of the individual.

We tend to hunt out the shortest route to the goal and pare away what many unfortunately regard as "fat". Are we forgetting the humanities? Will we one day wake up to the terrifying truth that we have created a race of mechanical men without hearts, without any depth of being, with no meaning in life save to supply one expert service in a little round cage for X number of dollars to spend on selfish interests?

Thomas Henry Huxley, a great natural scientist, while urging that more and more scientific studies be included in the curriculum, in 1882, wrote in a paper entitled, "On Science and Art in Relation to Education":

There are other forms of culture besides

physical science, and I should be profoundly sorry to see the fact forgotten, or even to observe a tendency to starve or cripple literary or aesthetic culture for the sake of science.

In a paper called, "A Liberal Education, and Where to Find it", written in 1868, he attempts to define a liberal education, and I quote this short passage:

That man, I think, has had a liberal education who has been so trained in youth that his body is the ready servant of his will, whose intellect is a clear, cold, logical engine with all its parts of equal strength, and in smooth working order; ready, like a steam engine, to be turned to any kind of work and spin gossamers as well as forge the anchors of the mind; whose mind is stored with knowledge of the great and fundamental truths of nature and of the laws of her operations; one who, no stunted ascetic, is full of life and fire; but whose passions are trained to come to heel by a vigorous will, the servant of a tender conscience; who has learned to love all beauty, whether of nature or of art, to hate all vileness and to respect others as himself.

I contend these views are as valid today as in 1868, or 1882. In fact, a recent editorial in the *Sarnia Observer* on this same theme brings these older ideas up-to-date, or perhaps expresses them from a different standpoint, and I quote, in part:

There is something besides mere gain and animal comfort to be won by education. Today the graduates are sent into the world with exhortations to climb the ladder of success.

The editorial goes on to say:

Another side of education is pointed out by *Contemporary and Alumni News*, the school quarterly of St. Francis Xavier University in Nova Scotia. *Contemporary* quotes Monsignor Robert Moses in a talk he gave in 1949 when he said:

"We want our people to look into the sun, and into the depths of the sea. We want them to explore the hearts of flowers and the hearts of our fellowmen. We want them to live, to love, to play, and to pray with all their being. Life for them shall not only be in terms of merchandising but in terms of all that is good and beautiful, be it economic, political, social, cultural, or spiritual.

They are the heirs of all the ages and of all the riches yet concealed. They will

usher in the new by attending to the blessings of the old. They will use what they have to secure what they have not."

The editorial goes on to conclude:

Perhaps there is rhetoric here. Maybe the words are a little on the florid side. But they are something better for mankind in a world where the hard-nosed job of earning a living and keeping up with the Joneses and the time payments has drained out much of the simple joyousness of being neighbourly and discovering the beauty and the wonder of the simple things around us.

And so I say, let us be warned by those who foresee the dangers. While trying to supply the demand for more and more people in every walk of our society who can provide certain skills, let us make sure that, in every level of our education, we provide for training in the humanities as well. Otherwise we may be sorry some day that we have neglected the finer things of life; indeed we may see our nation fall apart for lack of sympathy, depth of character, understanding, and a deep sense of satisfaction in service to others.

We, here, in this Legislature have the opportunity, yes, the duty to ensure that the citizens of tomorrow in Ontario are not ensnared by one-sided education. More than that, as people elected to give leadership we ought to demonstrate in our daily activities here that our education in this House is not one-sided, but embraces the whole broad field. We are really in training here; we are in a sense attending a university, and this is not a new idea at all.

John Henry Newman, the English scholar and the writer of the beautiful hymn "Lead, Kindly Light", in an address given in 1854, entitled "What is a University", says in part:

A university is in its essence a place for communication, and circulation of thought by means of personal intercourse through a wide extent of country.

And later on he says:

I admit I have not been in Parliament; yet I cannot but think that statesmanship as well as high breeding is learned, not by books, but in certain centres of education. Parliament puts a clever man *au courant* with politics and affairs of state in a way surprising to himself. A member of the Legislature, if tolerably observant, begins to see things with new eyes, even though his views undergo no change. Words have a meaning now, and ideas a reality, such as

they had not before. He hears a vast deal in public speeches and private conversation which is never put into print.

The bearings of measures and events, the action of parties, and the persons of friends and enemies are brought out to the man who is in the midst of them with a distinctness which the most diligent perusal of newspapers will fail to impart to him. It is access to the fountainheads of political wisdom and experience; it is daily intercourse with the multitude who go up to them; it is familiarity with business; it is access to the contributions of fact and opinion thrown together by many witnesses from many quarters which does this for him. However, I need not account for a fact, to which it is sufficient to appeal, that the Houses of Parliament and the atmosphere around them are a sort of university of politics.

In my work at school I have occasion to administer a test which includes the question, "What is the difference between a statesman and a politician?" A grade 7 boy once gave this answer:

A statesman is a man who does great things for his country, and a politician doesn't do much except try to get elected to something all the time.

Well, it is unlikely that all of us are cut out to be statesmen, but we can try. Man's reach should be beyond his grasp, or what's a heaven for, said the poet.

So I ask everyone in this Legislature to join with me during this session in an endeavour to spend less of our time trying to be a politician in the sense of the young boy's definition, and try harder to become statesmen; to eschew nit-picking, and witch-hunting, and weeping at the wall; to forego excessive and pointless verbiage just because we like the sounds of our own voices, and with dignity—and I underline dignity—and a good sense of humour, and according to our party beliefs and personal convictions deal with the important business contained in this Speech from the Throne to the end that we will demonstrate to the people of this great province that here is a Legislature of which they can be proud, which accepts its responsibilities for leadership and gets on with the business for which it was elected.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of honour on behalf of the constituents of the riding of Armourdale—the riding which I have the privilege of representing in the House—that I rise to second the motion of the hon.

member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) for the adoption of the Speech from the Throne, presented by the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. I imagine it is rather unique, sir, to have a government member who has crossed the floor of this House as recently as this week to be invited to speak on behalf of the government. I concur wholeheartedly, sir, in the remarks of the hon. member for Lambton West relating to the dignified and impartial manner in which you carry out your most important duties.

May I also take this opportunity of welcoming the two new members to this Legislature. For those who may not know, the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) is a lawyer by profession, and thus we add another humanitarian to our ranks.

I understand that the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) is a druggist by profession; it may well be that in this capacity he will be able to prescribe the proper remedy for an ailing Opposition—one of the hon. members to my left suggests "Geritol for tired blood" as a start.

Mr. Speaker, it is now over two years since the good ship Roberts—a new, young, streamlined model, lifted anchor and set sail on a four-year voyage under contract with the people of Ontario, having taken on many new crew members, and with the flag of the 27th Parliament flying overhead.

At the helm was our captain—the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts), and backing him up was a formidable array of executive officers, well qualified in their respective posts. The hold was laden down with vast amounts of important legislation, which during the past two years has been unloaded at various ports in Ontario and from these, distributed for the benefit of the citizens of this province.

Presently, since the voyage is now half over, we are setting course on the return trip to Queen's Park, after having loaded another valuable cargo of legislation which likewise will be dropped off at various ports on the way.

There has been much speculation already as to when our captain intends docking once more at Queen's Park to make an accounting to the owners of our ship, the people of this province. As we commence the return leg of our journey, there is no doubt that we do so with increased popularity, despite repeated attempts to scuttle our ship over the past two years.

There are, I understand, two other parties interested in taking away our contract with

the people of this province. However, their ships are not ready, nor will they be, due to certain factors, including a lack of suitable material and sufficient labour, and I understand that their crew is inexperienced, not having been off the mainland in 22 years.

I, for one, am happy to be aboard the good ship Robarts, skippered by the hon. Prime Minister, confident in my belief that he and his advisers chart the best possible routes in the best interests of the owners of our ship, the people of the province.

Mr. Speaker, in preparing this speech I came across two suggested recommendations for a good speech.

One concerns itself with the definition of the length of a good speech which is defined, "a beginning and an ending placed not too far apart."

The other concerns itself with the form and contents by one of the best liked politicians of our time—the late Adlai Stevenson—and his advice is set to poetry as follows:

If you would make a speech or write
one

Or get an artist to indite one

Think not because 'tis understood

By men of sense 'tis therefore good.

Make it so clear and simply planned

No blockhead can misunderstand.

I have tried to incorporate both these suggestions this afternoon.

I make reference first, Mr. Speaker, as one of the members representing a Metropolitan Toronto riding, to the proposed legislation respecting Metropolitan Toronto.

The basis for this proposed legislation will be the statement made by the hon. Prime Minister on the report of the Royal commission on Metropolitan Toronto, on January 10 last.

We are all aware that The Metropolitan Toronto Act was passed in 1953, that this novel form of government has had an impressive record of achievement, that it has been an outstanding success and recognized as such around the world.

We also know that an amending statute has been presented to this Legislature every year since 1955.

On June 15 last, Dr. H. Carl Goldenberg, Q.C., delivered to the government his report of the Royal commission on Metropolitan Toronto.

Subsequent to that date, the most detailed and exhaustive analysis and study was carried out by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) and his officials, including the

examination of more than 100 submissions from members of the Legislature, municipal councils, boards, commissions, ratepayer associations, and private citizens. This time-consuming thoroughness was necessitated because the decision reached affected not only the people of Metropolitan Toronto, but the well-being, stability and prosperity of the entire province.

It was necessary that the decision be in the best interests of all concerned.

The hon. Prime Minister's statement, except for one minor objection, met with almost unanimous approval of the elected representatives of the area I represent.

It met with the approval of the present chairman of Metropolitan Toronto, as well as the reeves of the four largest suburbs, and, I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, it has met with the approval of the majority of the citizens concerned. It will, I submit, provide the basis for another highly successful form of government for Metropolitan Toronto.

Perhaps, sir, an excerpt from an editorial in one of the local newspapers, in the area in which I reside, will better, and in an unbiased manner, describe the reaction to the hon. Prime Minister's statement:

Robarts' Metro reform demonstrates a government philosophy that preserves the values which permit the reasonably intelligent and reasonably well-informed citizen to understand the local government of which he is a part. This new Metro government enables the citizens of this municipality to participate in the management of their affairs without undue difficulty. It also recognizes an important democratic principle of representation by population—every 50,000-voters group in Metro will have a voice on Metro council.

The premier has recognized the pitfalls of amalgamation. An amalgamated government serving several hundred thousand persons becomes incomprehensible to the majority of citizens. The people see little or no purpose in their attempts to influence the state of affairs. They feel the government increasingly tends to leave decisions to experts and planners.

As the world's large urban centres study complexities of municipal overhaul, more and more are deciding that decentralization is the solution. The premier of Ontario has recognized this and it must be one of his main reasons for preserving a Metro which will include the city of Toronto and the boroughs of North York, Scarborough, Etobicoke, East York and York.

May I point out, and emphasize that the problem encountered in dealing with this situation, the fact-finding undertaken and the decision reached, reflect once again the wisdom of the hon. Prime Minister and our government in refusing to be stampeded into hasty decisions. These momentous decisions cannot be made overnight. There is an old saying "Act in haste—repent in leisure". To-day more than ever we should fly the caution flag and learn to make haste slowly.

Mr. Speaker, I do not recall any specific mention of taxes in the Speech from the Throne but at this time of year we are tax conscious, and I would like to digress for a moment and make a few personal observations about the fiscal responsibility of government.

Insofar as Ontario is concerned there is no doubt that enormous expenditures will be required in the years ahead.

This populous and economically advanced province is the main source of wealth for all Canada and money must be found for the investment necessary to maintain and increase Ontario's production of wealth for the benefit of all.

Investment in human capital is as important as other types of investment for the promotion of economic growth—this means investment in education and investment in social welfare as well as highways, and so on.

Governments today are truly on the horns of a dilemma. The burden of taxes is already heavy, but if we do not spend the money to provide the services required for growth, our economy will lag and the standard of living fall.

Yet, if government borrows to meet expenditures we are merely adding interest and postponing the day when the bills will have to be met.

In my opinion, one thing is sure and that is government cannot go on succumbing to this pressure or that pressure and spending more and more money each year.

It is government's job to weigh the various positions taken by conflicting interest groups, to attempt to reconcile these positions and to develop policies which are in the best interests of the general public.

Governments at all levels must plan. They must plan in order to clarify and define objectives, to mobilize all departments and agencies towards achieving these objectives, to co-ordinate the activities of these departments and agencies, and to exercise maximum economy in their operations.

Government has no money except what it collects from the people by way of taxes. When we demand services, we must be prepared to pay for them.

Perhaps one of the greatest inherent dangers in a democracy such as ours must surely be the demanding of services which are in excess of our ability or capacity to pay.

It is we, the elected representatives, who must hold the line, for today it is obvious that many of our people live beyond their means. Credit buying has reached staggering proportions, and it would seem that our citizens expect us to adopt the same attitude in expending public funds.

Almost two centuries ago, a teacher by the name of Alexander Fraser Tyler, made an observation about the rise and fall of the Athenian republic over 2,000 years ago, that:

Democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. It can exist only until the voters discover they can vote themselves largesse out of the public treasury. From that moment on, the majority always votes for the candidate promising the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that democracy always collapses over a loose fiscal policy.

It is alarming to note the popularity of the concept today, that anything obtained from the government is free.

As elected representatives, Mr. Speaker, we should ascertain from our civil servants and tell the electorate, frankly, how much additional services will cost. We should explain the additional cost in terms the voters can understand; we should explain what new or increased taxes must be collected to pay for new or increased services; we should relate these increases in dollars and cents per year for different income groups.

We should, through our civil servants, be responsible in seeing that government departments are run as efficiently and economically as possible—that the answer is not always a fresh infusion of tax dollars to balance the budget.

But perhaps more than anything, we should make an effort to try to educate the public on the cost of government services—straight figures and facts and not the distorted views of special interest outside critics.

What is our position in this province relative to the whole of Canada? We hear many statistics about our great province in this Legislature, but unless they are related or

compared they are meaningless. For example, while our population of less than seven million is only one-third of the population of Canada, we produce over 40 per cent of the national income and contribute some 50 per cent of the direct taxes collected in Canada. Ontario factories produce 90 per cent of all motor vehicles produced in Canada; 94 per cent of all automotive parts and accessories; 92 per cent of all office furniture; 90 per cent of all production of the electrical industries; 87 per cent of all agricultural implements; and 86 per cent of all iron and steel production. Factory shipments of manufactured goods have risen to 15.7 billion in 1964 from 5.7 billion in 1948—190 per cent increase in 18 years!

In agriculture, Ontario, with only one-tenth of the occupied farmlands in Canada, out-produces all other provinces in terms of market value of its products. As a matter of fact, Ontario produces one-quarter of the agricultural production value of Canada. Last year, Ontario farm crops were valued at just over \$1 billion—an increase of 97 per cent in just over three years.

In mining, Ontario leads all other provinces in value of mineral production. The total Canadian production will be close to \$1 billion, of which 42 per cent comes from Ontario mines.

In manufacturing, Ontario industries account for more than 50 per cent of the total manufacturing output of the entire Canadian industry, and in terms of total production of goods and services, Ontario accounts for more than 40 per cent of the Canadian gross national product.

Our province enjoyed its fifth consecutive year of economic expansion in 1965, establishing many new records in the process.

Employment, income and production all reached new peaks during this past year as the level of prosperity in the province rose.

Overall expansion, measured by the increase in the gross Ontario product, was 9 per cent, with over 6 per cent of this representing growth in real terms. The roughly 3 per cent increase in prices was the largest annual price increase of the current expansion.

For Canada, as a whole, the unemployment rate has been reduced from 5.5 per cent in 1963 to 3.6 per cent in November 1965. For Ontario it has declined from 3.8 per cent to 2.3 per cent in the same period, a truly remarkable record of achievement demonstrating and reflecting good government—the government of Prime Minister John Roberts.

The hon. member for Lambton West

has outlined some of the progressive legislation enacted by this government during the past two and one-half years. This is indicative of the fine leadership we are getting within our own sphere—within the confines of the province of Ontario.

What about our leadership in national affairs? For as the leader of the outstanding province in Canada, this is a must to us as Canadian citizens. What about Canadian confederation? Donald Smythe, of the University of British Columbia, writing in the December issue of the academically-oriented *Canadian Forum*, said: “Mr. Roberts proposed a set of principles about the Canadian confederation which establishes him as the most clear-headed English-speaking political leader in these matters”.

What were these principles? These were outlined by the hon. Prime Minister in a recent speech as follows:

It was impossible for Ontario to accept a federal system which is not based on the principle of a single national economy, and, furthermore, a single national government which has control over that economy.

National economic policies must be made sensitive to regional needs through more adequate and more frequent consultations with the provinces.

Ontario rejected the proposition that “the government of Quebec in any way represents the interests of French-speaking Canadians living in any other province of Canada.”

The existing constitutional provisions relating to French language and culture were to be regarded as inviolable with the insistence that these privileges belong to people—not to government.

These enunciated principles taken in conjunction with his numerous addresses on the topic of Confederation, his understanding of the problems, his patience, his tact, and, above all, his love of Canada and his ability to get along with people, point out to us all unmistakably that Ontario does indeed have a voice on national unity second to none, through a true Canadian statesman—the hon. Prime Minister.

The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, promises a busy and productive session. It contains a most interesting selection of proposed legislation covering a wide range of interests to the people of this province.

The proposed legislation dealing with the aged, including the licensing and supervising of nursing homes, will meet with the wholehearted approval of everyone.

The proposed amendments to The Securities Act and The Corporations Act will certainly give more and better protection to the investing public.

The man in the street will be vitally interested in legislation proposed on the basis of the report of the select committee on consumer credit.

The establishment of a new legal aid plan is a major step forward, and the creation of a new Ministry within The Attorney General's Department is a sensible move.

I am particularly happy with the proposed aid to small business, particularly in certain areas, because I maintain, always have maintained, and, I suspect, always will maintain, that the small business is the backbone of our economy. Every possible aid should be given to encourage the establishment and retention of the small business.

There is no need to further enlarge on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, because the hon. members of this Legislature will be dealing with its contents specifically this session, at which time I am sure full debate will take place on the legislation proposed.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the Opposition in general. I am aware that when one talks in general terms, it is unfair in many cases, because there are always exceptions. Having regard to the fact that I am a minor backbencher, having just been demoted from a front seat bench to the back bench—indeed, the Chicago Gang tell me that my next jump is to the East Gallery—and premising my remarks by stating that because of my inexperience I may be somewhat wrong in my observations, I am sure that the Opposition hon. members will not mind my devoting a few moments to them. What I have to say may give them a few bitter pills to swallow, but in the long run it may prove to be good medicine.

I may say, before I start, that dissension is natural to politics—as is disagreement—and so is clash of personality. We in this House, however, have a common denominator—the best interests of the people of this province—and for this reason, we work together with goodwill.

My remarks are prompted by the debate which took place yesterday, charging that the hon. Prime Minister is unfair in his treatment of the Opposition—a most unfair charge, in my opinion—one completely without foundation. On the contrary, I never cease to marvel at his patience, his understanding, his tact, his bending over backwards, his almost fatherly benign attitude to the leaders and

members of the Opposition. I think the terminology of the Opposition is “sweet reasonableness”.

I have heard the hon. Prime Minister say countless times in this House that he is prepared to spend all year sitting if necessary to properly deal with the business of the Legislature. Certainly no one looks forward more to the sessions than the hon. Prime Minister. This is to him what the stage is to the actor; this is the life-blood of politics. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, one of the difficulties is that certain hon. members of the Opposition are not too well-informed on the rules of the House. There is a saying that a biased critic will always find something to try the sharp edge of his tongue on, and especially so when he is ill-informed.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is not the rules of the House nor the alleged handcuffing of the Opposition that is to blame for their lack-lustre performance to date. I suggest specifically that the Opposition in this House have forgotten how to oppose, have forgotten their primary function.

They have not had 22 years' experience in Opposition; they have had one year's experience 22 times.

Good government requires good opposition and, fortunately for our government, we do not have to rely solely on Opposition parties—we are able to provide a good deal of our own opposition.

The Opposition reminds me of a little pup that a father took home to his six children; the pup tried to go in six directions at once to please six children at the same time.

So it is with the Opposition. At the opening of each session, they dart off in all directions—hell-bent for election, as it were—like the spray of a shotgun at long range, not hitting home on any issues, just making a mess. How much better if they prepared properly, took steady aim, and hit the target once in a while, for I am sure that we do make mistakes; there are always mistakes when the human element is involved.

Many times, Mr. Speaker, I have sat in this House and, yes, in committees, expecting opposition on matters of utmost importance—opposition that should be planned intelligently and constructively—only to have the whole matter fizzle undramatically for lack of opposition.

It is like opening a lion's cage expecting a lion to come roaring and charging out, and, instead, a quiet little mouse tiptoes softly out. I also never cease to be amazed at the wrangling which takes place between the two Opposition parties. Sometimes there is

a thin line of demarcation—as thin, Mr. Speaker, as the broth made from the shadow of a chicken that died from starvation. At other times, they are diametrically opposed—suspicious, jealous, and at that time one or the other of them sidles apologetically up to the government party seeking refuge on its shoulders as on those of a big brother.

I do not stand alone in this viewpoint of the Opposition; others more knowledgeable than I share it. It is indeed shared by the hon. leader of the official Opposition himself (Mr. Thompson), because in a recent radio interview he stated: “From now on, we are going to oppose more, we have not been opposing enough.” I congratulate the hon. leader of the official Opposition for his detection of this inherent weakness and suggest that instead of whining about being muzzled that he and the other Opposition members study and get down to the fundamental basics of opposing. Then this fourth session of the 27th Parliament will prove most fruitful and beneficial to the people of this great province.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow there are some formalities we will go through. There will be the report of the striking committee, I believe, and there may be some other introduction of bills, but I would like to proceed with a discussion of resolutions numbers one and two on the order paper. I believe the movers of those two resolutions, and they are quite closely linked together, will work out some way in which they can be dealt with satisfactory to the House, but that would be the order of business after we have completed the formalities in the morning.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.45 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, January 28, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Friday, January 28, 1966

Report, select committee re standing committees, Mr. Mackenzie	71
Motion to appoint Mr. L. M. Reilly as chairman of the committee of the whole House, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	72
On notice of motions Nos. 1 and 2, Mr. Singer, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. Renwick, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Grossman, Mr. Young, Mr. Yaremko	75
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Trotter, agreed to	92
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	94

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Metropolitan Toronto school for the deaf and Baywood Boulevard public school, Downsview; in the west gallery, St. Andrew's junior high school, Willowdale.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) from the select committee appointed to prepare the lists of members to compose the standing committees of the House, presented the committee's report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the lists of standing committees ordered by the House be composed as follows:

AGRICULTURE: Messrs. Brunelle, Butler, Carruthers, Evans, Ewen, Farquhar, Freeman, Gaunt, Gisborn, Hamilton, Henderson, Hodgson (Victoria), Johnston (Carleton), Letherby, MacDonald, Morningstar, McKeough, McNeil, Nixon, Olde, Oliver, Paterson, Pittock, Rollins, Root, Rowe, Sandercock, Spence, Villeneuve, Walker, Welch, Whicher, Whitney, Yakubski—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

EDUCATION AND UNIVERSITY AFFAIRS: Messrs. Apps, Bales, Downer, Eagleson, Guindon, Hodgson (Victoria), Kerr, Knox, Lawrence (Russell), Lawrence (St. George), Lewis (Scarborough West), MacDonald, McKeough, Newman, Nixon, Peck, Racine, Smith, Welch, Worton, Wells—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

GOVERNMENT COMMISSIONS: Messrs. Apps, Beckett, Ben, Braithwaite, Brunelle, Carton, Davison, Downer, Dunlop, Edwards, Ewen, Gaunt, Hodgson (Scarborough East), Johnston (Parry Sound), Kerr, Lewis (Humber),

MacDonald, Mackenzie, McNeil, Morningstar, Noden, Peck, Pittock, Price, Pritchard (Mrs.), Renwick, Rollins, Singer, Sopha, Taylor, Thrasher, Walker, Whicher, Whitney—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

HEALTH AND WELFARE: Messrs. Apps, Braithwaite, Bukator, Carruthers, Cowling, Demers, Dunlop, Eagleson, Ewen, Harris, Lewis (Scarborough West), Noden, Pritchard (Mrs.), Racine, Reilly, Rowe, Trotter, Villeneuve, Wells, Worton, Young—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

HIGHWAYS AND TOURISM: Messrs. Apps, Brown, Brunelle, Butler, Carruthers, Davison, Demers, Edwards, Evans, Farquhar, Freeman, Gisborn, Guindon, Hamilton, Henderson, Hodgson (Scarborough East), Hodgson (Victoria), Johnston (Carleton), Knox, Lawrence (Russell), Olde, Mackenzie, McNeil, Newman, Noden, Paterson, Root, Rowe, Smith, Spence, Taylor, Whicher, Whitney, Yakubski—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

LEGAL BILLS AND LABOUR: Messrs. Bales, Beckett, Ben, Braithwaite, Butler, Carton, Cass, Eagleson, Evans, Henderson, Gisborn, Lawrence (Russell), Lawrence (St. George), Morningstar, Reaume, Reilly, Renwick, Sopha, Thrasher, Trotter, Welch—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS: Messrs. Bryden, Bukator, Cowling, Demers, Dunlop, Ewen, Gordon, Harris, Hodgson (Scarborough East), Kerr, McKeough, Newman, Peck, Pritchard (Mrs.), Reuter, Rollins, Sargent, Singer, Walker, Wells, Young—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

NATURAL RESOURCES, WILDLIFE AND MINING: Messrs. Brown, Brunelle, Butler, Davison, Demers, Evans, Farquhar, Freeman, Gibson, Gisborn, Guindon, Hamilton, Hodgson (Scarborough East), Hodgson (Victoria),

Johnston (Parry Sound), Johnston (Carleton), Letherby, Mackenzie, McNeil, Noden, Pater-son, Pittock, Rollins, Root, Rowe, Sandercock, Sargent, Smith, Spence, Taylor, Villeneuve, Welch, Whitney, Yakabuski—34.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

PRIVATE BILLS: Messrs. Apps, Bales, Beckett, Ben, Brown, Brunelle, Bukator, Butler, Carruthers, Carton, Cowling, Demers, Eagleson, Edwards, Evans, Ewen, Freeman, Gaunt, Hamilton, Harris, Henderson, Kerr, Lawrence (Russell), Letherby, MacDonald, Mackenzie, Morningstar, McKeough, Newman, Nixon, Olde, Peck, Price, Pritchard (Mrs.), Reaume, Reilly, Renwick, Reuter, Rollins, Sandercock, Singer, Sopha, Trotter, Villeneuve, Walker, Wells, Whicher, Whitney, Worton, Young—50.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of seven members.

PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS: Messrs. Beckett, Bryden, Butler, Downer, Dunlop, Guindon, Harris, Kerr, Lawrence (St. George), Nixon, Oliver, Peck, Reaume, Renwick, Rollins, Smith, Walker, Wells, White, Worton, Yakabuski—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: Messrs. Bales, Bryden, Carton, McKeough, Reuter, Rowe, Sopha, Trotter, Wells—9.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

STANDING ORDERS AND PRINTING: Messrs. Apps, Ben, Carruthers, Cass, Downer, Edwards, Ewen, Farquhar, Freeman, Gisborn, Gordon, Knox, Lewis (Humber), Olde, Oliver, Pittock, Price, Pritchard (Mrs.), Reaume, Sandercock, Thrasher—21.

The quorum of the said committee to consist of five members.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves, seconded by Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition), that Mr. L. M. Reilly, member for the electoral district of Eglinton, be appointed chairman of the committee of the whole House for the present session.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in putting forward the motion I would like to make a short comment.

I think that this appointment and this motion has a bearing on what we were dis-

cussing the other day concerning the various functions of this House and its procedures. In these latter years, when the committee of the whole House or the committee of supply has come to be really a forum in which the conduct of various departments of government is very closely examined, as well as the estimates of actual spending, this office has developed in increasing importance. The hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly)—to give you just a brief rundown on his position here—was elected at a by-election in 1962. Perhaps other hon. members will not recall as vividly as I do, that his fate hung in the balance of a recount in those days. He was successful in that recount, and then the electors of Eglinton in the general election of 1963 realized that they had chosen properly, and perhaps a little thinly in the by-election of 1962, and he was returned by a very large majority.

Mr. Reilly's background reaches into municipal affairs. He was an alderman from 1947 to 1955, and of course he has served as chairman of various standing committees of this House and has a long background in the sometimes difficult task of chairing meetings and chairing gatherings where perhaps everyone is not exactly agreed on what is being discussed. I have great pleasure in recommending him to the hon. members of the House as Deputy Speaker and chairman of the committees of the House with the full knowledge and confidence that he will be able to discharge these duties to the satisfaction of everyone in the House.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to second the motion of the hon. Prime Minister for the hon. member for Eglinton.

We know that he is a man of independent thought, we have seen that in the House on other occasions when he spoke his mind. We also know he is a man of considerable and varied talent. We have seen that also in the House when he has sung his mind. I do not think he will need to do that in the discussions in the committee of supply, although perhaps it might liven up some of the heavier moments which take place in the wee hours of the morning.

May I say that from our side of the House we appreciate the importance of this job, of this position. We are aware that it requires impartiality and fairness and we know that the hon. member will live up to that.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is possible

to third a motion, or to double second a motion, but I take great pleasure in doing that, and particularly so with the hon. member for Eglinton. As the hon. leader of the Opposition says, he has indicated some of those characteristics which I think are necessary to be a good Deputy Speaker and among them I do not think is the fact that he increased his majority in the last election. I think that becomes irrelevant at this point. That is a touch of partisanship which he must now discard just as you, Mr. Speaker, have to in your position.

The hon. leader of the Opposition has alluded to a point which was rather teasing me as I look forward to the prospect of this session with the hon. member for Eglinton in the chair. Undoubtedly, notwithstanding our respect for the hon. gentleman, there will be occasions when we will have differences, indeed there may even be occasions when this House degenerates into a little bit of chaos, and I can now see the solution to it. The hon. Deputy Speaker will rise and he will break into song. Now if it is an Irish song that we all know, we will forget our differences and sing together. If it is a song like some we have heard from him, we will just have to listen to it as a solo.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of the whole House.

House in committee of the whole; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

Mr. L. M. Reilly (Eglinton): Members of this Legislature, first of all I should like to express my personal appreciation to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) for his motion this morning and for his kind words. I accept the words that have been spoken as a tribute to the people of Eglinton and I am glad, of course, to receive this assignment as your Deputy Speaker and chairman of the committee of the whole. I am particularly pleased to hear the kind words expressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) and by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). As all these hon. members have said, it is not an easy job.

Many of you may not relish this particular assignment. I accept it as a challenge. I realize that in order to do the work that you want done it will require tact, and it will require tolerance, and it will require the full co-operation of every hon. member of this House. Contrary to what has been

suggested by some of the speakers, it is not my intention to break out in song. As a matter of fact, I overheard one of the members, the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden), say: "Please don't encourage him."

Earlier this week several hon. members suggested the necessity for improvement, particularly from the standpoint of committees, and have made several suggestions on how we can improve and expedite the working of the House. I am suggesting to you that perhaps one of the best ways we can improve it is in the committee of the whole House.

Perhaps some of you will recall, when I came in here in 1962, that my maiden speech to the House stated that I felt we could make some improvement along these lines. I suggested that it reminded me too much of Toronto city council, that there was a lack of dignity and there was a lack of decorum. And I think that, with the co-operation of every hon. member of this House, we can look forward to expediting the work of the House. Certainly I am going to depend upon you for your support and full co-operation.

I will do my best to make sure that the work of this House is carried on in the way that you would like to have it done. And in so doing, rest assured that I shall not try to rule with an iron fist but I will try to rule firmly and fairly. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves that the committee of the whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: The committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

Orders of the day.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) which has been submitted.

In view of the need for doctors, has the hon. Minister inquired of the college of physicians and surgeons whether there are doctors established in Ontario who took undergraduate courses from universities which

the college of physicians and surgeons now exclude? If so, has the hon. Minister asked for an explanation from the college for excluding internationally recognized doctors from practising in Ontario?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I ask that I take this as notice, in view of the fact that I have talked to the college on several occasions verbally but to answer the question on that basis here would be trusting it solely to my memory. I would have to point out that the college has a small staff, and is not accustomed to having to provide material, such as would be necessary to answer a question of this kind, at the short notice that we accept in this Legislature.

I would, therefore, ask that I may take it as notice and provide the answer as soon as I can.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). Will the Minister inform the House why Harold Prall, the Chatham florist who sued Keystone Construction Company for \$2,000 damages suffered to his greenhouse during the installation of sewers for the Ontario water resources commission, should be denied the \$1,000 damages assessed by the judge and instead have the case dismissed with costs; the reason being given that the company was doing contract work for the OWRC and therefore the claim was barred by The Public Authorities Act? Forgive me, Mr. Speaker, for a sentence as long as that but I do not know how you can do it otherwise if you want to ask the question intelligently.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was unable to get the answer for the hon. member this morning. But I will take this as notice and have an answer for him on Monday of next week.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given to him.

How many students from Jamaica and Haiti have been admitted by the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons to practise medicine in Ontario during the last two years?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take this as notice for the same reason that I gave in response to the question of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), notice of which has been given.

Can the hon. Minister advise if an investigation is underway into the death of Renzo Nicolussi of Indian Grove, who was killed when he was installing fluorescent lighting at a warehouse in Toronto?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, immediately following this accident, which occurred on December 10, an industrial safety officer from my department carried out a thorough investigation of the circumstances surrounding Mr. Renzo Nicolussi's death. Our inspector later testified before a coroner's inquest held on January 26. The coroner's jury found that Mr. Nicolussi was responsible for his own death, since: 1. He had not locked the casters on the scaffold. 2. He had failed to wear a safety helmet. 3. He was carrying a heavy coat over one arm while descending the scaffold.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question? Would he comment on the statement made to the press by John Russell, president of the electrical firm, who said the company had no formal safety programme but left safety supervision up to contractors where his men were employed?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have not seen that statement, but I would comment in this fashion about it. I would be very much surprised and concerned if an employer of labour did not have any safety programme; and I will undertake to look into that matter personally.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

What action, if any, has been taken or is contemplated arising out of the inquiries made by the Cabinet committee which the hon. Minister advised the House on June 4 last had been appointed to look into the question of pensions paid to certain superannuated women teachers and teachers' widows?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, this matter was further considered, as I said to the House on that occasion, during the considerations of the government and discussions with the pension committee. The discussions then arose with the Ontario teachers' federation, with respect to the integration of the teachers' superannuation fund with the Canada pension plan. At

the time these discussions were concluded, the teachers' federation suggested to the government they wished to make some proposals about reassessment for the fund. We understand these proposals are now being prepared by the teachers' federation and the proposals include the superannuated teachers, as we call them here, and also the widows of the retired teachers—the two groups the Legislature has been concerned about. Their proposals will be coming to the government and they will be given consideration at that time.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Why do the needs of this small group of people—who I think we all agree have quite extraordinary needs—why should they have to wait while a whole lot of complicated matters affecting the plan generally are dealt with?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are not a whole lot of matters affecting the plan generally; but any consideration given to this part of the teachers' superannuation fund is of concern, of course, to the entire membership of the fund. The reassessment that the federation is asking for, as I said to the hon. member, includes, as we understand it from the federation, proposals that include the problem raised by the superannuated women teachers.

Mr. Bryden: Has the hon. Minister any idea when this reassessment might be completed and he, therefore, might be in a position to make a definite announcement of policy?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, when the reassessment will be completed. The federation has informed us it wishes to make these proposals just as soon as it has its own calculation and so on completed.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education, notice of which has been submitted to him. It is a three-part question.

1. Have plans been completed for the new western Ontario institute of technology?
2. If so, when will tenders be called?
3. What is the target date for the opening of classes at this institute?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Actually, Mr. Speaker, I am answering this for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). The plans have not been completed. There are two firms who have been contacted with respect

to the planning—Masson, Langlois and Associates, and William J. Hilliker. Since the original concept of the western Ontario institute of technology for new construction was proposed, some 60 acres were acquired, as I am sure the hon. member knows, in Sandwich West. Since that time, approval has been given for planning what has been called our vocational centre. The development will now include a complex comparable to the Hamilton situation. It is impossible at this stage to give any specific target date because of the increase in this complex.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister: Will the educational complex as contemplated now include a community college?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer this question at this time.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the first and second resolutions under other motions, and the first of these resolutions is moved by the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and the second by the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop). They involve the same thing to some extent; there are some differences, but by agreement of the movers of each of these resolutions, the mover of one will second the other and the mover of the other will second that one. This will permit us to consider these two resolutions at the same time. Those hon. members of the House, who wish to debate them, can direct their remarks to either one or both of the two resolutions, if we follow this procedure. As I say, this is agreeable to Mr. Speaker, it is agreeable to both the movers, and is agreeable to us, but can only be done with the permission of the whole House. If that permission is forthcoming, I would move resolution No. 1 and then subsequently I will move resolution No. 2 and the debate can take place.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS NOS. 1 AND 2

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 1, by Mr. Singer.

RESOLUTION: That this House advise the Minister of Justice at Ottawa of its grave concern relating to the distribution of hate literature and racist propaganda in the province of Ontario, and that the government of Canada be urged that amendments be made to the Criminal Code of Canada which will make it an offence for anyone

to advocate or promote genocide, or for anyone to communicate statements in any public place which incite hatred or contempt against any identifiable group, where such incitement is likely to lead to a breach of the peace, unless such statements communicated were true or relevant to any subject of public interest and on reasonable grounds were believed to be true.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I move, seconded by Mr. Dunlop, resolution No. 1 standing in my name which has just been read.

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 2, by Mr. Dunlop.

RESOLUTION: That, as, in the opinion of this House, the dissemination of statements or matter disparaging to individuals or groups by reason of race, national origin, colour or religion, is a matter of grave concern, and as it has been long held to be contrary to public policy to promote feelings of ill-will and hostility between different classes of Her Majesty's subjects, the Ministry should make further and appropriate representations to the government of Canada advocating the enactment of amendments to the Criminal Code and other legislation designed to eliminate those acts offensive to the dignity of Canadian society without the erosion of any of the liberties of the subject so long recognized as fundamental to our concept of democracy; and that the following amendments to the Criminal Code be included among the specific legislative proposals to be made as part of these representations:

(1) Everyone who publishes or circulates or causes to be published or circulated, orally or in writing, any matter intended or calculated to incite violence or provoke disorder against any class of persons, or against any person as a member of any class in Canada, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to punishment.

(2) Everyone who publishes, orally or in writing, a statement, tale, news or matter that he knows or ought to know is likely to cause injury or mischief to the public interest, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to punishment, save that no person shall be convicted of an offence under this section by reason only of having published statements relating to controversial, social, economic, political or religious beliefs or opinions, unless he advocates or incites disorder or the use of violence, or intends primarily to promote hatred or

hostility against a racial, national, religious or ethnic group or the members thereof.

(3) (i) Everyone who, with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such, kills a member of the group, is guilty of an indictable offence and is subject to such penalty as the Criminal Code provides for murder; and

(ii) Everyone who, with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group as such, causes bodily or mental harm to a member or members of the group, or deliberately inflicts on the group or any of its members conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction, in whole or in part, is guilty of an indictable offence and is liable to punishment.

Mr. Dunlop moves resolution No. 2, seconded by Mr. Singer, in the form read by the Clerk of the House.

Mr. Singer: The form in which these two resolutions come before this House is a most unusual one and I would think a unique one in the history of the Ontario Legislature. This is indeed about to be an historic occasion, Mr. Speaker.

Some of the suggestions that have been put forward by my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) and others about revised procedures have indeed fallen on fertile ears.

Notwithstanding the remarks made yesterday, Mr. Speaker, the rather nasty aspersions about whining and so on, I am glad to see and I am grateful to see that the hon. Prime Minister has accepted some of these ideas and has suggested the calling of both these resolutions together, and that the hon. member for Forest Hill and myself have been able to work out a method of co-operation. I am grateful as well, Mr. Speaker, to all the hon. members of the House for giving their unanimous consent in allowing these matters to proceed in this manner.

Mr. Speaker, the subject matter, the principle in both these resolutions is a matter of most outstanding and significant importance to the people of Ontario and to the people of all of Canada. Let me say at the commencement of my remarks that in principle I am certain that the hon. member for Forest Hill and myself are in complete agreement.

I have some substantial reservations perhaps about the method in which he suggests that his objective be achieved and perhaps he has the same sort of reservations about the method I suggest.

Be that as it may, and I will come back to the form of the resolution of the hon. member for Forest Hill in due course, I think it is significant, sir, that a member of the government party and a member of the Opposition have put on the order paper early in the session two resolutions which urge that recommendations—and I would hope before this morning is over that they be the unanimous recommendations of this House—that recommendations be forwarded to the government of Canada suggesting that certain changes be made to our Canadian laws, more particularly our Canadian criminal laws, which would deal with some very serious problems that face the Canadian community.

There has been concern for many years, Mr. Speaker, about whether or not legislatures should interfere with so-called freedom of speech. There has been the question asked, perhaps a rhetorical question, as to whether or not we can legislate tolerance. Does it mean anything to put on the statute books an expression of morality in this particular context? Is this going to change human nature? Perhaps the answer to that question, Mr. Speaker, is that all our laws in some form or another are an expression of the morality of the community.

I think, really, the complete answer to this question and this oft-raised criticism is that what better expression can there be of the morality of the community than the expression of that view by the legislators, whether in the provincial House or whether in the federal House, who were duly selected by the voters to gather either at Queen's Park or in Ottawa and from time to time to express their views.

Those views are expressed in the form of statutes or resolutions. These are the views, the current views, the prevailing views, of the morality of the community. So I suggest, sir, it is important that matters such as this come before this Legislature and be discussed and be resolved in a manner that is as satisfactory as can be to a majority or perhaps all the members.

I am not suggesting for a moment that if this resolution passes this morning, or that if the government in Ottawa takes the action that this Legislature might recommend, that the day after there will be no more hate or intolerance or lack of understanding amongst all of the citizens of Canada. But I am suggesting, sir, that if this action is taken there will be an important expression of opinion which will form part of the record of this House, which will be a very strong guide to those legislators in Ottawa as to what this

Legislature thinks, as to what we members think. This will have, has to have, a very salutary effect on the thinking of the people of Ontario and the thinking of the people of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, it is not new to this House that this sort of problem has aroused the type of criticism we have heard from time to time: You cannot legislate tolerance. This Legislature perhaps broke new ground when it began to embark on the various phases of what is now called The Ontario Human Rights Code. The same sort of suggestions were made. We could not legislate tolerance by legislating freedom of accommodation, we could not legislate tolerance by legislating freedom of job employment, and that sort of thing. But the fact is that we do have several meaningful statutes on the books of the province of Ontario which have had, in my opinion—and I think the opinion of most people who have studied these things—a very important effect, a very good effect, on the thinking of the people of Ontario.

We are far from reaching the millenium, certainly, but the fact that these statutes do exist and are part of our laws and became part of our laws by a unanimous expression of the members of this House, has been an indication of the thinking of this Legislature at its best. It would be my earnest hope, sir, that before this morning is through there will be unanimous approval of both of these resolutions.

There is another concern, another very real concern, when an approach is made to legislation of this type. There is a view, a very sincere view, of those people who believe that the right of freedom of speech must not be in danger, must not be infringed upon. They think that as soon as we get into this field there is a real danger that we are going to place on the statute books restrictions that will make it impossible to allow freedom of discussion. We worry, and rightly we worry, about the McCarthy era in the United States. We worry about the effects that the former section—I think it was 98 of the Criminal Code of Canada—had on this country in the mid-30's when people, by attaching a label to them, could be carted off to jail and imprisoned apparently because of what was in their mind. We must concern ourselves very carefully with the dangers of generally saying this kind of legislation is needed, then carelessly drafting the form of legislation that is going to go into the statute books.

Perhaps we in Ontario, or we in this Legislature today, should not spend too much

time dealing with the intricacies of the wording, because the wording is not our responsibility. If these resolutions pass, if the federal government sees fit to accept the suggestion of the Ontario Legislature and the suggestion of many others, responsibility of the wording will be the responsibility of that Parliament. But there is a very sincere concern in the minds of a great number of people that even by putting very careful statutes into the law, there will be a real infringement on the right to criticize and the right to debate and the right to be concerned about the other person's point of view. So it is a very narrow line that we must walk in taking action of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, most European countries have on their statute books—most western European countries—some sort of legislation of this type. Some of it I think is good, some of it I question insofar as its effect in wording goes. But as a result of the sort of tragedies that we saw in pre-war Germany and during the war, and because of some of the actions we have seen from some of the people who live in this country, I think we must be very gravely concerned about drawing a line between absolute freedom of speech and license.

There is a difference between freedom and license. In England recently the government decided that they were going to limit the speed of vehicles on the road to 70 miles an hour and a great public outcry arose saying that their freedom, their right to drive on the roads at unlimited rates of speed, was being endangered. Well, it is all a question of degree and the public good was important, apparently, that there be a speed limit on the roads in England and they brought it in at 70 miles an hour, with the idea of saving lives.

If unrestricted and unfettered freedom is allowed to exist, this would be the ideal; but where this unrestricted and unfettered freedom can endanger people in our community, groups in our community, then the legislators have a responsibility to concern themselves with these dangers and to try to work out legislation which will not infringe on the freedom of speech, but still will be a protection to those people who might be in danger. This type of action has been discussed for some time in recent years by a variety of people.

There have been a number of bills introduced into the House of Commons. There was a bill introduced by my associate, Mr. Walker, the federal member for York Centre, along with Mr. Klein, a member from Mont-

real. There is a bill by Mr. Orlikow from Winnipeg. There are several bills. A bill by Mr. Gelber, the former federal member for York South, and several other bills before the House of Commons in Ottawa, expressing the sort of principle the hon. member for Forest Hill and I are expressing in a variety of ways.

There has been a committee of the House of Commons set up to consider this problem and to recommend what action, if any, the federal House of Commons should take. There has been a Royal Commission of the House of Commons, headed by Dean Maxwell Cohen, the Dean of Law at McGill University and I am advised that that committee will be reporting to the House of Commons fairly soon. I understand that their report is completed and they will be reporting to the House of Commons reasonably shortly and making their recommendations in regard to this problem.

So certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this is a matter that is of urgent public importance and of real public concern. Really, Mr. Speaker, I think that the only question that we can usefully pursue this morning is whether or not it is possible, within the best intelligence that we have available, to put into the statute books some form of legislation which will give reasonable protection against these very serious dangers.

I do not think we want the sort of legislation that will persecute people by the label that they wear. The outlawing of the Communists, for instance, really achieved nothing, because the Communists changed their label to Labour Progressive; and if they outlawed Labour Progressives, then they change the label to something else. And I do not think it would achieve anything to outlaw the fascists as such, or the Nazis as such, because the labels by themselves do not mean anything. Then there is the other danger of trying subjectively to get into the mind or into the thinking of people, and this is where the hon. member for Forest Hill and I part company. It is in method rather than in principle.

He talks about matters intended or calculated to incite violence and it is my thought, Mr. Speaker, that if we outlaw matters intended or calculated to incite violence, then we would be putting far too grave a burden on our courts to inquire into what is in the mind of the people who will be charged. Judges and magistrates, being human and being moved by the spirit of the times, could very well work serious injustice on people who come before them, by reason of what

those judges or magistrates might conclude is in the minds of the people who are charged.

Again, as I say, Mr. Speaker, my quarrel is with the method and not with the principle. The hon. member for Forest Hill suggests that everyone who publishes a statement which he knows or ought to know is likely to cause injury or mischief to the public interest—and I am worried. As a lawyer I concern myself with phrases like this that do not immediately bring a meaning to me. I wonder how a judge or a magistrate is going to interpret what might be—what is likely to cause “injury or mischief to the public interest.”

Then, in his second paragraph in his resolution, he talks about, “intends primarily to promote hatred or hostility.” The thing that I am trying to establish, Mr. Speaker, is, if the wording is so vague, that there is a real danger of placing such serious restrictions on freedom of speech that, by concurring in legislation of this type, we will do more harm than good.

One cannot help think of some of the errors that have been committed in this country: The treatment of the Japanese during the war; the imprisonment of people without trial, again during the war. These are things that perhaps were made necessary by the emergency situation which the nation faced, but I would be very loath to see, on our statute books, statutes that were vaguely worded, which would allow the emotions of the judiciary, the emotions of the community, to carry away that right that we so jealously guard—the right of criticism, the right of debate, the right of a person of a minority group or minority party to stand up and say, “I disagree with the majority”, the right of my colleagues and myself to stand up and say that we think that this government is all wrong, that they are a bunch of rogues and they should go out. This should be our right.

The hon. Prime Minister says we exercise that right, and I hope the laws of Ontario and the laws of Canada will always give us the right to exercise that right. This is why I worry about the vague wording that might creep into statutes of this type.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I share with the hon. member for Forest Hill his abhorrence of the crime of genocide. The expressions of the United Nations in their charter, and the conventions in this regard, the various discussions—I think everyone in this country shares that similar abhorrence. Well, I just question in passing whether killing that is a part of a genocide plan really is not covered in the

statutes already. Murder is covered in the statutes of Canada, and it should be.

Then finally, sir, when the hon. member for Forest Hill suggests that everyone who causes mental harm to the members of a group, I just ask him, and not in a critical spirit, what he means by “causing mental harm” and how he makes it a crime to “cause mental harm”? If I am going to say nasty things about him—and I am not going to this morning, but in the next debate we have perhaps I might cause him some mental harm by suggesting that some of his ideas are completely wrong—would the wording in this section that he is suggesting be broad enough to have me brought before the courts?

Mr. Speaker, I have gone through the resolution of the hon. member for Forest Hill at some length to point out what in my mind are some of the dangers. But I do suggest that there is available to us, to the government of Canada, a method whereby there can be an expression of public opinion, an expression of the elected representatives, that we abhor the type of actions about which we are talking and that we do put on the statute books something that is not there today. There have been studies by many learned lawyers of the present provisions of the Criminal Code.

There is certainly no doubt that where there is a breach of the peace the people who cause a breach of the peace can be dealt with under present criminal laws. But we are asking for something more than that. It is the opinion of many learned counsel who have examined provisions of the code—and I think the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) shares this view, the matter was brought up in this House a year ago—that the provisions as they presently exist would not be sufficient to prosecute people for certain actions which they have taken.

The young and foolish, and perhaps mentally ill, group of boys who paraded in a park. This is the sort of thing that causes the community great concern, these boys who wore arm bands and called themselves the Nazi party of Canada. This is the sort of thing that we have to worry about, the dissemination of this hate literature.

I think the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) spoke about this in the last session and brought several samples. There is no point in bringing all this material again before the House. These are things which must concern us, Mr. Speaker, and these are things on which I would hope, and I would really expect, this Legislature will act and express its opinion.

In my opinion, if we pass a resolution, if we pass both these resolutions this morning, we will have substantially expressed the opinion of the people of Ontario that we want action to be taken, we want legislative action to be taken, and I think we will have achieved a great deal for our country.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, there will be few hon. members of this Legislature, indeed very few responsible persons in this province, who have not been subjected to letters, handbills and pamphlets which disparage individuals and classes of individuals solely by reason of their race, colour, national origin or religion. This disparagement is frequently accompanied by words and matter which incite persons to violence and even urges destruction of individuals of particular classes, or of the class itself.

The Legislature has demonstrated its abhorrence of depriving any class of rights and privileges enjoyed by others starting, as the hon. member for Downsview has pointed out, as far back as 1943 when it enacted The Fair Accommodation Practices Act which now extends to discrimination in employment and the full range of The Ontario Human Rights Code.

To a large extent, this Legislature has gone as far as it can in its own field of jurisdiction in accomplishing the objects which I am sure are cherished by every hon. member of this Legislature. The remedies against what we may call hate literature and hate mongering appear clearly to lie in amendments to the Criminal Code and other federal legislation exclusively falling under the jurisdiction of the government and Parliament of Canada. It would, I think, be futile and certainly a waste of our time if we were regularly to debate motions dealing with matters coming under the jurisdiction of Canada. Yet there are important matters upon which the views of this Legislature should be heard from time to time. I notice on the order paper there are questions from other hon. members, there are motions from other hon. members, dealing with subjects such as divorce and constitutional amendments which are clearly under federal jurisdiction.

Mr. Speaker, I think we could readily justify debating these resolutions today even though the remedies come within the jurisdiction of Canada, for at least two reasons. First, it should strengthen, we would hope, the resolve of the government of Canada to proceed with action; it should add to the voice of its own parliamentary committees and the voice we expect to hear from the Cohen committee. In any event, by approv-

ing these resolutions this Legislature will have stamped hate literature and hate-mongering as unacceptable to the legislators of this province, and in their view as unacceptable to the people of Ontario.

At one time, Mr. Speaker, the population of this province was very homogeneous in its nature, differing only in certain aspects of the Christian religion. Today, particularly following the tremendous influx of persons from Europe and other countries, the population of Ontario is heterogeneous and there are many identifiable groups who are seeking to maintain their identity within a Canadian framework; which I think we applaud and approve. They have differences with other groups, and any group that has differences which are identifiable may be subject to vilification by persons of a sick mind who do not fully appreciate the contribution of those other groups to the society in which we live in the province and the community in which we live.

The primary target of hate-mongering of recent years has been the Jews and the Negroes, but it could happen to any group or class in this province or in this country. Because the primary target has been the Jews, the Canadian Jewish congress has unhappily become expert in this matter and developed a very considerable body of expert knowledge. I drew freely upon material prepared by and for the Canadian Jewish congress in drafting the motion which stands in my name.

I should make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that reasonable men have different points of view, different opinions, about the proper means of solving this problem. We face quite clearly a danger that a solution which would eliminate or substantially reduce hate literature might at the same time impair some long-cherished freedom of our society. Most clearly in hazard is the freedom of speech and expression. Of course, in passing, I might observe that none of these freedoms is entirely unimpaired.

The freedom of speech and expression, for example, is not unlimited. It is limited, among other things, by Acts of this Legislature—The Libel and Slander Act; and indeed The Labour Relations Act—limited in the interests of society. It is said that absolute freedom is chaos and that the absence of freedom is tyranny. I think it is clearly the duty of lawmakers and of judges to find the point between these extremes which produces a situation which conforms with our view of a free and democratic society within which individuals have their liberties and within

which the welfare of society as a whole and classes among society are also cherished.

Mr. Speaker, some reasonable men hold that the fabric of our society is so strong that no action whatsoever need be taken at this time—that the assaults of the sick-minded hate-monger cannot hurt our society as it stands. Some other reasonable men may not share that view, but believe that the laws of Canada as they stand today—notably the criminal law—provides sufficient remedies, if one would but seek a test case. It is interesting to recall that the law officers of the Crown, in the right of Canada and in the right of Ontario, both declined to recommend test case prosecutions within the last two years, apparently on the grounds that they believed that, as the law now stood, convictions could not be obtained.

Many believe, and I think many reasonable men believe, that some new legal remedies are required. I would like to take a few moments, Mr. Speaker, to explain the specific proposals that I placed in my motion; but, before doing so, I would like to emphasize that the primary purpose of my motion was to urge the Ministry to make further and appropriate representations to the government of Canada, advocating that the government of Canada enact amendments to the Criminal Code and other legislation which would eliminate these offences to Canadian society and to Canadians, without at the same time limiting the liberties of the subject—eroding the liberties of the subject—so dear to our concept of a democratic society. This I believe can be achieved; and I sincerely trust, all hon. members of this Legislature believe it can be achieved. I know that many reasonable men, learned in the law, believe that this can be achieved.

The specific examples I have included were designed to be illustrative of the kind of action which is worthy of consideration and I am very happy to leave the drafting to those learned in the law and in a better position to do so. I would suggest to my hon. friend from Downsview, with whom we are in close and mutual sympathy, except apparently on matters of draftmanship, that the draftmanship here is not perhaps quite as loose as he would like to suggest, or has already suggested to this House. I do not claim any credit for having drafted the majority of these specific proposals myself, because they have been drafted by people for whose legal draftmanship I have the highest regard, perhaps higher even than my regard for the legal drafting skills of the hon. member for Downsview.

Let me comment, however, on the three points. The first of these points refers to the incitement to violence and breaches of the peace. I am assured quite clearly that this kind of thing is a crime today in the present state of our law, but it must be demonstrated that some individual is in clear and present danger. This proposed amendment to the law only extends the idea to classes of persons, so that the same kind of language or activity which would be a crime expressed towards an individual or persons, in clear and present danger, would be also a crime if expressed towards a class. I think we are all against breaches of peace and violence no matter how they occur or how they are incited.

The second point has to do with spreading of false news. The false news section, section 166 of the Criminal Code, is well known. The inclusion of the phrase “not only knows but who ought to know” brings in the well-known concept of the reasonable man. It is a thing a reasonable man would not do. This is not vague in wording or vague to the law or to jurisprudence. It provides in its saving clauses that opinion, fair comment on matters of religion and race and any other matters of this kind are not to be regarded as offences against the law unless they are done primarily for the purpose of inciting hatred among classes.

The third point has to do with genocide. Canada has ratified the United Nations convention against the crime of genocide but has done nothing to give domestic effect to that ratification. The sub-clause 1 of my third point, having to do with genocide, clearly refers to what would be today murder; and murder is already a crime in Canada. Why then is it placed here? I will give that answer in a moment. The two points of clause 3 together comprise the main elements of the crime of genocide as recognized in international law.

Mr. Speaker, our law has a variety of other offences to be found throughout the Criminal Code, including conspiracy. Thus I am told it would be highly desirable if the entire crime of genocide could be spelled out in one section of the Criminal Code so that other sections having to do with conspiracy and counselling, violence and disorder, and so forth could be related to that section. May I say that in my view much of the hate literature we have already seen counsels genocide without counselling necessarily the existing crime of murder. If the Crown is going to be able to proceed against people who counsel genocide, the crime of genocide has to be found on the statute books.

I did not particularly wish to get into a legal discussion of these matters with my hon. friend from Downsview. I only point them out to say that even those well versed in the law would have various differing opinions. I have consulted those who are well versed in the law and we believe between us, I am sure, that these are matters which can be dealt with effectively by the Parliament of Canada, by the government of Canada, and their advisers.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my hon. friend from Downsview that this may well be an historic day in this Legislature. I hope that these motions will receive unanimous approval of its members.

Mr. Speaker, I should like very much to thank all hon. members for their courtesy in assenting unanimously to the procedure which enabled this debate to proceed in this somewhat unusual manner.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, let me say at the outset that we support the principle of the two resolutions which are being debated in this assembly this morning. We have certain reservations about the scope of the language of the resolution placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Forest Hill who has just spoken.

I think we are in agreement, though, that this is not the time or the place to discuss the technical questions of drafting, as the hon. member for Forest Hill has stated, but rather to deal with matters which are within the competence of this Legislature to deal with on this subject of genocide and hate literature and the incitement to violence, by one group in the community, of others in the community.

It was in March, 1964 that my colleague, the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) first raised in this assembly the question of hate literature. Subsequently, on March 11 of that year, the hon. member for Scarborough West, who is unable to be present today, documented at some length the extent to which hate literature had become a problem within our society. I need not at this point review the documentation which he presented at that time. It is on the record, and is available for anyone who cares to read that magnificent address to this assembly.

I take issue, however, with the hon. member for Forest Hill who says that the area of concern is one related solely to the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada and has no bearing on matters which can be dealt with by this assembly. I would submit and suggest, for consideration by this

House, two items which if enacted by this Legislature would complement each other and would go some way—I think some considerable way—toward solving this very difficult and sensitive question, related as it is to civil liberties, the right of freedom of speech, the correlated right of freedom of the press and the right of freedom of association.

One possibility for this House to consider is the enactment of a statute which would provide for the civil wrong of group libel or slander. This would give to any member of a group which was libelled or slandered, the right to bring a civil action for damages in the courts of Ontario. I do not think that this would be a difficult civil right to draft for legal purposes from the viewpoint of clarity, or from the viewpoint of interpretation in the courts, in a way which, I believe, would give individuals a fundamental substantive right in this province to damages for any such libel or slander of a group to which such a person belongs.

The correlative question then relates, of course, to the need to identify the person who slandered or libelled the group. I realize it is, in some instances, a difficult question to ascertain who in fact was the person who slandered or libelled a particular group.

However, in the area of publications it should not be difficult to do so and I think we can get substantial benefit from a brief consideration of an Act of the Congress of the United States of America which was passed on October 23, 1962 and which now appears in the United States Code, Section 4369 of Title 39.

That particular law of the Congress of the United States of America requires a statement of ownership, management and circulation to be published by the editor or the publisher, or a responsible person connected with the publication, showing the title of the publication, the frequency of its issue, the address of the publication's office, the names and addresses of the publishers and editors, the names and addresses of the owners. And here is a significant attempt to ascertain who in fact is the true owner of such a publication where the owner appears as a limited company or as a trustee or in any other fiduciary capacity the names of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting. This statement has to be supported by affidavits of the editor and publisher as to the circumstances and conditions under which persons who do not appear as trustees hold their interest other than as a bona-fide owner, the number of copies of each issue

published, the number of copies of each issue distributed as paid circulation by mail, by carrier delivery, or other means, and by sales through news dealers; and, finally, the total number of issues in fact distributed.

If it were a requirement that such a statement be made on the initial publication of any document in the province of Ontario which would fall under the definition of a publication in such an Act; and if thereafter, either six-monthly or annually, a statement such as the one of which I have attempted to indicate the particulars, was required to be filed in a public office in the province of Ontario, one could readily ascertain the extent and degree to which literature of the kind which is of concern to this House today, is in fact distributed throughout the province of Ontario. It would also obviously facilitate any person who was attempting to find the true persons who in fact slandered or libelled any group within the community so that, in conjunction with the proposed remedy of civil action for group libel or slander, he would be able to bring that person to account in the courts.

I would ask that serious consideration be given by the government to the introduction of two such measures as a basic and fundamental way in which this province under its constitution could in fact go a long way toward solving the question of hate literature.

In conclusion I would say that I had noted in the resolution of the hon. member for Forest Hill that he refers to further and appropriate representations to the government of Canada by this government. I would hope during the course of this debate that the government would give us an up-to-date statement of the representations which have till now been made on this subject. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Could I ask a question of the last speaker before he concludes his remarks? Has he given any thought as to how damages could be assessed in the type of action he is talking about?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, the only thought that I have been able to give to that question is that there is always an area for the court to award what are in substance punitive damages in the cases, as I understand it in a very technical branch of the law, where the libel or the slander is prompted by malice towards the group. Therefore it would permit any member of that group to bring such an action in the civil courts.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in entering into the discussion of this motion. May I say, following the hon. member for Riverdale, that I feel he has proposed some very constructive suggestions. I feel sure that the hon. Attorney General will give them consideration.

I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the remarks by the hon. member for Forest Hill, following the remarks by my colleague, the hon. member for Downsview. I would just like to add my own sentiments to this. The hon. member for Forest Hill had pointed out that there is a changed population in Ontario and, indeed, Canada. We are really rather unique in the fact of the variety of people, variety of background, that we have in this province and in this country.

I know it gives a great deal of satisfaction to all hon. members of the House to know that we are an example to the whole world. People of different backgrounds, of different faiths, of different creeds, live together, respecting each other, working together harmoniously. As I say, this is an example to a world where there is tension because of racial background, because of historical background, because of religion.

But I do not think that we can be smug or complacent in this. The very fact that we have this strength, from the very background of our people indicates to us that we have to be constantly vigilant; because if there is discrimination towards one group, then, sir, there is discrimination, or the danger of discrimination, towards every group. We are all aware in this Legislature that in Ontario, and indeed in other parts of Canada, there have been these psychotic groups, very small groups and very ill people, who have stood for hate across our nation and in our province. All men of good will are offended at the license which these small groups are taking. There have been instances in Ontario of hate literature and in Vancouver, in Victoria, and in Winnipeg.

Now, sir, the crux of the question, of course, is this: What is freedom and what is license? Freedom of speech is the main cornerstone of our life and there are those who say if you put limits on our way of life you will erode the whole essence of our way of life. I notice that as far back as the 17th century great spokesmen on freedom, such as John Milton and John Locke—let me take something from Milton. He said:

Let truth and falsehood grapple. Whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter?

I want to take that point of view, sir, and just speak for a moment on it.

There are those who suggest that truth will always prevail and that has been pointed out by the other hon. members who spoke. We find today that we have seen situations where truth has not always prevailed in a society, where it has been twisted, it has been manoeuvred in order to create hatred, and indeed violence and genocide for groups of people.

Others have talked of the triumph of fascism and its defeat. Others have talked of the national socialism in Germany and the horrors which this brought forth. Today, with TV and with radio, with the skills of psychological warfare, it is not the statistics of the number of people in our country who have this psychotic hatred; they are a small group, but they have the license to send across the nation that which is offensive and dangerous.

May I say, as I am sure most hon. members of the Legislature know, that Canada did sign its statutory signature to the genocide convention and therefore I think it is very suitable that in this province, in the Legislature, we should be discussing this question.

I want to emphasize with the other speakers that freedom cannot be supported in absolute terms. Indeed, as the hon. member for Forest Hill said, I think very succinctly, absolute freedom is chaos and the absence of freedom is tyranny. It is with this delicate balance that we are concerned.

We are concerned, no matter the intentions of men of goodwill, when they draft legislation that it could mean it would stultify legitimate freedom. I quoted John Milton, the great proponent of freedom, and yet when we examine what he considered dangerous to the good society of England we find that he was concerned that Mohammedans and atheists were disrupting it. Therefore, sir I, who am not a lawyer, not skilled like the lawyers who advised the hon. member for Forest Hill, I have a little bit of concern at the looseness, to me, of some of his draftings.

Public interests? John Milton spoke of public interests, but he denied freedom to Mohammedans, to atheists and, I might add, to Roman Catholics in England at that time. There could be an interpretation which would exclude certain people under these vague terms. As a layman, and not as a lawyer, I was wondering how you can counsel genocide without counselling murder.

But these are small points. The main thing of concern in both of these motions is that we are trying to achieve an objective. We

are recognizing that freedom is not absolute. We are recognizing the inherent necessity in our society to permit freedom, but not to permit license which would incite people to genocide and the horrors which we have seen in the not-too-distant past.

It is because of this, sir, that I take great satisfaction in endorsing these two motions.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, of course I support the resolutions and will urge every hon. member here to do likewise.

First, let me state that I am very pleased that one of the resolutions was presented by an hon. member of this House who is not of the same religious faith as I. I have been most anxious to present such a resolution for some time and I have refrained from doing so because, in my view, human rights are everybody's concern, or should be, and not merely the problem of any particular racial, religious or ethnic group. I was most anxious that it should not get around that it is only the concern of one particular group. We find ourselves in the position here, today, of supporting two resolutions and differing in some respects—many of the hon. members—from each of them.

I am concerned with the resolution of the hon. member for Downsview. While I promised myself I would not get into any legal discussions, because I am not qualified to do that, there is no doubt, as I began making notes for this discussion today, that we soon find ourselves involved in the very important matter of how we are going to do this legally. I am concerned, even as a layman, in the part of resolution No. 1 of the hon. member for Downsview stating "likely to lead to a breach of the peace unless such statements communicated were true or relevant to any subject of public interest and on reasonable grounds were believed to be true." Well, I can see a million loopholes in that. I think I could drive a team of horses through that, quite frankly.

It seems to me that all one of these people would have to do is say, "Well, I believed it to be true, because so and so told me." Now, who was that so and so? Well, he was, in his day, some distinguished, some prominent man. As a matter of fact, I am sure the hon. member for Downsview has read some of the stuff which has emanated from some people across the line who were retired commanders of the navy, retired generals of the army, and so on. I think, if I were defending myself in a case of this nature, I could make a pretty good case that I be-

lieved it to be true, because it came from such a source.

As for the hon. member for Riverdale's suggestion that we can perhaps alleviate the situation somewhat by actions of this provincial Legislature, he suggests that we take some action here. Mr. Speaker, I have found that no matter how much disagreement there was as to how this was to be accomplished, there was almost unanimous agreement among all those who were concerned with this problem that the provinces should not muddy the waters. In fact, that is the expression some of them used, that it will only make matters worse for the provinces to attempt to legislate in this field, and give the federal government further reason for further delay. It must be federal.

As to the specific suggestion that the legislation should require the publication of the source of the publication, well, of course I do not think really this would accomplish a great deal. In the first place, I do not think anyone, as far as I have been able to ascertain, has ever been successful in a matter of group libel; and the forced publication of the names of all of those concerned with the publication of such material is not going to do much good, because most of this garbage comes from the United States. Those people who publish them are not ashamed of having their names publicized; in most cases their names are right on the publication. It has not done anything by way of reducing the flow of this literature at all.

Now I have in my files, the same as the other hon. members, material containing this vile type of filth, and it is the vilest stuff that can be conceived by a perverted mind. It is directed in varying degrees against Jews, Negroes, Roman Catholics and, in some instances, free nations. I will not dignify these rantings, Mr. Speaker, by reading any of it to the hon. members. They will understand the nature of this filth when I advise them that the material ranges all the way from suggesting that Jews use blood of Christian children for their religious services; to attacks on U.S. President Johnson, charging that he has Jewish blood in his veins; to statements that Mrs. Johnson had a degenerate upbringing, because she had lunch with a Negro serviceman; and probably the most tragic joke of all—and the only reason I use the word joke at the moment is because I cannot think of another phrase to replace the word joke—the most tragic joke of all is the suggestion, in fact the flat statements, that the Jews were the ones who gained the most from the last war.

Mr. Speaker, surely people, nations, governments, who forget the lessons of history are destined to repeat those ghastly errors. Surely we have learned by now that the proposed victims of hate, never, but never, end up by being the only victims of that hate. History is replete with the records of the same tragic process, in which a single minority group has been used as the scapegoat, but before the whirlwind of hate had expended itself, thousands, millions of others, including those who had sown the wind, were destroyed.

It is only 20 years since the end of the last whirlwind, the end of the last holocaust, when the grisly bookkeeping of hatred was toted up and showed all too clearly that the winds of hate, which had been so much against one group, had reaped a whirlwind of over 50 million casualties. Our duty therefore, the duty of all decent and intelligent people, even in self defence, is to do whatever is required to eradicate race hatred as far as it is humanly possible to do. Certainly it is possible to at least eradicate the overt manifestation of it.

What about the concern about the proposed laws affecting the rights of free speech? Again, as a non-lawyer, it seems to me that the laws of obscenity offer just as much danger to free speech as the proposed laws against the dissemination of hate propaganda. It has always been the concern of some that the laws of obscenity can endanger freedom of artistic and literary expression, and even freedom of the press. Yet we have such laws. Surely it is more important to attack the propagation of hate and genocide than it is to concern oneself with an obscenity crusade? And surely it should be no harder to define the propagation of hate and genocide than it is to define obscenity?

I know some will say that we are not making a good point because it is difficult to define obscenity, and this has already caused us a great deal of difficulty. But nevertheless we try, and in many cases we are successful in doing so. Surely we can at least do the same for a matter which concerns us more than obscenity and which certainly is much more dangerous in its implication. What I am saying is that while I appreciate the need to assure that the freedom of expression, the freedom of the press, and so on, are not diluted to the point where such freedoms become non-existent, I am sure that our legal brains can provide a solution which will safeguard those freedoms and yet at the same time assure that freedom cannot be turned into license.

I need not dwell upon the philosophy which accepts that freedom of speech, for example, should be curtailed by prohibiting a person from shouting "fire" in a crowded theatre. We have heard that before.

Furthermore, the hair-splitters seem to find nothing wrong in forcing a man to share accommodation he owns with a person he may find repulsive; in fact we do this in our Fair Accommodation Practices Act. Yet these same people hesitate to enforce laws which would prohibit that same man from libelling, reviling, abusing and insulting a group of law-abiding citizens, and even urging that their fellow citizens be murdered. We have laws which make it an offence to publicly slander an individual, but we see nothing wrong in a slander which includes all the people of the slandered victim's racial or religious group.

Let me give another example of the ludicrous position in which we find ourselves. It is illegal, under our human rights code in Ontario, for a person to have a sign on his property stating that no Jews, Catholics, Protestants, Negroes or Freemasons may enter these premises, and/or be accommodated here, and yet that same person presumably, under our existing laws as the legal purist would have it, may have a sign hanging from his premises stating all Jews, Roman Catholics, Negroes and Freemasons should be murdered as they are the scum of the earth, or something equally scurrilous.

Mr. Speaker, it is illegal to publish the name of a juvenile delinquent, and opinions have been expressed from time to time that this infringes on the freedom of the press. It does in fact infringe somewhat, but I ask does this prohibition in fact create any serious danger to the fundamental freedom of the press? The answer, of course, is no. The fact remains that the freedoms we enjoy—and that has been well pointed out here today—are those which are consistent with the public good; and many laws have their genesis in the roots of that which is not in the public interest or, in other words, public policy.

May I refer this House to a famous case which made history in this province and across this country. In 1945 there was a case before Mr. Justice J. Keiller Mackay in the matter of an application brought by an owner of certain lands registered in the registry office for the county of York to have declared as invalid a restrictive covenant assumed by him when he purchased those lands and which he agreed to exact from his assigns, namely, land not to be sold to Jews or persons of objectionable nationality. Jews having

been mentioned here in addition to those of objectionable nationality, we must presume that the Jews were not to be considered of an objectionable nationality but just because they were Jews.

In that case the distinguished justice stated, and I quote:

If sale of a piece of land can be prohibited to Jews it can equally be prohibited to Protestants, Catholics or other groups or denominations. If the sale of one piece of land can be so prohibited, the sale of other pieces of land can likewise be prohibited. In my opinion nothing could be more calculated to create or deepen divisions between existing religious and ethnic groups in this province or in this country than the sanction of a method of land transfer which would permit the segregation and confinement of particular groups to particular business or residential areas, or conversely would preclude particular groups from particular business or residential areas.

And here is the point, Mr. Speaker, and I continue the quote:

Ontario, and Canada too, may well be termed a province and a country of minorities in regard to the religious and ethnic groups which live therein. It appears to me to be a moral duty at least to lend aid to all forces of cohesion and similarly to repel all vociferous tendencies which would imperil national unity. The common law courts have, by their actions over the years, obviated the need for rigid constitutional guarantees on our policy by their wise use of the doctrine of public policy as an active agent in the promotion of the public weal.

While courts and eminent judges have, in view of the powers of our legislatures, warned against inventing new heads of public policy I do not conceive that I would be breaking new ground were I to hold the restrictive covenant impugned in this proceeding to be void as against public policy. Rather I would be applying well recognized principles of public policy to a set of acts requiring their invocation in the interest of the public good.

And further on he states:

If the common law of treason encompasses the stirring up of hatred between different classes of His Majesty's subjects, the common law of public policy is surely adequate to void the restrictive covenant which is here attacked.

The jurist states:

My conclusion therefore is that the covenant is void because offensive to the

public policy of this jurisdiction. This conclusion is reinforced, if reinforcement is necessary, by the wide official acceptance of international policies and declarations frowning on the type of discrimination which the covenant would seem to perpetuate.

And that is the end of the quote.

It seems to me, sir, that the philosophy upon which the decision of the learned justice was based was on the point of public policy. I repeat the last portion from that decision:

It merely makes it more appropriate to apply existing principles if the common law of treason encompasses the stirring up of hatred between different classes of His Majesty's subjects, the common law of public policy is surely adequate to void the restrictive covenant which is here attacked.

I suggest to you, sir, that if we substituted for the words "restrictive covenant" in this ruling, the words "right to publicly vilify and/or insult any religious, racial or ethnic group" that the same logic and reasoning would apply.

Let me paraphrase the judgment with the new way it would read. The common law of public policy is surely adequate to void the right to publicly vilify and/or insult any religious, racial or ethnic group which is here attacked. The learned Mr. Justice Mackay, in my view, made history by applying the rule of public policy which has held to this day, and I might point out that it was even more novel for him to do so in those years as it would be for the Parliament of Canada today to enact like legislation prohibiting the publication and/or propagation of hate literature. In other words, I suggest that the foundation of the new law needs only to be based on public policy and the Ontario Human Rights Code and/or the federal Declaration of Human Rights.

I concerned myself, Mr. Speaker, with this matter some time ago and it was discussed within our own government. I am proud to say that the hon. Prime Minister and our hon. Attorney General were most anxious to act in this matter but it was agreed by all concerned, as I mentioned earlier, that it would be inappropriate and unwise for the provincial government to function in an area which was unquestionably, in the view of all of those who participated in the discussions we held, *ultra vires* of the province and that our best efforts should be directed to induce the federal government to take the necessary action.

At that time the hon. Attorney General

urged the Minister of Justice to make changes in the law in this regard and publicly stated that when such laws were enacted they would be enforced in this province to the letter. The hon. Prime Minister moreover asked that this problem be put on the agenda of the then upcoming federal-provincial conference.

Now some may recall, Mr. Speaker, in a public speech I made some time ago, I had stated, "Anyone who spews forth Nazi poison, anyone who calls himself a Nazi today here, anyone who demands a return to Nazi genocide, any of these is probably insane and society owes it to itself and indeed to them"—meaning the Nazis—"that they be isolated from society until cured." At that time I was taken to task by some people for that suggestion.

One editorial writer castigated me as he put it, "He"—meaning me—"wants alleged Nazis put in institutions without the benefit of a trial."

Now the point I was making—and it was quite clear—was that the expounding of genocide in this day and age could be *prima facie* evidence of a mentally disturbed person and such person should be given a mental examination. I did not suggest he be thrown into a mental institution without any hearing. Was this such an outrageous proposition?

First, I would point out that, just about the same time, there was on the order paper in the House of Commons a bill, C117, to amend the Criminal Code, which was placed there by W. B. Nesbitt, the Conservative M.P. for Woodstock. I will not trouble the House by reading the bill but the explanatory note on the bill itself states:

This bill proposes to enlarge the Criminal Code definition of a defamatory libel to include hate literature because such literature is in many cases the expression of a sick mind. The bill further proposes that any person charged or convicted of publishing such a libel shall be placed under mental observation to determine whether he is mentally ill.

I was very pleased to hear the hon. leader of the Opposition referring to these people as psychotics, and sick or ill I think was the expression he used.

Further, Mr. Speaker, it might interest the hon. members to hear the views of an eminent Canadian psychologist on this point. He states:

The Canadian Nazi party advocates the abolishment of the democratic process once they have achieved power. The members

of the party propose to substitute a morality which does not have its roots in Judeo-Christian ethics, in humanistic concerns for the rights or welfare of the individual or indeed any acceptable system of values within our society.

Morality is to them the will of the person possessing power. Might is right. There is no standard of morality beyond the will of the all-powerful group who has achieved control of the social order.

Children brought up in such a social order come to accept this definition of morality. This phenomenon is seen and has been seen in totalitarian societies of the past which adhere to the power definition of morality. The individual who is a product of our Canadian democratic society yet gravitates to a movement which advocates the termination of the democratic process upon receiving power, followed by the mass extermination of a group of our citizens, is frequently the paranoid who seeks a target for his psychotic feelings of persecution or the inadequate person who hopes to absorb some of the power which is promised by the group or the mentally retarded whose limited capacities of reasoning render him prone to suggestion and influence.

It may not be the case that all members of a group advocating mass murder are mentally ill within a definition of that term which requires that they manifest classical psychiatric symptoms of mental illness, yet it is in the interests of the individual who is drawn into such organizations, and indeed in the interest of our society, that we identify which of those individuals who desires to engage in genocide is a product of mental illness requiring care and treatment, those whose advocacy of murder is to be seen as a problem for our legislators to deal with.

The position taken earlier is reiterated: The person advocating mass murder of a group of our citizens, whether they be Jews or otherwise, must be considered suspect of a form of mental disorder and a psychiatric examination should be undertaken. In the recent case of Matthew Carey Smith, the so-called "Beatle bandit", evidence was presented at his trial that he suffered delusions, considered himself an agent of social justice and that his purpose in life was to amass an army to achieve the violent overthrow of the Canadian government. His robbery and the murder he committed were justified by him on those grounds.

In the Lee Harvey Oswald case, the feelings of deep-seated inadequacies and the experience of power and self-justification in the act of the assassination of the President were brought out by the psychiatrist who had examined Oswald in childhood and who had studied the case subsequently.

When you suggested that our local neo-Nazis should be given mental examinations, some newspaper editors recoiled in horror. Apparently they reacted to the potential for perversion of such a procedure. That is, that anyone who disagrees with a prevailing system of morality should be considered mentally ill. While it is not believed that the advocacy of mass murder necessarily indicates mental illness, one cannot agree that it should be ignored or treated as a boyish prank. It may very well be indicative of a dangerous form of mental illness and it is advocated that the existing provisions of our society for the determination of such issues be employed; that is, an examination by professional persons competent to judge such issues.

This is the end of his opinion.

So I still believe, Mr. Speaker, my point is valid and worthy of consideration by the federal authorities. I hope Mr. Nesbitt presses his bill again in the new Parliament.

Now we have heard all the arguments, that you cannot legislate prejudice, which has been brought out by previous speakers. It should be clearly understood that no one is suggesting that we legislate prejudice. A person has the right to hate to his heart's content, if I may put it that way, but he has no right to allow his hate to harm another person.

The right to differ does not or should not include the right to defame. The right of free speech does not or should not include the abuse of that right. We have found that where our laws, such as the Ontario human rights laws, are such that they tend to encourage people to live with and get along with each other, that those people have benefited thereby, learning to lead a much richer and much fuller life, having found through their close contact with others that the distorted stereotypes they may have built up in their minds over the years, were generally proven completely false.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had many letters from various organizations and individuals asking for some legislation to curb this propagation of hatred. They are from all types: Anglo-Saxons, Poles, Ukrainians, Jews, Italians,

Czecho-Slovakian, and so on, they run the gamut of all our different groups of our society in Ontario today.

For those who may feel we need never have concern in this country about this disease of hatred taking root, permit me to quote from an article in the *Canadian Weekly* dated June 19, 1965. It is an article entitled "When the Ku Klux Klan rode in Saskatchewan". The writer is Jeannine Locke. It is a spine-chilling account of how powerful the Klan was here in Canada in the late 20's and early 30's. I will merely take the liberty of quoting the last paragraph of that very extensive article. Miss Locke concludes:

But from those tiny files beneath Saskatchewan's legislative assembly he [the promoter of KKK philosophy] emerges again a substantial figure, a master in the techniques of spreading ignorance and fear in order to turn men against each other. If the times are ripe, the Gardiner papers reveal, our society too can be temporarily subverted by the hatreds that bigotry arouses.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we are urging upon the federal government we hope will tell them clearly and unmistakably that the 7,000,000 people of this province want some action in this regard.

As I say, I wholeheartedly endorse the resolutions. I congratulate the sponsors and recommend to all hon. members of this House that they unanimously support the resolutions, placing the people of our province behind the philosophy that we are expounding here today and, as has been said, participate in a declaration and eventual legislation which will make history in this country and also a better nation for all of us.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I am conscious that the time is slipping away and I will not take up too much time of the House.

Already practical suggestions have been made by my colleague, the hon. member for Riverdale, and the other hon. members of this assembly. But I must rise to my feet this morning and participate in this debate because I have long felt strongly about this matter and indeed raised it in the House a couple of years ago. I feel very strongly about it because in my own riding I am in constant contact with people who have lived through the Hitler horror and who carry with them the tattoos on their arms designating their status at that time. These people, when

the hate literature and similar propaganda appears, feel something of the old terror and they express to me and to others the heartfelt hope that somehow, in this new land of theirs, there will be the framework of legislation and action so that what happened to them could not happen to them again and could not happen to their children and to the people among whom they live today. They want assurance that it cannot happen here.

I would like to emphasize what the hon. member who has just spoken pointed out, that the serious nature of this kind of hate propaganda emerges in times of crisis. Perhaps we do not worry too much about it except in time of crisis, because then it becomes very significant and very powerful.

The hon. member for Forest Hill mentioned that in the early days in this province we had a very homogeneous population; but if he looks back over the history of that time he will realize that there were stresses and strains building up in this province, in the structure of society, which resulted in this very kind of smear campaign. The family compact, sensing the challenge to its power on the part of the rising leaders of democracy, began to pinpoint the American non-conformist preachers and the American people who were coming into the province who had real experience in the democratic tradition, and so the word "American" became the smear word of that day. No less a man than Egerton Ryerson was launched on his career largely out of this kind of hate-mongering which took place during those significant years.

We know what happened in Germany when out of the suffering and unemployment of that land the people were given a scapegoat. The scapegoat anti-Semitism and the persecution of the Jewish people of that nation.

In Paraguay today, a ruthless dictator gives his people an enemy to take their minds off their own troubles, which are largely caused by his own regime, and he points to Communism as the great danger there. And so, in times when crisis builds up, these are the times when the hate-mongering takes on added significance and greater power—when people are insecure. So I would point out to this House that the final answer to effectiveness in this field is security for our people—the kind of a civilization and the kind of society where no group feels insecure, and where all groups feel they are a vital part of the society in which they live.

But, after all, what has been said is true; the people who write this sort of thing, and

disseminate the hatred in this way, have diseased minds and those minds need to be examined. But I do think also that we should face the fact that we can deal with diseased minds in other areas; so that in this area, too, the diseased mind should have at least social concern and social action.

A little over a year ago, I brought to the attention of the hon. Attorney General, the present Attorney General, a pamphlet which was being spread, and still is being used, *The Red Rabbi*. At that time, I pointed out that the author of this pamphlet is the master of the big lie, and is directing his fire against Rabbi Feinberg from whose speeches over the years he lifts bits and pieces completely out of context to make them say things contrary to the whole spirit of the crusade the rabbi has waged for social justice and world peace.

And this kind of smear, you see, is hard to meet because it does give the rabbi's words; but, as I say, it lifts them out of context and it presents an entirely different picture than it ought to of the man concerned.

I sent this to the hon. Attorney General and told him:

I am enclosing a leaflet which has been receiving distribution in Toronto. It is without doubt one of the most vicious and unwarranted attacks on a man of outstanding character and reputation that I have seen. I urge that immediate steps be taken to find ways and means of circumventing poison of this type being published and circulated in Ontario.

I realize that problems exist in this area, but surely a way can be found to prevent this kind of character assassination and the wholesale smearing of groups of people through the printed word. I hope that appropriate action can be taken, and taken quickly by your department.

At that time, the hon. Attorney General said distribution of the pamphlet will be studied as part of the department's current investigation of hate literature. I hope that the hon. Attorney General may enter this debate and give us something of the results of that study, and perhaps some suggestions of what might come.

I think all of us who are interested in this matter have files of literature calling for wholesale genocide, literature which never should be published and never should be allowed.

So, this morning, I would simply say that we should be able to set bounds within which real freedom can be exercised, but bounds

beyond which no one should be allowed to go in this field. While I do not agree entirely with the complete substance of these resolutions, I do feel that this House should unanimously endorse the spirit that is here outlined and that we should take whatever appropriate action should be taken to make sure that this kind of activity can be adequately dealt with, within the province of Ontario.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege indeed to rise in this House at this time, to participate in this debate, which has been referred to by the hon. member for Downsview as being an historic one. It has been quite properly pointed out that the basis of the discussion of the two resolutions lies outside the jurisdiction of this House, and some reference has been made to the fact that it lies within the federal jurisdiction. Yet the very fact that this has been a topic, not only at the level of federal jurisdiction, but one in respect of which some 55 nations saw fit to sign the United Nations convention, brings it within the purview of the discussion of all men.

One of the things that make worthwhile the fighting to take a seat in this Legislature, is to have the opportunity of expressing oneself on matters close and dear to one's whole life. We will be discussing, during the course of this session, many things which affect the interests of our citizens. The programme which has been unveiled by the hon. Attorney General will indicate a goodly number of measures in which we set out to protect the consumer; to protect his pocket-book.

Yet in the overall life of parliaments and nations nothing is so important as the field of the rights of the citizen. We here in the province should be proud of the role we have played in the development of this for we have not only set the way for our citizens but for other jurisdictions to follow in our path.

This province has adopted the Ontario Human Rights Code, and it is one of those statutes which does have a preamble and that preamble states, and I quote again for the hon. members of the House, as follows:

It is public policy in Ontario that every person is free and equal—

I underline these words:

—in dignity and rights without regard to race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin.

And what other form of dignity or what other right is more important than that referred to in the two resolutions placed before us?

We, in our jurisdiction, have gone ahead and have fleshed this policy with statutes through the years which have set out in specifics that which we find as being contra or offensive to this public policy. It was with pride that all Canadians saw that, in 1952, the federal House saw fit also in unanimity to endorse the United Nations convention in this regard.

Now perhaps the time has come to flesh out there what has been accepted as public policy, because certainly the adoption of that convention indicated what was public policy in Canada, to flesh out that convention by more specifically setting out what is offensive to that charter. We in this province have accepted as an underlying philosophy "the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God". In weeks ahead that will be referred to in this House.

We have here too in this province a very unique situation that I have referred to on other occasions. To me the most outstanding fact of Canada as a nation, and our jurisdiction as a province, is that here more than anywhere else in the world men and women have come from all parts of the world, bringing with them differences of creed and culture.

Yet, sir, we are bringing about a society in which, in large numbers, these men and women live side by side in harmony, and one in which they are working out their own destinies as individuals within the confines of their families and communities.

We come to a situation where we are called upon to resolve great principles. Here again one of the things which I have counted a good fortune in my life, is that I, a citizen of this country, privileged to have been born in this country, have enjoyed freedoms of which none of my predecessors through countless centuries enjoyed in the homeland of the birth and growth of their kinfolk. It was here for the first time in perhaps a thousand years that a Yaremko was able to participate and be dignified with all of the freedoms that his fellow citizens have.

I have before me a pamphlet issued by the Queen's printer at Ottawa in 1959 called "Our System of Government." At the outset, in the introduction, there are listed the basic freedoms. Some nine, I believe, are referred to, known to all. But I should like to read the description of the basic freedom,

listed as number one, "freedom of speech," as follows:

Every person in Canada has the right to state his opinions freely and openly on all public matters without fear of being punished or interfered with by the police, government officials or any other person.

And then it goes on to say:

It is understood, of course, that no person may make false statements that would damage the reputation of others or make seditious remarks calculated to stir up resistance to lawful authority or create disaffection toward Her Majesty the Queen.

Perhaps the author of that, were he rewriting it today, would also state that it is understood that these things referred to in the resolutions should not be done. Perhaps we have indeed come to the time when understanding is not sufficient. We in this province have given to our citizens the utmost of freedom in all of their actions and yet we have limited them in some degree. Of course, our human rights code is outstanding in that limitation.

I notice particularly in the resolution of the hon. member for Forest Hill that he incorporated as part of his resolution the general principles laid out in the United Nations convention adopted in 1948 and he accepted the definitions of genocide as referred to therein. It is an indication of the weaknesses of mortal beings that here today in the 20th century we should have found it necessary to have nations adopt as guiding principles these matters, and that here on this date, January 28, 1966, we are engaged in a discussion of these things.

I do not think it is really necessary that we debate the details of these two resolutions. Suffice it to say that they have given us all an opportunity of subscribing to general principles. To some of us perhaps there has been experience brought about by intimate contact. In the sphere of genocide I know that the race from which I have sprung in the mid-30's was subjected to a genocide programme which eliminated some 7,000,000 of those who called themselves Ukrainian through a calculated programme of starvation. Those events are still commemorated today. In June of this year three of the smallest nations of Europe, the Baltic states Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia, will be commemorating the 25th anniversary of events of June, 1941, when, in hundreds of thousands, citizens of those lands were taken, killed or disappeared into the vastness of Siberia, never to be seen again.

And so, Mr. Speaker, all citizens, some with a much more personal interest than others, will take notice of today's discussion in the House. As I say, it is a privilege to have participated in this event, which we hope will culminate in some concrete steps being taken within this land of ours to again add to the dignity of our citizens.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, it is 1 of the clock. I presume I should adjourn the debate, but there is one thing I would like to have through you, Mr. Speaker: The assurance of the hon. Prime Minister that the debate on this resolution will continue in the near future. So often these resolutions are adjourned and then they die on the vine. We on this side do not want this one to die on the vine, we would like to see it come to a vote. I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if we could have the assurance of the hon. Prime Minister that we could continue this debate in the early part of next week?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, there are several other hon. members of the House on all sides who would like to speak to these resolutions and the order will be called again. I can give no undertaking as to precisely when, but in the business of the House I am sure there will be an opportunity before too much time passes.

Mr. Trotter: On this understanding, that it will not go too long and will not die on the vine, I will adjourn the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with the first order.

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves the adjournment of the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before you put that motion, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Prime Minister whether he would consider, in conjunction with resuming this debate, an early debate on the topic which is involved in resolution 10 standing in my name on page 5 of the order paper, namely, the whole approach to the Canadian Constitution in the wake of, dare I say at this moment, the demise of the Fulton-Favreau formula?

A couple of weeks ago the hon. Prime Minister himself was credited publicly with indicating that he thought that the formula is dead; that there was a vacuum and that we should move to fill it. My point is that I

think, now that we have got some time further to discuss it, that this would be an appropriate place, in this Legislature, to give some thought to this. Will the hon. Prime Minister give us some assurance of an early opportunity to debate this and related matters?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has immediately started the debate by putting his point of view here. I would not necessarily agree that the Fulton-Favreau formula is dead. I notice, among certain elements in our political life, that there is some disagreement. I cannot really just follow what is going on with the Fulton-Favreau formula but this is a question which I think might be debated here and I will consider the representations made, and also I am aware of all the resolutions that are on the order paper.

Mr. Thompson: Could I say that I do not agree with my hon. friend on my left? I am hoping that the hon. Prime Minister will follow the order of the resolutions rather than jump around in connection with these.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, one final comment on that. If this is what we are discussing, I have a further plea to the hon. Prime Minister; that he give some thought to a procedure that exists in other legislatures, namely, that we have a specified hour, once or twice a week, and then I would agree with the hon. leader of the Opposition that we take them in sequence. In other words, bills and resolutions put on the order paper in the name of Opposition members or government members were treated with some degree of dignity as though they would be considered by this Legislature instead of being sloughed off at the end, which has generally been the practice. I would concede to the hon. Prime Minister that he has improved it some, but I think the final improvement is to give a specified time when there will be an opportunity to discuss these.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to enter into a debate on this procedural matter at this stage. I can only say that I am happy for those very slight words of recognition of what has been done, because I think anybody who examines the operations of this House, and what has happened in the last three or four years—and I am sorry I had to get up and say this myself, but there have been some very distinct improvements. I do not think there were many items left on the order paper after the last session that were not dealt with; and also I do not think that they were dealt with in the manner certain

hon. members of the Opposition always like to assert.

I do not know for whose benefit it is that they are dealt with at 11 o'clock at night; I do not know what the difference is in dealing with the estimates of The Department of Education at 11 o'clock at night; so what difference is there in dealing with one of these resolutions?

In the last session, if you will recall, there were certain times set aside to deal with these resolutions and notice was given as to when those times would be, and the resolutions that would be called, so that those who chose to speak to these resolutions—be it the mover or be it some other member of the House—were free to do so.

Therefore I am not prepared to sit and have anyone say that these matters are not dealt with in an orderly manner because I maintain they are.

The other point I would make, in reply to the hon. member for Parkdale is, that it is very difficult to start at the beginning because, to give an example, there is a motion here, No. 4 for instance, standing in the name of the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) providing for provincial licensing and inspection of existing nursing homes. There is a bill, a government order, dealing with this matter, and surely that is the place for the hon. member to make any comments he may wish, on second reading of that bill, where the matter can be discussed in principle, or when the bill is in the committee of the whole House stage and will be considered clause by clause. So there are quite a few things that enter into the decision of when and how these matters are going to be called.

I can assure the House that we will provide opportunities, as I have said on many other occasions, for discussion of any matter that any member wants to bring before this House. Let me point out that next week we are going to commence the Throne speech debate and this is an opportunity for any member of this House to rise and speak on any matter he may wish. He does not need a resolution, he needs only to file his name with the whip of his party; that debate has never been completed until we have run out of speakers and as soon as the Throne speech debate, as it is called, is completed, the Budget debate will commence and that debate is of exactly the same character. There are no limitations placed whatsoever. It is called a Budget debate but in that debate hon. members may roam far and deal with anything they wish.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Nothing specific is debated.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Nothing specific is debated but anything can be said. It is an opportunity, sir, for any member of this House to introduce on the floor of this House any subject he likes, and in fact we have no time limitations and he may speak as long as he likes. I would suggest to hon. members of the House on all sides, who have matters which they wish to bring before the House, that this is a way of doing it.

And finally, I must say that, in conducting the affairs of the House, it is the responsibility of the government to run the government; and, of course, we must look to government business. It must have priority and, regardless of what jurisdiction you may quote to me, this is true in every jurisdiction having a parliamentary system. Finally I can assure you, as I have before, that there will be opportunity provided for these matters to be discussed here, but the business of the government must have priority; otherwise we would not have a government.

Mr. Speaker, that is my contribution to what really is not a debate, and which I did not intend to enter as a debate, but there is the position.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, in view of the hon. Prime Minister having made these statements, I would like first of all to suggest to him that, in your rules and proceedings of the House, if he was to follow the rules correctly the government does not always have priority on every day the Legislature meets, to conduct the business. There is a period which is allocated to the Opposition, or to private members, specifically to them, and one of the concerns has been in the past that—let me first of all say that the hon. Prime Minister has certainly been better than his predecessor where it became almost futile for the Opposition to present any bills or resolutions, because they just were completely ignored. I think that was flagrant abuse of Parliament and I appreciate that the hon. Prime Minister has permitted some resolutions. But I am fairly sensitive about this, because my resolution, which I put on last year, was not permitted to be debated—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Number three.

Mr. Thompson: Number three. And I would say that there is always a danger if a Prime Minister is going to set the priority of even the private members' time. This is really why I would like to see a set

time for private members' bills, or public bills as they are called, and for resolutions, so that there could be some opportunity of initiative on the part of the Opposition. We can put the government on its mettle for a change. Today we have. But if we could initiate some business—because we represent certain groups of the province—and in Parliament, if it is to be democratic, we should have our opportunity, as well as the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I recognize the principle being advanced and I could say that if the procedure of the House were checked it has been recognized on previous occasions and it will be recognized as in the past. I have no desire to have all the initiative here; and I do not think that, from the way the House has been conducted, at least since I have been here, that this is, in fact, the case. I have always given notice as to when private members' business would

be called, and I am quite prepared to continue as before.

Perhaps there will be sufficient time for certain days to be set aside. I would like to give notice of when these things will be called, but I cannot accept the proposition that a start be made at number one and that we should go right through the whole list, because this simply may not be practicable. But I am quite certain that, as the affairs of the House unfold, hon. members will find that they will have plenty of time to discuss these matters; because many of them are of interest to members on this side of the House, who wish to hear the debate and perhaps to take part in it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.15 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, January 31, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

CONTENTS

Monday, January 31, 1966

Reading and receiving petitions	97
Election Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bryden, first reading	97
Statement re Vanier institute of the family and Vanier institution for women, Mr. Grossman	97
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Thompson	100
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to	119
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	119

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, JANUARY 31, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to welcome guests to the Legislature and today we welcome, in the east gallery, students from William Treadway public school, Scarborough.

Presenting petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petitions have been received:

Of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass confirming a certain by-law respecting fences; and for other purposes; also, the petition of the governing council of the Salvation Army, Canada East, praying that an Act may pass exempting certain real property owned by it, as defined in The Assessment Act.

Of Fanny Eliza Dickieson and Viola Belle Gray praying that an Act may pass vesting certain property of the late William A. Dickieson in the petitioners.

Of the corporation of the city of Sudbury praying that an Act may pass to establish a parks and recreation commission.

Of the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Windsor praying that an Act may pass vesting certain lands and premises in it in fee simple.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves, seconded by **Mr. R. J. Harris** (Beaches) that **Mr. H. E. Beckett** (York East) be substituted for **Mr. Harris** on the standing committee on municipal affairs.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE ELECTION ACT

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Election Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): **Mr. Speaker,** a brief explanation of this bill is as follows. The purpose of the bill is to: (a) require—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I do not think anyone asked for an explanation of this bill.

Mr. Bryden: Well, **Mr. Speaker,** I believe you indicated late in the last session—the point has been covered in any case—but just to refresh the hon. Prime Minister's memory, **Mr. Speaker—**

Mr. Speaker: Proceed with it.

Mr. Bryden: The purpose of the bill is: First, to require disclosure of both campaign contributions and expenditures by both individual candidates and central party organizations; second, to fix a limit of permissible expenditures at both levels in election campaigns.

The limit proposed for central party organizations is 15 cents per name on the voters' lists in all of the constituencies in which the party is running candidates. The limitation for individual candidates is 15 cents per name for all names on the list in urban subdivisions and 20 cents in rural subdivisions. The bill does not propose that there should be any contributions from the public Treasury to election campaigns of either individual candidates or parties.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): **Mr. Speaker,** it is with justifiable pride that I rise to announce that Their Excellencies the Rt. hon. Georges P. Vanier, Governor General of Canada, and his gracious lady, Madame Vanier, have honoured the government of our province by lending their distinguished name to a new Ontario institution.

Their Excellencies have demonstrated their vital concern for all members of our society. The Canadian conference on the family in June 1964 came into existence because of their profound desire to develop a deeper awareness and a better understanding of the role of the family—its present conditions, its strengths and weaknesses and its problems.

The incorporation of the Vanier institute of the family was officially announced in April, 1965. The institute is the result of a resolution unanimously adopted at the conclusion of the Canadian conference on the family, to create a permanent organization to study and promote the spiritual and material well-being of all Canadians.

As sociologists and others have pointed out, persistent offenders usually come from poor economic and social background. We cannot isolate one single factor, even extreme poverty or great emotional deprivation, as being decisive. A social disorder as severe as persistent criminality must be studied in all its dimensions. The tendency towards delinquency starts early, therefore the institute, through its special researches and projects around the family, will assist in the work of corrections, a work in which Their Excellencies have shown great interest.

It is with a deep sense of gratitude I take this privilege of announcing to the House that an outstanding Canadian who has served this nation as soldier, diplomat and Governor General, and the lovely wife, mother and social worker who has been his companion through life—Their Excellencies—have agreed to lend their illustrious name to the institution which will replace the present Mercer reformatory. The new institution, construction of which it is expected will commence this year, will be known as the Vanier institution for women.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree).

Would the hon. Minister inform the House what steps are being taken to investigate charges by foreign students attending the University of Toronto that landlords are discriminating against them?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, no formal complaints have been received by the Ontario human rights commission in this connection. Rooming and boarding houses, including those generally used by students, are not covered by the human rights code.

However, a few years ago, the commission worked closely with the University of Toronto housing service to develop an anti-discriminatory policy which was ultimately endorsed by all prospective landlords using the housing service. The commission was commended for its assistance in this regard.

At that time, the housing service came under the students administrative council. Since then, it has been transferred to a housing director within the university itself. Apparently a number of problems have arisen under this new arrangement.

Once again, the human rights commission would be more than willing to assist the University of Toronto housing director in overcoming some of these recent difficulties.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the human rights commission talk to a landlord who has less than three rooms or three facilities? I understand many students live in one room of a boarding house.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I did not hear part of your question. Can the human rights commission do what?

Mr. Thompson: Can it talk to a landlord from the point of view of discriminating towards people of coloured background when there is a loophole by which a number of students may live in one room in a home?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I made reference in my answer to the steps taken by the commission in conjunction with the housing authority, which then was under the direction of the students administrative council. At that time, a survey was made of all of the houses or homes in the university area where students might seek accommodation, and a very healthy arrangement was arrived at by all the landlords—if I could call them that—or the operators of these boarding houses, with respect to this particular matter. There is no problem in dealing with people on this subject. I think in this part of the programme and that part of the operation of the human rights commission a good deal of the success is found.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), of which notice has been given.

Is anything being done to revise the hourly wage rates of highways maintenance personnel in the Chatham area, as reported in a recent news report as follows:

Surveying personnel, \$1.38 to \$1.49; assistant inspectors, \$1.33 to \$1.44; weighmen, \$1.44 to \$1.55; checkers, \$1.33 to \$1.44.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I do not have any information regarding the detailed wages that are mentioned in the press report. I am able to answer the first part of the question.

Perhaps I should endeavour to clarify the question a bit. I am not certain whether this applies to the public servants who are working in that area or whether it applies to casual help. I rather think that it does not apply to public servants. However, the one is related to the other in the sense that once the salaries have been negotiated and set for the public servants, the salaries of those casual workers throughout the whole province will be brought in line with the public service.

As the hon. member is aware, I think, I did answer this question on Thursday last and pointed out that negotiations are still being carried on between the civil service association, which is the bargaining agent for the public servants, and representatives of the civil service commission. I understand that the negotiations are proceeding satisfactorily and that it is hoped that an agreement on wages will be reached before long.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) how many meetings have been held by the hon. Minister's committee on the teaching of religion in schools since its appointment last session; and, second, has the committee called for submissions from interested groups and individuals?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, to be perfectly accurate, the committee was not appointed last session. The chairman was indicated; and this chairman, of course, was the Hon. J. Keiller Mackay, and he has been directing the organization of the work of the committee. A staff has been established and offices set up.

The committee itself has been provided with materials on the Ontario programme and with relevant information about programmes in other jurisdictions outside Canada. The committee has met and has agreed on procedures to be followed. Approval has been given by the committee to a form of advertisement soliciting briefs from various organizations and individuals. I am instructed that this advertisement will appear in the near future in the usual number of publications in the province so that it will come to the attention of all interested parties.

I am also advised by the chairman that the committee wishes a period of time to familiarize itself thoroughly with the background information with respect to the subject with which they are dealing, and for this purpose they have scheduled meetings on February 11, 18 and 25. It is after this date that they expect they will be having submissions and I understand there will be many of them from other groups and the public at large.

For the information of the House, Mr. Speaker, besides the Hon. J. Keiller Mackay, the other members of the committee include Mr. John W. Whiteside from Windsor, His Honour Judge H. Waisberg, judge of the county court of the county of York, William S. Martin from Niagara Falls, Dr. Mary Q. Innis, former dean of women at the University college and Dr. F. C. A. Jeanneret, the former chancellor of the University of Toronto.

Mr. Nixon: Supplementary to that I would like to ask the hon. Minister how many of the members that he has appointed to this committee are actually separate school supporters and of the Roman Catholic faith?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say about separate school supporters but William S. Martin is a member of the Roman Catholic faith and is the past president of the Ontario separate school trustees association.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker I would like to direct the following question to the hon. Prime Minister.

Are any steps contemplated to regularize the position of the police force of the Niagara parks commission by integrating it with the Ontario provincial police, or in some other way?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, the Niagara Parks commission does not normally require or use the services of the Ontario provincial police. For the general routine of patrols and related activity in the park, it does have its own security and traffic officers and their duties are very well defined and set down by the commission itself.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker my specific question, which for some reason the hon. Prime Minister did not want to answer, is: Are any steps being taken to integrate that group into the regular police force or otherwise to regularize its position?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think my answer would make it obvious that there are no steps being taken to integrate them with the Ontario provincial police and I think their activities are regularized at the present time.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of this debate I would like to pay my deepest respects to you.

All hon. members expressed great confidence in your impartiality when you were elected to this high office. I think you have demonstrated that you understand and appreciate the noble tradition and the high esteem of your office. I frankly concur wholeheartedly with your approach to giving greater pomp and ceremony to the entrance of the Speaker. From our side of the House we recognize that you are the guardian of all the power in the Legislature, of all its dignities, of its liberties and of its privileges.

One of our concerns is not with your entrance, Mr. Speaker; it is with the manner in which you leave the House. To be quite frank, we have been disappointed in that there have been occasions when you have had to leave as though you were a common messenger boy in this great assembly.

I am thinking of the alert eye of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) who noticed the new approach being taken by this government, and its erosion of your prestige. Let me say that with the erosion of your prestige comes the erosion of all the rights of the people of this province. We notice that in the past—and I want to re-emphasize this—a previous premier would move that the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply. Then on that dark day of December 7, 1961, very near an anniversary of another occasion when freedom was threatened, we saw a sly move in which you were dismissed by the intonations of the Clerk of this House, and I read for December 7, 1961: "Orders of the day. House moved into committee of supply, Mr. K. Brown in the chair."

Now, why do we place such stress on your importance and the recognition that you must be assured of your rights over procedure? We say this, sir, because in Britain there are five motions which can be made when they move into supply. This is the time when, historically, an Opposition can make grievances, motions of grievances, and bring forward the problems which they have in their constituencies or which they feel concern the whole country. In Ottawa there are six motions of grievance.

It is very important in this House that the government does not always have the priority

of business. I want to stress that. The hon. leader of the new party (Mr. MacDonald) seemed to concur with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) that the government must always have priority of business. If that situation arises—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): When did that happen?

Mr. Thompson: If that situation arises then, sir, we find we have a cowed and a beaten Opposition. I was amazed—on listening to his interjection—I was amazed to see on Friday, when hat in hand, the hon. leader of the socialist party asked the hon. Prime Minister: Would you put my motion ahead of the other?

Well, I am not begging to the government for the rights which we have as an Opposition. According to the rules of procedure of this House the Prime Minister is not in the position to move the motion—the resolution—as he wants. This is a pattern that has been developed. They should come according to their order of precedence, and this is what we are going to insist on.

May I say, sir, as I look at the House and I appreciate the interest with which the hon. leader of the new party is now interjecting, I only wish he had done it on Friday.

Mr. MacDonald: I did.

Mr. Thompson: May I say, sir, that one of the areas in which we see an erosion of democratic right is the question period.

The question period of Parliament has been referred to as the cocktails before the banquet and it is at this point that the Ministers of the Crown are tested for their knowledge and their grasp of their department and their quickness to answer questions. The hon. member for Sudbury spoke of this last year. He described having been at Westminster, having heard the rumbling voice of Sir Winston Churchill, felt the cut and thrust of debate that took place and saw the masterful action of Ministers of the Crown.

May I say, sir, in this session, in the questions that we have asked, I want to compliment the hon. Ministers of the Crown on the articulate way that they read their answers. There are a couple of them who stand on their feet and answer questions about their department, but on the whole it is like a heavy comic opera. At the end of last week we saw hon. Ministers get up and read prepared statements by civil servants. If this is the situation, if they cannot answer on their own, surely they are not being judged for

their grasp of their department. There are only three conclusions one can come to: They themselves do not know the policies of their departments; or, second, they are apprehensive and they want to hide from the scrutiny of the public in answering the questions; or, third, sir, and I hate to come to this conclusion, they are slow-witted.

We would not want any of those conclusions to be thought of by the people of Ontario; therefore, I suggest that the hon. Ministers stand on their own feet. I agree there are times when they are going to have to read an answer, but we have seen this farce of them reading lengthy documents. Indeed, the number of times they read in the last session was extraordinary. He is not here, but one of the greatest examples of this was the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) who in answer to a question, took up five pages of *Hansard*.

While I am on this matter of procedure, I may say that we are going to watch carefully in this session. A number of practices have taken place over past years which have not meant that we have had good government, alert government, in Ontario—or a vital, virile forum in this Legislature.

One of the most apparent, of course, is the matter of written questions. For too long the government has hidden, in every way it can, the answers to written questions. Until this fall, frankly, I thought there might be some validity in the kind of painful look which the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) had when he got 100 questions from my colleague, the hon. member to my right (Mr. Singer).

An hon. member: Your adviser.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I have a number of advisers and they are very good.

May I say that in these questions we waited for over 40 days to get replies, and we heard of many man-hours being spent. Yet, as we look at Britain, in one day they get 105 questions—105. And even Macmillan, the Conservative Prime Minister of Britain, said "Six days is too long in a democracy for answers to written questions. We will bring it down to three". I would like to see a page of that taken in this House by this Prime Minister.

The question that comes to us is this: Is the government purposely holding back answers to questions because it is afraid of giving us the answer before the department estimates? Or is it because it has not got an efficient administration and cannot get the answer; be-

cause certainly in Britain they get these answers, as I say, in three days. We are going to look at that one pretty hard.

I notice that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) is out. Perhaps I will go further into a number of these areas at another time in the Budget debate.

But we are tired of the subterfuge that takes place in presenting the estimates—the cover-up, the sugar coating, that is given when they are presented to the House for the scrutiny of the Legislature and the scrutiny of the people. They get a far greater breakdown behind the secret doors of Treasury, the department has to explain much more fully than in the presentation we get.

We are concerned, sir, about this House being a façade; about the rush at the end of the session to get as much business through as possible, rather than to have it geared over the period of the session equally so that there can be time and deliberation on estimates.

One thing we are really concerned about is this whole practice of Lieutenant-Governor's warrants—the enormous amount of money that is spent without parliamentary approval.

We are also concerned, sir, with the whole approach taken to analyzing each estimate and the item in each estimate.

At the opening of the past session, the one before this, I thought that the mover and seconder set a particularly high tone for the Legislature. I remember that the hon. member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) gave a real clarion call on the need for research and looked to the day when there would be an elimination of the means test. Then the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) gave a talk on French-Canadian relations, particularly on the aspirations of the French-speaking people in Ontario, towards Confederation.

I wish to apologize, sir, that I was unable to be present during the mover and seconder's remarks on Friday. I apologize because I know that—on Thursday, thank you—I know that they put all their efforts, all their mental powers, all their philosophical approaches into this speech. It is a very great honour. It is a great honour to be chosen by the hon. Prime Minister to be the mover and seconder, and I know that the content of both of their speeches will reflect all of their ability and I know that their constituents will look at that and judge them accordingly. I have not read them but I congratulate them on the very real effort they put into them.

May I say, sir, that I understand that among the efforts put in by one of them—either the mover or the seconder—was an effort on my behalf. He thought he would like to give me some advice. Since I first entered the political field, I have been offered advice. I remember in my first election, in Dovercourt, I was walking through my riding at the start of the election and someone came up to me; his advice was that I should not be in it, that I was going to be beaten. I learned later that he was a candidate himself, so I did not take his advice too strongly.

But I can honestly say that I have listened to advice from armchair and newspaper pundits, and others, and I find that really, when you are fighting elections, the best thing possible is to have a sense of direction, a sense of purpose yourself. Look at the advice, but do not get too rattled by it.

I know that, when I mention elections, the government and the socialist party will be most disappointed if I did not say a few words about the two by-elections. As I understand it, these were a test for all of us, and at the start I want to be charitable. I want to be charitable because it may have happened that the local Conservative associations in Nipissing and Bracondale may have not, as yet, formally thanked the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Ministers who flew up to Nipissing. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) has not been thanked for his efforts in Bracondale. I saw him one day, like a lean forest ranger, marching up one of the streets there.

An hon. member: Was he in uniform?

Mr. Thompson: He seemed awfully lonely and, from the vote, it looked as though he was a bit lonely. But if he has not been thanked formally; on behalf of the Liberal associations of the two ridings, we want to thank him for his participation.

There were some who were not there, but I assure you they were very much remembered. There was the hon. Minister from Cochrane South (Mr. Spooner). I do not think he came down to the riding in North Bay. It is a long way from Timmins to North Bay, I guess, and he did not think he would be there. But I can assure him when the rain came down, when I arrived in North Bay, their thoughts were in connection with him. Frankly, they were annoyed with him. He comes forth with statements about rain makers, saying as long as his preserve was all right it did not matter and describes that the rain-making machines around Timmins do not affect his area. And they recalculated and it

seemed to affect the North Bay area. Actually, I think his statements were wrong with respect to that. I say the point is not where the rain fell or how it fell; the point is, and the hon. Minister missed this, the people of the area were not asked to make any decision over their environment or over the weather. His concern when he was asked about it was that it fell somewhere outside Timmins.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): The hon. leader of the Opposition should have been in Timmins. It rained from July and into the middle of November.

Mr. Thompson: And was it accountable to that? No one was asked whether the machine should be there or not. It is a principle of yours, sir.

When we come to pensions, for example, we have a similar situation. The hon. Minister is not only all-wise about weather, but he is also all-wise in connection with the benefits a worker should have on retiring.

May I say that he is noticed by the people of this province. He is asked a simple question—and I come back to the question period—he is asked a simple question about how many meetings he has had with unions. He may think he is showing a shrewd, quick approach by first of all saying he will get the answer tomorrow out of his files. He may then think how clever he is, when he stands up and gives us a long discourse about the benefits of OMERS and refuses to answer the question and sits down again.

De Gaulle, as hon. members know, did not do so well in this last election with a high-handed manner; and similarly he refuses to answer the questions of the people of this province. And he has not answered it yet.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: What question is the hon. leader of the Opposition talking about?

Mr. Thompson: I am talking about the question that the hon. Minister was asked two days ago. He has not answered it as yet, and he can be disdainful and say: "What do I care, the public be damned." There is a day of accounting for my hon. friend and that kind of attitude.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I wonder if my hon. friend would tell this House what happened to the 15,000 pamphlets that were sent up in my riding in the last election to his candidate? That came out of his office.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: As usual, the hon. Minister misses the point and wants to talk on another subject. Some day he will be able to answer the questions. I am sure in his case it is not because he is slow-witted. I have quite an admiration for his ability. He fits into one of those other categories I mentioned at the start.

What about the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) in Nipissing? We regretted we did not see him there, because I am sure that he is a man of great compassion. I walked around the riding with my colleague from Ottawa, and as I walked around with him, particularly amongst French-speaking people living on farms there, we only wished that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare would get up and look at some of those conditions. I think, then, he would question his whole administrative approach to welfare.

The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), I noted, was not up there; probably because he felt he could not win any Indian votes or there were not any Indians up there. May I say that we appreciated your remarks.

Just while I am talking about the hon. Minister of Public Welfare who came out with a statement, I admit a little hastily, about what was going to be done about Indians, I could not help thinking: Could there not be some conflict in Cabinet? After all, here are the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) talking about Moosonee, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare talking about community development; and what is the attitude of that sterling 20th century reformer, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management? Keep them in the wigwam.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition would like to look up the definition of wigwam. I would suggest that he do this and then, perhaps, he would know what he is talking about.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Although he was not up there I can assure hon. members that we put his philosophy around. Then we come to the hon. Prime Minister. The hon. Prime Minister came up on two occasions and, frankly, I was very impressed, Mr. Speaker. They had an embroidered card, printed

beautifully, where one was invited to come and have tea with the hon. Prime Minister.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Embroidered?

Mr. Thompson: It was embroidered around the edges.

An hon. member: Embossed!

Mr. Thompson: I thought it was embroidered but one can say embellished.

An hon. member: A very nice looking card, anyway.

Mr. Thompson: One had to go as to a sort of head lord, like a serf going to see the land owner. They tell me that when they got there the hon. Prime Minister sensed the mood. They say he was as bored as they were with the whole thing, shaking hands there in line, saying hello to them. They came over to our meeting. We had an affair, it was not quite as dignified as the hon. Prime Minister's, a spaghetti dinner. I know he went in for a more dignified approach, but the people of the north are relaxed and a free and easy group.

I am going to leave the hon. Prime Minister at this point, because I have a sense that the socialist party feel left out.

An hon. member: Were they there at all?

Mr. Thompson: No, I want to say this about them because I live in Bracondale—I was going to say like an army, but when I think of one of their hon. members I am concerned about what that conjures up in their minds. He has been declaring war for Britain with Rhodesia, so I do not want to use the term army. But I would say that some of my neighbours told me that the socialist fellows came around and banged on the door. And in one case, the neighbour said, "He was such a sincere and self-righteous young fellow I had him come in. And he came in five times." And she said, "I did not know whether to ask him if I should put him up for board and room."

Let me say that we were concerned about the socialists in Bracondale. We were concerned because in the last session they had a make-work programme on their platform. Hon. members may recall it. They tore up sofas and we were concerned in case there were not any upholsterers around.

Interjections by hon. members.

An hon. member: They are harder to tear up.

Mr. Thompson: The thing that interests me is that the socialist party, at least the hon. leader—and I admire him—bounces back with vim. He admitted they did not do so well in the by-elections. "But look how we did in the federal election," he says, and he goes into his statistical approach about how he moved up a couple of rungs.

I had some doleful Charlies come to me from various arenas including the fourth estate—

An hon. member: They had reason to be.

Mr. Thompson: One said to me: "Did you see how the new party did in the provincial election?" Yet the socialist leader is happy again and he says they are going to do better in the federal election; and they have done better in the federal election and now they will do better in the next provincial election. And I said to him: "You think this is really a serious threat? Did you see how we—the Liberal party—did in the federal election?" If that is any indication of confidence, I would be sitting over in that seat tomorrow.

Let me say this: I was pleased to hear that the socialist party has more organizers. I want to mention to them the young fellow who came around five times to my neighbour, and spoke to her. She felt terrible that she did not give him board and room, but she has changed a bit; so if one of those organizers is looking for board and room, I can give him the address and then he can stay in the riding.

I think, sir, that the party has taken a wise approach. They have been called the CCF party; they have been called the New Democratic Party; and we heard that in their press conference they are going to put more hoopla—whatever that is—since their election. From now on I am going to call them the hoopla party. It affords us a lot of laughs and I think now they generally recognize their role.

Mr. MacDonald: Scintillating brilliance.

An hon. member: He is getting to you now.

Mr. MacDonald: No wonder the government is unconcerned in face of this feeble attack.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): On a point of something or other—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, one of the terms that could be used for this session, and for the last session, is that it is a session of

protest. Yet we have an age of affluence in this province, yet we see that there are more and more people who are coming down to the Legislature, who are picketing, because they are being pushed around in some way.

I noticed on television that the hon. Prime Minister suggested that perhaps some kind of a fad is taking place regarding this picketing. I do not. I think it is something more serious than that. I think there is a concern and an uneasiness on the part of the people that they are being pushed around by big government. I think, sir that they are wondering where a politician stands, no matter what party.

They are not sure that we do not make promises and that we forget about people. They are not sure whether we try to dodge controversial issues and take stands. And I think, in a way they are getting cynical about it.

I appreciate that leadership in the 20th century is agonizingly difficult; for modern politicians, with big government and because of big government, recognize that decisions can provide both opportunity and great hazards. I think the problem of government today is to be able to discern what are the wishes of the people; to be able to draw the people in to helping decide the course and the destiny of their province. It is too easy to take automatic action, to think we know what are the right answers for people and not draw them into participating in making decisions.

I think that one of the great opportunities we have today is to encourage public dialogue and public participation about the role of our province in Confederation. I urged the hon. Prime Minister to establish an advisory group to help this province in knowing both the background of Confederation and also where we should be going; but I had hoped that the men and women he would draw together in an advisory group would not be shackled to government, that they would not be preparing meetings for government alone. I had hoped that they would be preparing meetings, preparing papers for the Legislature; that the hon. Prime Minister would want to see public discussion taking place across this province.

And yet, sir, I was bitterly disappointed to find that this group, and they are very able people, is being held very closely to advising the hon. Prime Minister alone. Surely this is the opportunity for us to have this expand into an all-party committee, where we would use the thinking of these people.

I see this particularly when we think of

the Fulton-Favreau amendment formula. The hon. member for Sudbury and myself were dismayed when the government came back with this *fait accompli*, to use the word of the hon. Attorney General. We were dismayed that there had not been greater public dialogue. The hon. member for Sudbury talked of Sir John A. Macdonald; he pointed out that the day after we were having this debate on the Fulton-Favreau formula, was one day after the date, 100 years previously, when there had been the great debate over the 72 resolutions in 1865. And he pointed to the fact that, despite the difficulties of travelling and communication, the fathers of Confederation had gone by horse and travelled to constituents to tell them, and to get their opinions, and to draw them into taking part in the framing of Confederation. He described one occasion of Sir John A. perhaps not being quite able to discuss, as fluently as he usually could, the advantages and the disadvantages of the 72 resolutions; at a luncheon, I think it was, with the Lord Mayor of Montreal—however, I am sure that was not a usual term.

I have the feeling that this government is afraid of public dialogue. One of these people who are on the advisory committee does not see himself as a Conservative advising Conservatives; he has very provocative ideas. He does not want to be shackled into just whispering in the ear of Mr. Ian MacDonald. He wants to be shouting out from the rooftops, "Let us discuss these points of view."

The problem with the Fulton-Favreau formula was that when it came before us, there had been a White Paper; we knew there was some dissension to this. Bora Laskin, a well-known constitutional lawyer, had raised the scent on it and talked about rigidity; we were concerned, but we voted for it, Mr. Speaker, because for 40 years Canada has been struggling to come to a consensus by which we could repatriate the Constitution and could have a system of amending it.

And the hon. member for Sudbury and myself felt that, with the consensus of all the governments of Canada, after 40 years there has been an achievement. The hon. Attorney General has said that this is a *fait accompli*; and even though we raised objections and apprehension, and we argued about the way this was presented to us, we felt at that time that we should be part of showing goodwill. We were assured that there may be need for further adjustments but, as we look at the history of Canada, men of goodwill and reason have never been held back because of some

constitutional rigidity and we felt there could be further amendment if necessary.

Now, sir, we are concerned that the Fulton-Favreau formula is going to be discarded. And it is for that reason that we feel—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Who says that?

Mr. Thompson: I say we are concerned, and it is for that reason that we would like to share with the government in the deliberations about our Confederation. I remember the hon. Attorney General waxing into poetry; he was ecstatic about his experience at Charlottetown. And I can remember how the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) said how he wished he could have been more a part of this in participating in it. I felt that; all the people of Ontario ought to feel this; and it is for that reason that we want to see a Confederation committee set up, using the advisers the government has, because the government is going to lose some of those advisers if it keeps them close to working with just Mr. Ian MacDonald.

One of the aspects of the Fulton-Favreau formula and the approach taken, I think, has been that it was trying to do two things. It was trying to both repatriate the Constitution as well as to amend it. And I think a lot of us were excited over the first aspect, without having a harder look at the second.

Yet we know that it is not really such a problem to repatriate the Constitution. This can be done, as the hon. member for Forest Hill in debate pointed out, without any consultation with the provinces, simply by changing English institutions to Canadian institutions. But the problem, and the concern of the provinces, is in connection with the amendment procedure afterwards.

We feel, because of the changed attitude in Quebec itself, the fact that the separatists are no longer a threat, they are dissipated, the fact that there seems to be greater cordiality and understanding, that therefore it is time for us to have a committee that could look, not only at amending procedure if we have to have another procedure, but at the role of Confederation.

There are important committees now, which will be reporting shortly—tax committees—both here and in Ottawa. And I feel that it is vital today that we should have a strong central government. I think it is also vital that the provinces should recognize this and not be going to Ottawa saying, "You can help in certain areas if it is going to chip away at your tax sources more."

I am hoping that in this great deliberation that will take place after we see the report of the tax committee, we would have done thinking ourselves about what the responsibilities of the provinces and of the federal government are. And it is for that reason that I urge the hon. Prime Minister to widen his approach towards getting advice from this group of talented and able men, to bring in the whole of the Legislature.

May I say that another point that concerned me very much is when government members go up to the Dominion-provincial conferences—the hon. Minister of Health is at one right now—the rest of us sit here, waiting to hear what the decision is going to be. I presume that one will be in secret. Sometimes it is not quite clear, from the reports we get from the Ontario representatives up there, just what did take place.

In the medical insurance discussions at one point, we thought that the federal government was only to give \$14 and then we found that they would go as high as \$20. I think today because of the great importance of these deliberations in Ottawa between the provinces, that this should not be a secret, closed meeting. We have to debate on the decisions the government comes to.

The hon. Attorney General called the Fulton-Favreau formula a *fait accompli*. This is wrong. This is making a neuter of this Legislature. And we, sir, want the discussions in Ottawa more open to the people's representatives. It is for that reason that we urge that the hon. Prime Minister should consider, with the Dominion-provincial conferences, that there should be a delegation made up of all parties from Ontario. We agree that the discussion and the spokesman should be the government but that our role should be that of observers. I think that this should be considered.

It has been done in the past in Ontario, where we have had more than just the government going up to discuss these questions. There are many of us who feel that the decisions are all made up there and that we play an insignificant role. This becomes a very dangerous situation, when the representatives of the people are emasculated through decisions being made behind closed doors in Ottawa.

May I say it seems to me the goals we have to look at today are the goals of an abundant society, and we have to consider a strategy towards that. There are some who still look at the approach in politics as that of the threat of depression, and they have a depression philosophy; but it seems to me it is a much tougher philosophy to be thinking

of what our approach and our strategy will be when we have abundance, to see that we can keep the economy moving, and also to see that we can bring people, who are in pockets of neglect, further into the flood of a booming economy.

There are questions that we have to ask ourselves in this Legislature and I look at the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree).

How do we ensure adequate supply of trained labour? I noticed applause when we talked of the efforts that had been made to get skilled labour from overseas and this is a great advantage to us. But always there is a question in our mind: If we are forced to be getting skilled labour—we do want more people—but is it because we are not doing enough adequate training, or having enough apprenticeship courses, to be able to meet this? It is not necessarily so, but it raises that question.

How do you make sure that automation is a blessing for management and labour? You have had an automation conference. How do you involve the people in the increasing complexity of co-operative planning for the future? How do you counter the insidious threat of inflation and set up fair wage and price guide lines in a democratic society? How do you balance the wage increases with the gains in social security, with the gains in the Canada pension plan, and the medical insurance—these fringe benefits? How do you encourage and promote Canadian-owned industry without cutting off foreign capital, which we want and need? And how can you better co-operate with Ottawa to act in a quick and a concerted way to head off economic dangers?

May I say that I believe that we have got to have more co-ordination in our own government. I believe that the hon. Prime Minister has got to chair an economic committee. I know the way he has been doing this, and I feel that there has been too much of a one-department approach. Let me take the example of the Indians, about whom we were talking before. Last session, the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests stood up and announced that he was interested in jobs for the Indians, and that his department was helping them to plant trees and he was going to help them get walk-in freezers.

It seemed to me that this was very commendable, and we appreciated his humanity in developing this idea. I want to say that I was in Kenora, and I heard words of commendation about his department, and what it was doing there for the Indians. But my concern was, just as I saw him walking lonely

up the streets of Bracondale, is he walking the same way in his fight for the Indians?

The hon. Minister would be concerned about housing and economic development, training education and welfare. Are they all behind him and working with him? When he puts those walk-in freezers in, and I commend him for it, did the other hon. Ministers know what he was doing?

Last year he told me that there was going to be this co-operation, in fact when I asked him about it last year he said they just had a meeting three hours ago and I expected, because I sat on a committee which he chaired, and I waited patiently and anxiously during the session to hear him come out and say this is what we achieved. It was not until this year that we heard the hon. Minister of Public Welfare come out with a statement, and it seemed to me the initiative of making the statement came from him but the initiative of the policy came from the federal government. I may be wrong about the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Let me interrupt the hon. leader of the Opposition for just a moment. There has been a committee working with the federal government on this for the last 12 months or more and I do not think my hon. friend, in his criticism of this government, wants to detract from that work by trying to build the federal people up as though they were the great white father in this matter. I think that will not help them any, as he knows from his own experience in Kenora.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I would say, sir, that in any help that he can get in this province in welfare and in other work, I am right behind him. I am not trying to deter him at all. I simply make the remark about the hon. Minister of Public Welfare because I noticed that he was up at a conference about a month ago—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. Minister of Public Welfare is chairman of the committee.

Mr. Thompson: It was a welfare conference and I always seem to hear what Quebec is saying. On this occasion the Quebec spokesmen had come out about family allowances and the hon. Minister of Public Welfare—I think this describes his philosophy, I am sure hon. members will agree with me—up there with people bringing forth stimulating ideas, with our Ontario representatives to the fore, when one of the newspaper men asked: "How do you feel about this?" said in reply,

and I think this is his philosophy and perhaps that of most of the provinces: If you do not say anything then you agree. It is rather a passive approach, I think, but he was quoted in that way.

May I say, sir, that the problem of co-ordination is quite clear to us. I am going to read an excerpt from Professor Ralph Krueger's speech because I think it is worth repeating every year until we see that something is done. This was the speech to the regional conferences, and this is why I hope the hon. Minister of Lands and Forest did not think I had no reason to be alarmed. I was concerned because this is what he says about co-ordination by departments:

Generally, each department has limited its administrative region for its own specific purpose without regard to regions of other departments.

This is Professor Krueger at a conference called by the government at which a number of us attended. He goes on:

The basis for delimiting administrative regions has varied from department to department. In some cases the regions have been delimited on the basis of physical geography. The Department of Agriculture has used the county as its basic administrative limit. Other regional boundaries have been chosen arbitrarily in order to divide the province into areas with approximately equal amounts of administrative work.

For still others, there is a limitation of regional units which seems to have been made on an ad hoc basis, which is difficult to explain. The situation produced by a large number of different sized regions whose boundaries do not coincide has been further complicated by the introduction of a multiplicity of sub-regions and districts generally arrived at in the same haphazard manner. The net result is an apparent maze of administrative regions and districts that often cut across basic statistical data gathering units, such as counties and townships, thus making it difficult to analyze trends in resource use and economic development and difficult to formulate and implement planning and economic policy.

And he goes on:

After reviewing the provincial regional administrative organization one is led to the conclusion that when confronted with an outmoded municipal structure the government of Ontario in the place of the needed basic reorganization of that structure superimposed upon it a whole new

and complicated set of administrative regions. This expedient has in turn created a fundamental impediment to rational planning of resource use and economic development.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we have a real job on our hands to unravel the utter administrative confusion which this government has let pile up. Before I go into regional development I would like to talk briefly about one approach which I think should be considered by the hon. Minister of Labour and I am talking about the need for a consensus.

I go back again to the difficulty in our society today in getting a feeling by the people that they can participate in making decisions. That is my main point. I raised the aspect of a Confederation committee other than for one party, for the government party, so that we can get dialogue and participation.

Now I want to talk about a labour-management forum. I know that this has been brought to the hon. Minister before. I am aware of the difficulty. A previous leader of my party had often tried to push this idea to the attention of the government. Of course, there are difficulties in getting unions and management to think on a province-wide basis; the difficulty of representation, for example. Can the Canadian chamber of commerce representatives speak for the industries? Can the Ontario federation of labour speak for individual unions? Yet, sir, I think that we should try this. I am sure the hon. Minister is aware that in Nova Scotia, where there has been a start in some way—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): I am away ahead of the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: May I say I would be interested in knowing something further on this, because as a result of what he is doing, I think there are a number of questions that have to be discussed. For example, Medicare, Canada pension plan. How do we relate these programmes—and there will be more—to wages and benefits?

It is not sufficient—let me take the Canada pension plan—it is not sufficient for some autocrat to be saying to unions, which have been negotiating and feel they have the right to be making decisions with management, for some autocrat to come along and say, "You integrate, you must integrate." That situation might not have happened if we had a

forum for management and labour called by government.

I regret that almost at the deadline of January 1, it appeared that the hon. Minister responsible had not got around and talked to the people who were involved in this situation. We have seen where the President of the United States has also stepped on the other side into the steel industry and told them for the sake of the dangers of inflation that they hold the line.

Yet instead of the big stick of government being used, if you could have a forum with representatives of labour and management, you could call experts and academics, so that at least they could discuss their challenges and aspirations.

It would seem to me that Professor Arthurs put it well when he said there are no occasions beyond the crises produced by collective bargaining or controversial legislative proposals for the exchange of views. Thus there is no accumulation of goodwill that stems from familiarity and respect upon which the parties may draw on difficult times.

I know it is not right to refer to Sweden or to West Germany because the situation is completely different, but I do say that in Ontario we could show an example of the type of co-operation which later, I think, should be developed in Ottawa.

May I turn to another area in which I feel that we have to draw people into taking part in making decisions; and this is in the area of agriculture. I have excellent advisers; the hon. Prime Minister referred to one adviser. May I say I have a team of advisers behind me, and in the area of agriculture I have a number of thoroughly capable men who know how this province should develop agricultural policies.

An hon. member: They are not advisers, they are trying to get your job.

Mr. Thompson: One of the things in our party is that we have areas that we can see over the years that should be promoted. I look back in agriculture to statements made in the press several years ago, and I still think that the same things hold true for today. They were made by the former member for Brant.

The Ontario agriculture marketing committee—and I am sorry the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) is not here, I understand he is in a snow storm—the Ontario agricultural marketing committee in 1961 stated that the only significant and chronic surplus being produced in Ontario agriculture is farm people.

The farmer has been the first to sense the bitterness and also the advantages of automation, and I spent last summer meeting with representatives of agriculture and going out to farms. I have been up in Nipissing and gone out to the farm areas, and I feel that when we have an agricultural revolution the government has neither laid long-term plans or thought of the aftermath which takes place with the revolution in agriculture, the aftermath of people who are stranded.

I say this because in the 1961 census it showed that there were 121,000 farms—and I admit they included residential units and part-time farmers—but 30,000 farms sold less than \$1,200 worth of produce annually and 20,000 sold less than \$2,500.

I am aware that the farmers of Ontario are prosperous on the whole. This province leads all others in the value of farm products, but in 1964 the sale of farm products was \$996 million; it may be \$1 billion. So looking at it from the sale of products one may feel that the farmers are prosperous. But as you look at it more fully you realize that from 1952 to 1964 the income dipped \$432 million to \$345 million.

Operating costs as a percentage of cash farm receipts in Ontario rose from 48 per cent between 1951 to 1954, to 66 per cent between 1962 and 1964. And that is the cost-price squeeze. Sure, we can say in one index that the farmers are prosperous but as we look at the cost-price squeeze, we realize that this is just a façade.

Marketing changes are worrying the farmer. An estimated 80 per cent of food sales in Ontario are now controlled by supermarkets or by stores which go in for group-buying. Economists say that this trend—and it is narrowing the farmer's choice of market—will continue.

Let me say that when we look at that situation and we see what the government is doing to help the farmer—with the threat of marketing being narrowed into monopolies, with the cost-price squeeze, with the cost of equipment rising—we find that in Quebec—and I think this is very significant—in Quebec the agricultural budget for the current fiscal year is about four times that of Ontario.

We find that in ARDA, a programme which is helping communities to help themselves, we find that Ontario spending has been about one-fifth of that of Quebec.

I was interested in looking at the preliminary report of rural poverty in four selected areas. And I thought to myself as I listened to the hon. Minister of Agriculture that surely

they will not be able to pick out any areas in Ontario; there will be no areas here where there is stark poverty. And yet I find there is a whole selected study in one area, Lanark. It could have been the hon. Provincial Treasurer's area—he woke up suddenly to realize his constituents were not looked after as well as he thought they were and they could move into many other areas around this province. This is the kind of case study that they sketch. I will read this; it is called Family A.

Mr. and Mrs. A. and their two sons live in a hundred-year-old house that is in fair condition. It has room heaters and a kitchen stove. Water is brought in from an outdoor hand pump; there is no bath or indoor toilet; the family has no electricity, television or refrigerator.

And it goes on to say that the nearest doctor and hospital are 13 miles away, the high school 13 miles, and the primary school one mile. Another interviewer spoke to Mr. and Mrs. B. and describes them in the same light:

The B's have twelve children at home ranging from eight months to 15 years. Five children are away from home. The family live in a converted railway station that is in fair condition. Heating is by space heater and a kitchen stove supplemented by an electric cooker. Water is taken from a hand pump outdoors and there is an outdoor toilet. The parents have always lived in the country. Their home is on the second and third floors; they have spent \$1,400 on repairs.

Mr. B. said they needed \$1,400 more.

I can go through a number of these, as you can see, Mr. Speaker. There is a whole documentation of poverty in Ontario.

Let me submit: I believe that the government should be taking a co-ordinated approach towards agriculture. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) and others have said that the hon. Minister of Agriculture seems to get aroused only when a crisis takes place, and then he has a kind of patchwork approach. He has a bandage which he applies to part of the problem, rather than looking at the bloodstream which is out of order. The government has to start talking with farmers.

Let me say one thing I noticed when we were up in Nipissing. The hon. Minister of Agriculture went up and the people were delighted to see him. They thought it was great that they had finally come face to face with him. But, you know, they made a mistake. They thought that, having met him once, after the election was over they could still

come down to talk to him about their problems of crop insurance, and he would still be the same accessible and friendly fellow.

Well, they came down; they came down with the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith); drove down in the early morning, excited that they were going to come into the great presence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. At noon we arranged to get some sandwiches for them, and we tried to explain to them that they should face a deflation of spirit, that they were not going to see him. As a practice he does not see farmers. I heard of one group who have not seen him for six months. He has got to start meeting the farmers in order to know the problems of this province.

I think there is a question of looking at the marketing boards, a thorough examination, to see what is needed, whether there is a loophole for these marketing boards to work more efficiently. I think we have to look at alternatives to farm employment; we have got to look at the various insurance and subsidy programmes to be overhauled. We know that at present there are farmers who live on depreciation of capital, and we know there are others who are victims of the so-called cheap food policy.

I may say that when I was talking first, and giving the example of the amount of food that is produced, I heard the remarks of the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party. One thing I was interested in, when reading about Tommy Douglas in one of the weekly papers, was the description of a very fine intellectual, Fred Young, who has now moved out to BC. He had mentioned—

An hon. member: Fred Young?

Mr. Thompson: Fred Young.

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not confuse us a bit more and—

Mr. Thompson: I will get the quote on it.

Mr. MacDonald: I think the hon. leader of the Opposition actually means Walter Young.

Mr. Thompson: All right, Walter Young, then.

An hon. member: The Young boy.

Mr. Thompson: He had moved out to BC and he was describing the new point of approach to farmers and labour and he said, "Forget the farmers"—I will paraphrase it a bit but I will get the exact sense: Forget the

farmers, we will concentrate on the labour unions.

Mr. MacDonald: That is what the Liberals and Tories do—forget the farmers.

Mr. Thompson: I do not think it was Fred, but it was certainly one of the higher echelon of the New Democratic Party.

An hon. member: We will return to the unions now. That is where the money is.

Mr. Thompson: I want to get back again to the patchwork development across this province. I have talked of the need for a consensus of approach in labour; I have pointed out that there are areas of poverty in agricultural areas, and I come back to the approach of regional development. I want to say that 40 per cent of the families in the counties of Bruce and Haliburton have annual incomes of less than \$3,000, and ten per cent of the families in the counties of Peel and Halton have incomes under that figure. Last year I supplied figures; the approach we have is of giving average statistics, so that in this province we have got to look at each region and examine it to see the inequalities that exist.

Look at the birth rate. I want to hit at this again. In Middlesex county there are 16 to 25 deaths per thousand; in Prescott-Russell there are 26 to 35 deaths per thousand; in Glengarry there are 36 to 45 deaths per thousand, in childbirth. And there is a relationship here to services which government should be providing. In Middlesex there are 6.6 active treatment beds per thousand; in Prescott-Russell it is 1.5 beds per thousand. It is clear that there has got to be a concerted approach on the part of government in developing regions.

Our concern, and it is a very real concern, is that you see only one department doing a little bit on this. We read about the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs having nine studies going for regional administration, and then we hear that the hon. Minister of Education has moved into the consolidated schools, according to certain regions which he has defined. We hear that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) has started to get larger jail units. We see that the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management has started to move about filling land, and is moving into the sewerage area. We see that the hon. Minister of Health is off in his area setting up health units; and the hon. Minister of Public Welfare has got a couple of units set up, broader regional

units. The hon. Provincial Treasurer, the man who would give substance to all these services, so that the municipalities could be developing them, you do not hear much of him in the picture.

It is for these reasons that we feel—instead of nibbling around the subject, hearing that there is going to be a little bit more that one department will do, or that another department is going to do—that today this government has got to take a concerted approach towards regional development. They came on Metro, but only when there was a crisis; then the hon. Prime Minister stepped in and we hear from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and from others that we will get a decision from the people themselves—they will be formulating voluntarily to see what kind of regions they should have.

It is becoming more apparent that the government wants consultation from the people, but I am sure that even though it has made compromise upon compromise, I am sure that if it had left this up to the local municipalities around Metro, and told them, "Well, you straighten this out yourselves," that it would have got nowhere. I think, similarly, if we talk of regional government, as we have these regional conferences, that today the people are asking for leadership from the government, and co-ordinated leadership. It is going to require tough decisions because some small municipal reeve may be offended but it is going to require decisions, and this is what the people are wanting today.

One of the dreams, sir, which our party has, when we speak of regional government, is that we will see a pattern across this province. We read of planners who envisage—if action was only taken—concerted action on the part of the government, planners who envisage an approach that could be developed. What kind of benefits? We could see the Bruce Trail, winding from Niagara north, becoming a provincial park. We could see the Niagara fruit area being used to its best abilities, its best resources. We could see the Muskoka area as a region there for planning camping for tourists, hunters, as one of the large areas in which to go out and relax. Similarly in Bancroft, and Renfrew and Madoc; these areas could be set aside for tourists, for lumbering and for other businesses close to Montreal, to Toronto and to Ottawa.

In our cities, if we could get more courage on the part of this government, we could see cities with treed walkways, great cultural centres with an ethos; cities with underground traffic.

I do not see these now. What I see is drabness and really, in many ways, cheapness. We see our rivers and our lakes polluted. We see filth and open sewage in many of the rivers where once they were catching salmon.

And we see, sir, a sprawl spreading out from cities. In areas where people could be proud, if we had leadership, we see slums which are sucking the vitality of these great cities of which we should be proud. We see suburbs that have been built without parks; the only recreation is a commercial shopping centre which closes down at night.

We look at our Great Lakes in Ontario and we think of Niagara Falls through to Oshawa. One Minister told us that we would have beaches there, it would be like the Riviera. Now it is littered and filthy and we see the people on the weekends trying to get out of this concrete suburbia in which they live with car behind car pushing farther north, trying to avoid the signs which say, Water polluted.

We can do better than this, in Ontario if there were planning and concerted action and concern. And the people want this. The people of Ontario today want to look up, they want to have something bigger than the humdrum existence they have.

I remember being out in the Red River area and I talked to an old man who was there. He lived in a small community and there was a large cathedral in the community that towered over all the small houses. I asked him: "Did you play a part in that?" He said: "I helped to pay for it and I worked to build it." He said it meant there was something worthwhile in his life, something far bigger than himself.

Now if this government could only catch the feeling that people want; they want something of that spirit in Ontario. And what do we get? We get compromise and compromise. We get a little bit done here by one Minister, a little bit done by another; and a bit of nervousness when they are going to move in towards some regional area. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions tells us to keep quiet about this, he is going to sort of negotiate the thing.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): All right, I did it.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, he did, but it was him alone doing it. Why not be bold and imaginative and say we will all work together under the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister to get this job over, and tear down those old buildings we have?

The hon. Prime Minister talks about evolution rather than revolution and I would suggest to him that he should recognize that with this great social revolution taking place today, this agricultural revolution, then this term evolution really is not terribly dynamic, it is not terribly challenging. It describes to me a kind of boredom or caution, over-caution, with the changes that are taking place in our society.

Another challenge we have is in the field of health. I talk again about a consensus by people and people working together.

I have been reading this summer about the background of Ontario. I just finished reading *The Tiger*, which I commend to hon. members. I mentioned this before. It is about a member for the Bruce peninsula, a very glamorous and dynamic person. We have an hon. member ourselves who is carrying on in this tradition.

Let me say that the tradition in Ontario has been that men and women in carving out their frontier homes have worked together to help each other. Where something was too much for one individual then the whole community got together in a bee to give him a hand. I think that is a great tradition which we have.

In a sense we still have this. The hon. member for Forest Hill emphasized that freedom is not absolute, that there is an interdependence amongst men and women. Well, there is an interdependence about health. There has developed a tradition that in the building of hospitals, no one man or woman can build a hospital today, a modern hospital, alone. We get the community together; we work together to provide help.

Let me say no one man or woman can pay for a university to train a doctor with the skills that are needed and the modern research that has to be brought forward. In that same tradition of frontier days, Mr. Speaker, we work together to develop the means of teaching doctors.

In many cases in society there are those who cannot afford—although taxes are paid for the hospital facilities and after taxes have paid for the training of doctors—they cannot afford to use those services, they find that this is prohibitive. It is for that reason that the hon. Minister of Health has been so proud of hospital insurance in which a group of 15 or more have to belong to the hospital insurance of the province, so that a group helps to pay for the individual who is weak, or sick, or infirm. Groups working in industry on the whole are healthy, they are better risks.

What has this government done now? It destroyed this collective approach to responsibility. It destroyed a pride which most of the people of Ontario have in wanting to band together to do their share of helping each other.

What is the government saying with its government approach to medical insurance? It is saying we will take individuals, and if you look at the record of PSI, individuals in many cases are the dangerously ill people, the poor risks. They are not in a group, they are not working with General Electric or somewhere. They are going to be taken over by the government and the healthy and the good risks are going to be free for the insurance company, the commercial efforts, to handle.

Well, we fight against that! I am not going to develop this much further because we have a bill coming before the House, but I want to say very firmly and strongly that my party is for a universal, government-sponsored system of medical insurance throughout this province.

While I am on it I would like to talk about the foreign doctors for a moment. The hon. Minister of Health is on the board of directors of the college of physicians and surgeons. This government gives the charter to the college of physicians and surgeons, and yet for some reason we feel we cannot ask explanations of the college of physicians and surgeons. I am looking forward to getting an answer from the hon. Minister of Health on why there are certain foreign doctors who have been barred from practising in Ontario. The only answer that we have had so far from the hon. Minister of Health, who has been in touch with the college of physicians and surgeons, the only answer is they did not have adequate undergraduate training, even though they are recognized in the United States and in great universities such as Edinburgh and others, even though they teach in our universities, doctors who are going to move out and practise themselves cannot practise even though, in some cases, they are actually chief interns in a hospital.

And then the question is asked: With this shifting decision that is made by the college of physicians and surgeons, has it always been from this particular undergraduate school that you would not accept people to practise in this province? And we find out that for a number of years there have been doctors who have graduated from these universities' undergraduate schools who have come over here, and who are now prominent men and women in the field of medicine here; but for some reason the college of physicians and surgeons has decided now that the

undergraduate training of these new people coming in is not satisfactory.

There is a variety of the most weak and fatuous excuses being made, and this is when a government should step in and not be afraid of big institutions. They should step into the area and demand from the college of physicians and surgeons what their reasons for this are. And we ask the hon. Minister of Health to start assuming some of his responsibilities. We demand of him an answer on this question.

So I look at the need for collective approaches in this province. I realize that there are a number of areas where, if we can stir up excitement in recognizing the dynamic development of our province, we would then get after some of these services, and an understanding of what is needed in order to continue these years of abundance.

One of the concerns is, of course, with labour. The hon. Minister of Labour is not here, but I notice that in the Speech from the Throne there was mention made of counsellors. This is something—as there are in other parts of that Speech from the Throne—that we push for; there has been a need for a bureau of statistics. We are not narrow in this thing; we are glad that we brought forward ideas and that the government is taking them.

There certainly has been a need to get counsellors who are going to advise young people and others concerning vocational training, concerning job opportunities. More and more today, with the mobility that we have, we need to get fast information, we need to get help in moving workers, we need to get counselling. And I want to talk of the working man for a moment in this period of abundance.

I have a little office, Mr. Speaker, in my riding, which I still maintain. One thing that really irritates me in this great abundant province is when I see a man come into my office, a family man, a man who wants to work, but a man who, because of some tragedy at work has suffered some kind of infirmity and is given some compensation; and he is told, "You can go out and do light work." I have a number who come to the office; they may have a wife and a couple of children, and I see them come there, asking, "Can you help me to get some work? I want to do anything but I can't do heavy work."

I ask them, "Well, is there any opportunity of light work? What about retraining for you?" But he cannot get anything in this day and age. In this wealthy province there are too many rejects who are not being given opportunities, and I am looking forward to

the debate on workmen's compensation for we will come forward with very strong criticism and very clear ideas. Because we are dealing with the dignity of people; and I, personally, have looked in the eyes of too many of them whom I have seen crushed and defeated because of the lack of a proper interpretation of retraining men who have suffered injuries at their work.

The hon. Minister of Labour has talked of the blueprint for labour and I want to, in this area, say that there is again overlapping and confusion. The hon. Minister of Labour looks after apprenticeship; the hon. Minister of Education looks after vocational centres, institutes of trade, technological schools, community colleges; and the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) looks after COSTI.

Men and women are wanting to get retraining; they recognize the need for it in this abundant society; and yet, in an examination of Ontario and the Ontario working force, we find that people do not know, that there is a general lack of public knowledge, about training programmes available. That, by the way, is stated in the economic council's review on sustained and balanced economic growth.

What is needed, with the mobility of labour today in this great industrial province, is a manpower agency which is more than a placement service, important as that function is; it should be a key operation agency for implementing manpower policies and it should be the sole co-ordinating agency for all policies and programmes relating to the labour market.

I am afraid that year after year we have pushed on this, and we will in this one as well, and we will in some more until we get this government out of office.

Let me now turn to religion and education. It interests me, in this whole education field, that the hon. Minister, whom we thought was so dynamic and driving, when you look more closely into it you find he is contaminated with the same disease as many others. He believes in evolution rather than revolution, social revolution, in this fast-moving economy of ours.

What about community colleges? I have travelled around this province and I realize that many communities are looking to these colleges as the hope for their young people. They have looked to the hon. Minister of Education to give some new thrusts to the lives of these young people by setting up these colleges, and yet we find that despite all the plans for an announcement, and the seeming haste in which a development was

going to take place, the board of regents were only appointed a few weeks ago. May I say this council or board—the point is they were only appointed a few weeks ago—is a terminal approach. I know the hon. Minister hates that term, but there is terminal education for a number of our young people unless something is done very quickly about these community colleges.

There are fourth year arts and science students who are fooled, who have been misled. They are not sure where they are going to go, and it is all because they were assured there would be community colleges which would be developed and that they would advance into these.

Oh, we will probably get a crash programme. That has been the situation in education for teachers, training and so on; and yet if a government had the idea of looking at methods of forecasting needs, I cannot think of anything more simple that can be forecast than the needs of our young population in education—knowing there is a certain age group that will go into certain institutions and so on, and to plan for that. But, as far as community colleges go, this council of regents are going to have to work with greater haste or else we are going to have a disappointment for many young people.

What about educational TV? Last year we heard how we were going to have a private television station on UHF. We have heard nothing of this—although we have been looking for it. I understand they put a programme on at some unseemly hour in the morning and that is all that it is.

What about teachers' training? We badly need to get teachers' training upgraded. We look at BC, we look at Alberta. What do we find? A committee has been set up.

What do we find about grade 13? I asked the hon. Minister what was the situation about grade 13. We have seen this has been before a committee and then before an implementation committee. There is confusion throughout this province about it and we ask whether in the province's estimates we will have a decision and we are not even assured of that.

A competent educator, and one whom I respect greatly, has said that in the first six years of schooling in this province children are only working 40 per cent of the time. Surely that would be something that would cause concern and be worthy of examination. In this situation we have again a committee; we do not know when it is going to report to us and so on.

We do not know what the community college portends, what its purpose is going to be, but we have a very strong suspicion from the name schools of applied arts and technology.

I say, sir, that if the hon. Minister of Education has weakened because of the pressure of some people who are trying to advise him, who call themselves intellectual aristocrats, if he is being flattered by them and being weakened by them, he is going to make these colleges into really a glorified trade school. If he is doing that it is going to mean that he believes in terminal education, because even industry is saying that. What is needed by young people moving into industry is a broad background. They are going to have to re-train probably three times in their lifetime and they need a broad background in order that they can adjust to particular training and industry wants to do the training itself.

The other reason, of course, is more a spiritual one. It is really more a reflection of what one thinks the purpose of education is. Do hon. members think education is just the learning of some narrow skill or do they think it is the learning of values, of the nature of our society, to have a philosophy?

I would suggest that if the hon. Minister of Education is going to make the community colleges trade colleges, then, sir, he is indicating to us once again where we differ from the Conservatives. He is thinking of an aristocrat or an elite group in society. We like to fight for an egalitarian approach to education.

There are many other areas in education which will be developed, because we are concerned that there is not equal opportunity. This is just a nice fancy slogan that is thrown around the place.

We are concerned about opportunity classes. We are concerned about the culturally deprived children. With the Roberts scheme grade 8, at age 14, is going to be singled out and shuffled one way or the other. Yet we see that there are many children from poor homes who will take a number of years to catch up to the background which other children have. There are many children from new Canadian homes who have language difficulty and if we have a cut-off period that is too soon we might just be continuing a class structure. God forbid we have that in this society, but hon. members opposite may be doing that, for they really have not had the chance, by grade 8, to develop themselves fully. It is to help them in this, so they get a firm, equal start with the others,

that there should be a hard look at having junior kindergartens.

Another area, of course, is in Toronto. I must congratulate the Toronto board of education for the programme they have developed for the physically handicapped and emotionally handicapped. They have moved into word blindness and a number of other areas. Yet we have to expand this equality throughout the province.

When I was in the north this summer I went into a home where there was a young citizen of Ontario who has a problem of co-ordination in seeing. I have heard he could get help in Toronto. There are facilities for helping to teach such a young person in Toronto. But his lot, because he lives outside of Toronto and in the north, is that he just sits in a rocking chair on the verandah and becomes more like a vegetable in this society.

There is no question that the poor child—and I come back again to the aspect of the need for opportunity classes—there is no question that the poor child does not have the same advantages and the same incentives to carry on in education. One out of every two young people aged 19 to 25 whose parents earn \$7,000 or more are attending day school or university; and one out of every five or six children of 19 to 25 of those who earn \$4,000 or less are still studying. In other words, two young people in the 19 to 25 group, if their parents are \$7,000 or over, and only one out of every five or six of the same group with \$4,000 a year—30 per cent of the labour force.

The reason I am mentioning this is to indicate the fact that the unskilled worker's children obviously have less chance or less incentive to take education, and I just point to statistics on this. Thirty per cent of the labour force is skilled or unskilled and only 15 per cent of their children are in the final year of high school. An educator estimates that of the 50,000 to 61,000 teen-age pupils who were dropouts between 1963 and 1964, that of that large number, those thousands, were born of parents with incomes below \$5,000.

In short, what he is saying is that 80 per cent of teen-age education leavers—people who drop out—80 per cent of them, in 1963 to 1964, belonged to a lower income group. The children of the poor income group are not getting the same satisfaction, the same incentive, the same thrust, to go on in education as the richer group. Our concern in this is because we could perpetuate an economic class structure unless we open the opportunity for education to everyone.

Let me come back to the new Canadian child, the child who has come over with his parents in the hope that this will be a new world of opportunity for him. Here we find in the area of school children—and this is from the international institute of Metropolitan Toronto—in the area of school children under 16 there is an urgent necessity for the newcomer to learn English as quickly as possible to get skills for the new society. Yet we find that the international institute says that there is a real difficulty for many of these people to get such English teaching. The programmes now available for this age group are very lean, says the international institute, and many newcomers are suffering from this neglect in terms of their educational prospects.

We go on down the line to the emotionally disturbed child, to the handicapped child, and we find again that there is not an equality of opportunity, Mr. Speaker. There are great gaps in this whole area. We thought the hon. Minister of Education would give a new drive to education in this province. Frankly, as we read the papers, we realize that he is providing a muddying of the waters and a confusion for many of the young people.

What is the future? Mr. Speaker, you have a background in education and I ask you this rhetorically. What would you do if you were teaching a group of young people who had taken—and let me tell you there are 5,000 of these young people who have taken four years of arts and science courses—and then they are told that it is going to be very difficult for them to transfer into a fifth-year course and that there will not be community colleges for them? The five-year students had to take new maths. The fourth-year students did not and because of this it is virtually impossible for them to proceed further. They have been told that there would be new avenues for them and they are feeling that someone is misdirecting them.

I suggest that there is a muddle in grade 13. We asked the hon. Minister about this when we read that two universities were now permitting students, admittedly a small and sample number of them, to move into their universities with grade 12. But there is something wrong in the administration here. Last year there were 12,000 appeals from the final examinations—12,000!

There is muddle and confusion. I know some young people who are thinking: "Well, next year we will not have any grade 13; we will stay out of school for a year, it is a tough and hard exam."

It is up to the hon. Minister of Education

to come forward and to come forward soon with a declaration of what is going to be done, and that is why we are pressing him on this.

We often listen to representatives from the other side tell us that education in this province is ahead in Canada and ahead in the world. I only wish I could say that. The Economic Council of Canada's report says that Ontario is lagging behind B.C. and Alberta, and is far behind the U.S. Within our boundaries, equality of education is meaningless. I refer to Helen Lang, who is senior economic adviser to The Department of Economics and Development—and I am sure she is a very capable lady if she works with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) and we can take her words as being sound and knowledgeable.

An hon. member: I would require—

Mr. Thompson: Well, perhaps we should at that. I have this quote from her; it says:

If we are to ensure a high level of education we must improve the availability in remote areas of our province.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We are now.

Mr. Thompson: Well, when are they going to go about it?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We have been doing it for years.

Mr. Thompson: Then why does she say this, of this year, in her report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: She is looking for more improvements.

Mr. Thompson: In the northwest part of this province and in the northeast section of the province, to give a breakdown on this, 13.5 per cent and 10.8 per cent of the population have less than elementary education. Yet when we take the area around London, the figure is 3.4 per cent of the population; in comparison with 13.5 and 10.8 in the northwest and the northeast area.

Now I know that London has many great advantages—there are educated people—but we would hope that this could spread throughout the province. What are they doing in order to help outside areas? Let me just take Frontenac county. In Frontenac county there are no kindergartens, there are no special classes for the slow learner or for the exceptional child, there is no guidance in the school system, there is no library or bookmobiles. The rural child is very clearly neglected.

Mr. Singer: And the government has been doing it for years, as the hon. Prime Minister says.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I could take the area of welfare. This is in this land of abundance. I am showing these cracks that take place, and frankly the only conclusion I can come to is that, first, there is not a co-ordinated approach, a concerted approach; and, secondly, there is rather a bored attitude about it; as you look at the area of education, a satisfaction.

I noticed you all cheered when I said that Ontario leads in the world—as the government usually says, and yet when it is pointed out to you that there are serious gaps, serious lacks of opportunity in areas of this province, the hon. Prime Minister tells me, Well, we have been doing this for years.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I said that we have been improving the situation for years and any examination of the record will prove what I say to be correct.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I am sorry I did not catch that the hon. Prime Minister said they had been improving for years, but I would say that they have got to make much greater improvements. We are coming up each year to point out that there are still great gaps in regional development in this province.

I want to list these areas which we push for. I picked them out because of the debate in the last session and I want now to move into the welfare area.

We find there, for example, that there is a real need for supervised day-care centres in order that working mothers will be able to have their children looked after. And I remember in the debate last year on this, people said the mother's place is in the home and so on. Well, I spent the summer meeting a number who very definitely feel that they ought to be at home but they have to have day-care centres for their children because they have to work.

There is a need for the Indians and I come back to this, there is a need for an aggressive, hard approach on the part of this government to help the Indians to help themselves. I was glad to hear in the Throne speech that the hon. Minister of Health is now moving into the area of nursing homes, to set certain standards for provincial nursing homes.

Last year we raised this; I visited nursing homes and we read in the paper of old people being shuffled off into nursing homes. I spoke to an association of nursing homes

and as I was speaking, a newspaper reporter said he was being called out because of the maltreatment of some old man in a nursing home and he wanted to cover this case. The hon. Prime Minister would say, Well, we are improving. I would say when we think of some of the situations which we permit our people to endure, that we are far too lax and indifferent about getting on with the improving.

In mental health there are states which are showing a new forward approach. I was glad to read in the *Globe and Mail* this morning of the approach towards mental retardation, and the cottage atmosphere and the development within a neighbourhood. But I have seen, far too often I have seen, people who are mentally ill; and I have seen what facilities are open to them. I have talked to men in the United States where they have developed neighbourhood clinics, and I have told them about the approach on the part of this government where we have people huddled into mental institutions—and this has been a practice year after year—and they are frankly shocked at our treatment of people who are mentally ill.

I would suggest that, in this area—we have talked about retardation—we start looking with a far harder look at our whole approach towards mental health. There can be preventive work done, there is no need for large numbers to be placed in mental homes. In the very first speech I made in this House I had statistics from the welfare council of Ontario describing the large number of old people who were ending their twilight years in the mental hospitals of this province because they had nowhere else to go.

Apart from this area of lack of concern towards people, I think of the disinterest of this province towards environment, which again reflects on people. Air pollution: In the area in which I live there are 740 tons of grime falling annually. In Metropolitan Toronto, they are doing studies where they see that people can no longer live, where they say that it is a danger for the people to be in the area.

Regarding our rivers—the hon. Minister of Energy Resources and Management is not here—we raise the serious problem of polluted rivers, of polluted lakes. I know it is an international question about Lake Erie. It is a real cesspool. There are 2,000 square miles of dead water in Lake Erie.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That description belongs to the hon. member for Bracondale.

Mr. Thompson: I am afraid it belongs to Lake Erie; not only Lake Erie, but Lake Ontario, and there are too many of these areas. I remember that we asked the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management—and I appreciate he is back again—last year about research. Perhaps I was moved to do this, because of the hon. member for Russell, who had told us that, in this age, this government should find out what its resources are, what the problem is, and then it should be able to negotiate, either on a national level or an international level, knowing what it has to do itself and knowing what its problems are.

So I brought this up in the debate when the hon. Minister was presenting his estimates. And I recall him saying, "The trouble with the leader of the Opposition is that he goes after research, he is always after research". And when we asked him about the problems, the extent of pollution in this province—believe me, it is going to be a very real problem, unless something is done about it—he told us, "I drive around," he said, "and I see what is going on, there is no need to worry."

Hon. Mr. Simonett: How about the report; did the hon. leader of the Opposition read it? If he did so, I think he would admit that there has been a considerable amount of work done on pollution throughout the province.

Mr. Thompson: And we read the report and that is why we were concerned. In the report it said that there was a need for viral studies and the report said that unfortunately we do not have a virologist. I understand you have now. The report said that there was a very intensive study to be done by a bacteriologist but unfortunately he left and they had to wait for six months to get another one. And we would hope that that department is going to be much more aggressive about getting facts of our water resources and, secondly, at the extent of the problem. And then you decide how you can deal with the problem?

Last year the hon. Minister said that one industry had been fined. One industry. And yet we know of the extent of pollution that is spewed out into the rivers and the lakes around here. He had a study, in which, I think, 344 industries were named offenders, and yet we do not know up to this date how far they are going in checking this. And may I say that the people of Ontario are becoming more and more concerned.

I was out in Peel on Saturday, talking about this. They have a real problem. You go out to Orleans, a small town outside Ottawa—situated in this country which is rich in its natural resources, in its water—and what have they been doing for four years? They have had to take water by truck, or else they have to boil the water, while the OWRC has been negotiating for four years.

In Peel, I talked to the people there, they do not know how extensive the problem is going to be, getting sewage facilities for their people. The Credit River—one person in Peel described it as an open sewer—could be the most beautiful river.

Fines have to be brought into line with the social cost. I think you have to move further on this, on water pollution. I think you have to go to the federal government and tell them of this problem, and ask that the federal sales tax should be taken off anti-pollution equipment. Similarly, the provincial government should be taking sales tax off, and should be offering guaranteed low interest rates.

This is a problem that demands a concerted approach by this government, by the government in Ottawa, and by the municipalities. What I have been saying, Mr. Speaker, is that we are enjoying today in this province a period of abundance and that this creates greater responsibility on government. It creates great responsibilities on government because, in a period of abundance, there is all the more reason why government should be concerned that there are not gaps—gaps of poverty and gaps of neglect.

I am suggesting, sir, that this government is permitting such gaps, whether with people or regions, because we are not getting together in a concerted approach to analyze our resources and go after the problem, Mr. Speaker.

I am suggesting that this government has become somewhat lax and bored in its governing, and I think that they have approached the rights of the people with a feeling of disregard and, in some cases, contempt. We have seen, sir, in the last session, too many times, the rights of the individual being pushed around by the government.

At the opening of the session we were talking about expropriation problems; men who lived on their land and who had their farms, and hoped they could go to their member in order that they could argue against an expropriation authority. Some people may say that is a small point. To us

it is a vital point that people do not get pushed around.

In the last session we read, and were concerned about, a man who was put in a mental institution, and who was fighting for his freedom. Finally he achieved it, but it was the principle that a free man could be put there by the inactivity of government, and left there, that worries us. And certainly we see situations where there is a disregard towards the investments of the people. We saw Windfall; a crisis developed there and we hear that the government is going to move in in some area now.

What about Atlantic Acceptance? A crisis development—so government is going to move in somewhere. There is bankruptcy in this province. I was interested to talk to the hon. member for Sudbury and my hon. colleague to my right about how active this government was in pursuing and administering its bankruptcy laws. I found that in comparison with the vigorous approach taken by Mr. Wagner we had only part-time staff on this problem, and this is what concerns the people. We have a government that seems indifferent to governing and indifferent to the rights of the people.

I could go on down the line. On workmen's compensation in my own riding: This is what gets people mad, when they see men who want to work in order to keep a family, who want some more retraining. People get mad when we stand up before the hon. Minister of Health and we ask him about the need for hospital beds; and at times he tells us there is no need for hospital beds and yet we hear of people in this metropolitan area who are desperate to get into hospital. People get mad, Mr. Speaker, when they think that there are Ministers of the Crown who have got so far out of touch with reality that they do not realize that they are answerable to the people and that they think it is cute to come in with great long epistles and smother us with their verbosity. They think this is cute.

May I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the people of Ontario are getting fed up—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: So are we.

Mr. Thompson: We are fed up with their cuteness. It is for those reasons, because of their neglect of vital areas and failure to give an equality of opportunity to all the people of the province, and because of their neglect of the rights of the people that I move, seconded by Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South), that the motion moved by the hon. member for

Lambton West (Mr. Knox), be amended by adding thereto the following words:

But that this House

1. Regrets the failure of the government to protect the rights of the individual citizen of the province of Ontario against the ever-growing encroachment of the bureaucratic process;

2. Regrets that the government has declined to co-operate with the federal government in the field of medical care and has failed to provide a universal, comprehensive medical plan for all citizens of Ontario;

3. Regrets the failure of the government to provide equal educational opportunity for all citizens of Ontario;

4. Deplores the attitude of the government towards the rights of those who contribute to the greatness of the province through their labour and deprives them of using the collective bargaining process to improve their pension plans;

5. Regrets the failure of the government to ensure that the farmer receives his equitable share of the fruits of the abundant economy;

6. Regrets the government's neglect in having failed to take the necessary steps to bring into existence effective regional government;

7. Deplores the neglect of the government toward the pressing needs of the northern part of our province and its failure to take positive action to develop a varied economy in that important area;

8. Recommends that in view of the failure of the Fulton-Favreau formula for the amendment of The British North America Act to win universal acceptance in Canada, that the government place in the hands of an all-party committee the problem of devising a scheme of repatriation and amendment of our Constitution, which committee would avail itself of the assistance of the Ontario advisory committee.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I feel a little overwhelmed at the moment. The sweep of that amendment is so great that I feel that I should take an overnight period to examine what, if anything, is left out of it.

Mr. MacDonald moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.45 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 1, 1966

Liability on parents for damages caused by the tortious acts of their children, bill to impose, Mr. Peck, first reading	123
Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, first reading	123
Tabling report No. 3, Ontario law reform commission on personal property security legislation, Mr. Wishart	123
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. MacDonald	129
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Walker, agreed to	153
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	153

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, in the east gallery, students from Dr. F. J. Donevan collegiate institute, Oshawa, and in the west gallery, students from Clarkson public school, Clarkson.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

LIABILITY ON PARENTS

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to impose liability on parents for damages caused by the tortious acts of their children.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. G. R. Carton (Armourdale): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member be kind enough to favour us with an explanation?

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. member for Armourdale asked this question.

This bill is designed to eliminate the increasing incidence of vandalism that is plaguing school boards, councils, recreation and parks commissions, and other public bodies and commissions throughout the province. The glass bills alone of our larger boards of education are running into hundred of thousands every year. School trustee councils and other public bodies have requested that parents should have some responsibility when their children deliberately break windows, destroy school and park property. If this bill passes in the Legislature—and I hope the hon. members will be favourable to this—parents will be liable for an amount up to \$100 for wilful damage to public property by their children. This will go a long way toward cutting down the cost to our municipal taxpayers for this type of vandalism.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. member favour us with an explanation of this bill?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to do so.

The amendment prohibits bodies governing the admission to professions or callings within the province from refusing or suspending memberships because of race, creed, colour, nationality, ancestry or place of origin, and ensures that these bodies are removed from the present exclusions.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to table herewith report No. 3 of the Ontario law reform commission on personal property security legislation.

The presentation of this report to the Legislature gives me some satisfaction for several reasons.

One of the most significant features of the report is that it reflects so deeply the very generous and altruistic work that was done on this project by many dedicated members of the legal profession.

The draft bill, which forms part of this report, was prepared in its original form by a committee of the Ontario section of the Canadian Bar association, made up of Mr. F. M. Catzman, QC of Toronto as chairman, with Messrs. D. E. MacKenzie, J. H. Corrigan, QC, T. A. Wardrop, J. T. Torrance, Professor A. S. Abel and Professor Ian F. G. Baxter. These gentlemen formed the committee that worked for several years to produce a draft bill generally referred to as the Catzman bill, which would make uniform in Ontario the laws relating to security interest in personal property and fixtures.

The work done by this committee is significant because it will assist in bringing

to this province not only a modern and efficient method of securing interest in property, that is, personal property, but it will also greatly facilitate commerce between this province and other jurisdictions. In a time when the financing of our development is so significant I think we must all realize the importance of the legislation which was first proposed as a result of the study by Mr. Catzman and his committee and which, having been further developed, now forms part of the report which I have just tabled.

The principles represented in the draft bill are of great significance to the people of the province, particularly those who are engaged in our financial and commercial community.

For this reason we have considered it most desirable that the draft proposal receive the closest possible scrutiny from all sources. A draft bill has been approved in principle by a committee of the Canadian Bar association under the chairmanship of the hon. R. L. Kellock, QC, and the bill was also the subject of a very close scrutiny by a special conference that was convened at Osgoode Hall law school last spring. All of the recommendations and comments that have been received in these various deliberations have been brought forward and in many cases have been utilized to improve upon the original draft statute. And most recently the Ontario law reform commission has taken the matter under advisement and ultimately it produced the report.

Over the past summer, I caused the report to be reproduced in quantity and we distributed the report as widely as possible to all associations and persons who are interested in this matter. As a result of this wide distribution we have received many comments that have been constructive, and these have all been referred to the Ontario law reform commission for further consideration.

I believe that the hon. members of this House will realize that we have done everything possible to obtain the most constructive criticism upon the proposed bill. We are now in the process of preparing a bill, a modification of, and we think an improvement upon, that contained in the report. We propose introducing it to this Legislature just as soon as it has been developed to the point that we are satisfied it is ready for your consideration.

We are directing our efforts to have that legislation before you at the present sitting of this Legislature. I am sure you will recognize the value of having it most thoroughly reviewed by the various persons working in this area before taking the time of this House in the consideration of this legislation. I would

commend the report to the consideration of all the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, since it will place before them the most significant features of a proposal which merits consideration of all of us.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General will permit a question?

In the report there is reproduced the draft bill which is the Catzman bill in essence, is it?

Presuming that it is, do I gather from his accompanying remarks that there are going to be further substantial changes? I was not quite too clear. We have the Catzman studies, we have had the Bar association studies, we have had the law reform commission studies, and now we are going to have the department studies; to what extent is what we have here going to be similar to what the hon. Attorney General is going to introduce?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, answering the inquiry from the hon. member, if he will observe the report, he will note that it is dated May 28, 1965. It was received shortly after that date. We did not, however, at that time see fit to table it in the House, which was then in session.

The draft bill which forms part of the report is in large part an extension from the Catzman bill, which was produced by the committee referred to in my remarks. Having received the Catzman bill, having studied the representations made, the matter was referred to the law reform commission, perhaps some two years ago. The law reform commission had the benefit of discussions with Mr. Catzman and members of his committee and ultimately produced this report which contains the draft bill. But that was not all we did.

While we were not able to table this report in the last session, it was reproduced in large quantity—I think 2,500 copies. We sent it out to organizations, not only in this province, but all across the country, to law professors, law schools and some jurisdictions outside, for their comment. Mr. Catzman's own committee convened upon it and studied it further. In many areas, the bill in the report does not coincide exactly with the Catzman proposals. Therefore, Mr. Catzman brought forward certain comments and quite a number of constructive criticisms. There were other criticisms received from other bodies.

You will note from the remarks I made that the committee of the Canadian Bar studied this bill and then Catzman met with me on two occasions in recent months. The

suggestions, which were made again and which were in writing, have again been referred to the law reform commission. Mr. McRuer and his commission have been very glad to have those, and have assured me they are most interested in studying them in comparison with the draft bill contained therein. We are expecting comments from the Ontario law reform commission and we have our own commentaries to make in the drafting of legislation.

I realize, of course, that it is for this House in the final analysis to approve the type of legislation which will be enacted in this field. But what I am in effect saying to the House is that since the draft bill which accompanies and forms part of this report was prepared a year ago, considerable study has been carried on since that time. I would anticipate that from the studies of the law reform commission, and from our own studies, we will present a bill which—I think the words I used were “will perhaps be a modification of and we would hope an improvement upon.” I say that with great respect to the law reform commission, but we think an improvement is needed upon the draft bill which is here. But those changes perhaps will not be major; there will be minor amendments, additions and things that have come to light in our discussions and studies since this report was received.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, supplementary to that, perhaps—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I will have to inform the members that on statements before the orders of the day, it is not the practice to have a discussion on the statement. I have allowed a question; I might even allow a supplementary, for the Minister to elaborate on this very complex report. But I must warn the members that they are not to take it as a precedent that such questions and supplementaries will be followed on other statements before the orders of the day.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, without establishing any precedent whatsoever, might I ask the hon. Attorney General as a supplementary question, would it be possible to bring before the Legislature reasonably quickly, the government's idea of what the bill should be, so that it could sit for four or five weeks and again have the benefit of a review of the profession and others interested? It is a complex matter, and that additional period of review of what the government thinks should be its final form, could be very helpful.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think we can do this within what I would consider reasonable time. We expect to have it ready, as I mentioned in my statement, for this session, and I think soon. I feel this legislation, this whole matter, is of such importance that it does need full and perhaps lengthy study in this Legislature. It would even be better to contemplate—if that became necessary—passing the bill through this Legislature without its being finally enacted, rather than to arrive at something that would not serve the purpose.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General permit a further question?

Mr. Speaker: why would it take The Department of the Attorney General this length of time to introduce into the province of Ontario a system for securing personal property interests which is in force in the state of New York and which has been the subject of an independent initiative having nothing to do with his department for a period of nearly six years? It seems to me to be an undue length of time.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Will the member just pursue his question, but not state an opinion?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Attorney General has not been here for six years; something less than two.

Secondly, I do not think it follows that we adopt, *holusbolus*, legislation from the state of New York.

Thirdly, if the hon. member will look at the report which contains the bill, he will see that in section 70—and there are 72 sections in this draft bill, which takes considerable drafting—some six very important Acts now on our statute books are completely repealed. To write into one bill the legislation contained in six important Acts takes some little time and study.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), a copy of which he has had in advance.

Can the hon. Minister give the House a report of the strike situation at the *Oshawa Times*, particularly what role the government is playing in it?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, the first connection that my department had with this matter goes back to July 27, 1965, at which time the services of the conciliation branch in the dispute were

requested and granted. Subsequently there were various meetings at the instigation of the conciliation branch which did not lead to a conclusion or a resolution of the matter and it led to the appointment of a conciliation board on—I think it was—September 14.

The conciliation board had various meetings, and indeed attempted mediation in the course of its proceedings without result. The result is that the dispute was unresolved and the time for strike or lock-out action became available to either of the parties.

Yesterday morning officials of the department met first with the representatives of the union involved and later yesterday were in touch with representatives of the employers, and as a result a meeting was called for today. I believe the meeting is under way at this moment.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis).

In view of a statement made by Dr. J. Wendell MacLeod, executive secretary of the association of medical colleges, that four of Canada's 12 medical college schools have been warned at times during the past ten years that unless their methods were brought up to standards, their graduates would be limited in the kind of work they could perform in the United States—and may I add I hope they do not go to the United States—would the hon. Minister assure this House that none of the four schools referred to by Dr. MacLeod are located in Ontario?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the hon. leader of the Opposition has read his question, I wonder if it would be possible for me to read my answer, although, Mr. Speaker, in this case, I do not need to.

I am anxious to give as much information to the hon. members as I can. The only information I have is from the same press report. We have endeavoured to contact Dr. MacLeod; we understand he is somewhere outside New York city at the present time, so I am not in a position to indicate to the House what he had in mind. We shall endeavour to get some further information.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) that was put to him yesterday. The hon. Minister, unfortunately, was lost in the wilds of Middlesex county. I am glad that he is back today and I hope will be able to give us a satisfactory answer.

Does the hon. Minister consider that the government, through its present or former milk control agency, has any responsibility for payments to milk producers from manufacturing plants that go into receivership or make an assignment?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): The answer is "no", Mr. Speaker.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), notice of which has been given him. What action is the hon. Minister contemplating regarding the Jones report on the reorganization of the Ottawa area, particularly in view of the turn down of the report last night by the city council?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member would read again the last part of the question, because I do not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Young: I said: particularly in view of the turn down.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member repeated words at the conclusion that were not in the question. Would he mind reading the question again, please, as it was submitted to the Speaker?

Mr. Young: The question then, Mr. Speaker, is a simple one. What action is the hon. Minister contemplating regarding the Jones report on the reorganization of the Ottawa area?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, in answer to that part of the question, I may say I am not in a position at the moment to make a recommendation to the Legislature concerning this matter.

The report of the Ottawa-Eastview-Carleton county local government review was presented by myself to the representatives of the concerned municipalities on August 9, 1965. At that time I asked that the municipalities and concerned organizations, local boards, commissions and ratepayers groups, and any persons, groups or organizations with an interest in local government, could feel free to make presentations to us in the department so that we would have the benefit of their examination of this report. I suggested that the date of November 30, 1965, might provide sufficient time for these submissions to be forwarded to the department.

It subsequently became quite apparent that that date was too early and so I extended

the date to January 31, 1966, and I understand that some organizations and some municipalities have not yet submitted their critique, if I may use that term, of the Jones report. That being the case, if submissions come in after this date, we necessarily must examine all of the submissions. I would hope that, before too long, we will be in a position to feel that we have received all of the critiques of the report that are to be sent to us.

We will then, in the department, be in a position to assess these submissions. I expect that I will, myself, meet and consult with the representatives of the municipalities and local boards and those whose submissions would appear to have perhaps more weight than others. Under these circumstances, I do not anticipate that I would be in a position to make an announcement in this connection within the next short while.

Mr. Young: I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit a supplementary question? I would like to ask if he feels that it is possible that legislation might come down during this session in this respect?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I would doubt it very much. There are only 24 hours in the day for me, the same as for everyone else, and being busy in the House and trying to maintain operations in the department makes it a little difficult. I doubt very much if we would have the time to properly assess the report itself—all of the submissions—for this session.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). I read it because I respect the rigidity with which you demand that we follow every word. I would prefer it if I could just ask a free-wheeling question, but I will follow the advice of Mr. Speaker.

Does the hon. Provincial Treasurer know the identity of the U.S.-controlled firms in Ontario which have been affected by the request of Washington that U.S. companies with foreign subsidies report quarterly on their contributions to easing the U.S. balance of payments problem by way of increased exports, lowered investment, and dividends repatriated to the U.S.?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I regret I do not have the information requested by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and so my answer to his question must be no.

I have discussed this matter with the controller of revenue of The Treasury Depart-

ment who informs me that no returns that are made to our department furnish that information.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask a supplementary question? In view of the reaction by Mr. Kierans in Quebec, who showed considerable alarm, is it the intention of the hon. Provincial Treasurer to study the extent to which this will affect the economy of Ontario? Does the hon. Provincial Treasurer have the same approach to the problem as Mr. Kierans?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that I may have greater confidence in the government at Ottawa than Mr. Kierans has.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), a copy of which has been submitted to him. What is the scale of rentals on the Ontario housing corporation units now in the process of completion on Central avenue in Windsor?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member, the scale as it applies to Central avenue includes heat and domestic hot water, and the minimum rental for these units including the services referred to above is \$45 per month and is applicable to families with incomes ranging up to \$189 a month. Rentals then increase progressively in relation to family income, reaching a maximum proportion of 30.2 per cent, when the tenant's family income reaches \$479 per month. And that rental scale used for these units is the same scale which is applicable to all units developed by the Ontario housing corporation. This scale, as I am sure the hon. member knows, was introduced as a national application in Ontario in 1965.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister: Is there a reason for such a great spread between 23.9 and 30.2 per cent in the rentals of these units?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, there is a reason. The scale was set up between the central mortgage and housing authority and the other housing authorities across Canada and it does range from an income of \$189 up to \$479; the percentage increases roughly \$1 more on every \$4 worth of income. One of the things we are investigating now, along with the federal authorities, is the hardships that may be imposed by the 30.2 per cent on the marginal income.

I think in Windsor there is a peculiar problem, where there is a shortage of available private accommodation; these are the people, we feel, who are facing a hardship if we continue with the 30.2. As I say, in talking to the federal authorities, to the Ontario housing corporation, we are now taking a look at that to see if there is any solution.

But I must keep in mind, and I think the hon. member must keep in mind, that we must find some way to encourage these people once their income increases to find private accommodation. That is the reason for the increasing scale.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask another supplementary question. Does the hon. Minister not think that 30.2 per cent is just a little too much to ask people in a subsidized housing accommodation to pay—up to \$145 a month on a \$479 income?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I would say that may be a penalty, if there is no private accommodation available, but if there is private accommodation available the reason for the 30 per cent is to encourage them to find accommodation for themselves, because we certainly do not want to accommodate people who have an income that will permit them to buy from the private developer. We are not in the business to compete against the private developer.

I think the hon. member has a situation in Windsor—and we had one in Hamilton not too long ago—where private accommodation, as I said earlier, is not available. If we do not find accommodation for these people it means they move from perhaps something they enjoy, with a good living standard, into something far less at a higher rent. As their income increases, we think it is our responsibility to encourage them to do business with a private developer. I do not think the scale of income is something that we are going to worry too much about. When they get to that point I think they can look after themselves and we should encourage them to look to the private developer for accommodation.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions for the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), notice of which I trust has been given to him.

1. Does the government interpret The Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act to mean that historic buildings—and I emphasize the word “buildings”—may be designated under the Act?

2. If the answer to question 1 is “no,” has the government given consideration to widen-

ing the provisions of the Act to afford such protection to historic buildings?

3. If the answer to question 1 is “yes,” what historic buildings have been designated under the said Act?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, in two words the answers to the first two questions are “no” and “no.”

However, I might expand that a little bit for the information of the hon. member and the House. Actually, The Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act has nothing to do with assistance towards acquiring and preserving historic buildings. I am informed that it was originally passed in the early 1950s as a result of considerable publicity arising from the discovery of a very early Indian quarry site on Manitoulin Island.

This site was being excavated by the National Museum, and as sometimes happens, amateur diggers swarmed to the site and were apparently interfering with the exploration and also taking away valuable artifacts. With the aim of preventing this, the Act was passed so that the Minister could designate a piece of land in surveyor's terms as an archaeological site of significance. This designation would remain as long as archaeological excavations were taking place.

I think that a total of seven sites have been designated under the Act and perhaps if I give the House the descriptions of them, the meaning would be clearer. They include the Indian quarry site on Manitoulin Island, to which I referred; Cahiague, a Huron village near Orillia; the Forget Indian village site near Wyebridge; Willow Fort near Barrie; the South Burleigh Township Petroglyph site; Tabor Hill site, and the Penetanguishene military and naval establishment site.

Technically, as I say, no consideration is being given to extend the provisions of The Archaeological and Historic Sites Protection Act, but at the moment we are studying the matter of historic buildings around the province. As my hon. friend will perhaps recall, in conjunction with the department of architecture of the University of Toronto, and the archaeological and historic sites board, we have done some surveys in this connection this past year.

An hon. member: What about my site in Moosonee?

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), notice of which has been given.

In the recent sale of the Ontario Northland Boat Line at Timagami, was it a condition of sale that the present service be continued and that service by the new owner be expanded as the permanent population and tourist population expands on the lake?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that one of the conditions of the sale of the Ontario Northland Boat Line at Timagami was that service be continued. I would think that the new owner would expand it to take care of increased business if necessary.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, it is traditional in rising to participate in this debate that members extend to you words of commendation and appreciation for the manner in which you are conducting your very difficult office. I want to say that I join in that tradition, not in any routine sense but with enthusiasm.

I was a little disturbed a week before the session opened to read in one of the articles which was discussing the procedures in this House and some of the rather deplorable features of those procedures, where it indicated that the Speaker of the House was still under the thumb of the government. Mr. Speaker, I will be frank and say that I think there have been occasions in the past, within my memory, when there appeared to be rather conclusive evidence that that was the case. I personally do not think it is the case now, partly because I think the present hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) takes a somewhat different approach than has been the case sometimes in the past, but more important because I think you are exercising your responsibilities in an independent fashion.

I trust that if anything more were needed to make certain that you do that, beyond any shadow of a doubt, the kind of comment that was made in that article would be all that would be required. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I will say this, that I feel this year for the first time since I came into this Legislature, that a combination of you in your position

and the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) as the Deputy Speaker and chairman of the committee, gives us promise that we are going to be able to achieve those heights that I think everybody hoped we might be able to achieve in the conduct of this House. I will say that without prejudice, just in case before the end of the week you and I get into a difference of opinion—which I assure you, Mr. Speaker, if we do, I will know is an honest difference of opinion on your part and I hope you will believe it is an honest difference of opinion on mine.

I turn very briefly to the mover and seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, I think these were about as fanciful a pair of speeches as I have heard in this Legislature in that capacity, since I came into the House in 1955. In fact, I found myself so transported by the poetic flights of fancy on the part of the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) that for a time it was almost as though one were out in a twilight zone, out of touch from reality altogether. The hon. member was presenting such an idyllic picture of Lambton county that there was positively an other-worldly quality about it. Is it possible that the hon. gentleman was gilding the lily a bit?

It is not for me to say, and I am the last person in the world to dispute his enthusiasm for Lambton county, but I will tell him that when I did get back to earth again after that poetic flight of fancy, the thing that intrigued me most was that nugget of history that he had dug out with regard to the fact that a predecessor of his, as member in Lambton West, Timothy Blair Pardee, had been the seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne—and I repeat it just for the hon. members of the House to ponder—in 1874, 1877, 1878, 1882 and then for four consecutive years, 1884, 1885, 1886 and 1887.

My question is, why? Well, this was back in the days of the Liberal regime under Mowat. Is it possible that there was such a family compact within the Liberal regime under Mowat that the goodies, these honours, these traditions, were shared among so very few? I just do not know.

The other question that intrigues me, Mr. Speaker, is, why would one so often be a seconder of the motion and never the mover? Always a bridesmaid and never a bride. I have been delighted with the production of Canadian biography in recent years with regard to the great figures of Canadian history. I think it is one of the delights of those who are interested in Canadian history, but there

is one major gap in terms of a definitive biography of an undoubtedly outstanding figure in Canadian history, and that is a definitive biography of Oliver Mowat and I hope—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Macaulay had one under way but I think he has become too busy to finish it.

Mr. MacDonald: You mean he was doing that as well as his favourite topic of radio-activity?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Maybe I should not make this comment without rising, but I do believe he had a complete framework of a two-volume work on Mowat which we outlined back in the distant days when he and I were back-benchers, but I have not seen anything of it recently.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, how even that dynamic and energetic person was fitting in a biography of Mowat, with his 30 years as premier—just think of the tomes one would have to go through—between the chapters he was writing on the evolution of the atom, I just cannot understand. However, there it is. But I trust when somebody—Robert Macaulay or somebody else—gets at the life of Mowat they will dig out the explanation of Pardee as a repeated seconder. In the meantime, I do not think I am going to have the opportunity or the pleasure of doing it for myself.

I turn now to the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton). Mr. Speaker, I tried hard to follow the course of the good ship Robarts, as he had it meandering across the landscape of the province of Ontario. He described it once again, Mr. Speaker, with such an air of unreality, that quite honestly he did not expect anybody to believe it, even some of his fellow Tories.

Can it be that the hon. member for Armourdale has forgotten, for example, that the good ship Robarts, on one occasion less than two years ago, almost foundered on the rocks of Cass? Indeed, foundered so badly that there were two or three of his shipmates who were threatening to desert the ship on that occasion. Has he forgotten that? Or has the hon. gentleman forgotten that last year the skipper of the good ship Robarts went overseas, and when he came back he discovered that the pension orders had become so mixed that his first mate of the day was sending out conflicting signals; and the first mate and the skipper had to get together on the intercom one afternoon, in order to get the signals straightened out again?

These are parts of the story of the good ship Robarts, but we did not get any of it. I come to the conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that the mover and the seconder this year gave us—and I welcome it—a lighter touch to the Throne debate, but I think it is time for us to get back to reality and I want to congratulate the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson), because he certainly got us back to reality.

Here he gave us once again a display of the Liberal party in mock battle, storming the bastions of Toryism. Amid a cacophony of muted sound and fury, the hon. leader of the Opposition tilted his wooden sword at the government and he charged. He charged for two-hours-and-a-half; his toy guns were blazing and his pea shooters were popping. Is there any wonder, Mr. Speaker, throughout the whole performance, that the government hon. members sat there—to the extent that they could survive the boredom and stayed in the House—and they smiled and smiled. They knew that they were not going to be hurt and neither they were.

To the extent that there was any solid content, I could think of no better adjective to describe it than to borrow that favourite adjective of the hon. leader of the Opposition's predecessor, Mr. Wintermeyer, when he used to refer so often to "platitudinous". Well, we got the platitudes.

Mr. Speaker, the whole attack of the hon. leader of the Opposition had all of the conviction and fight of a personal credo that had been ghost-written, and then notes had been prepared on the ghost-written text.

I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that, in this Throne debate, hon. members on both sides of the House, instead of spinning fanciful tales about the good ship Robarts, hummed to the tune of "The Good Ship Lollipop", that we should get down to some of the true facts of life regarding this government.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this government in the last two years, has been shaken each year by a major crisis. In 1964, we had a storm that broke over the police bill, which led to Cabinet resignations, and threats of resignations from back-benchers. The Cabinet did not know what it was doing, what it was authorizing. It was playing with fire and it did not even know it. The government caucus was equally lax in its scrutiny; most of the hon. members had not even considered the bill before it reached the floor of the House. The Attorney General's handling of the whole issue was so indescribably inept that he became the obvious

scapegoat for the government's whole failure, and so he went.

But the fact of the matter is that, in one evening in this House, this government teetered on the brink of defeat and was shaken to its foundations. Now, one would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that all that would have taught the government a lesson but it did not. In 1965, we had a repeat performance on the pension issue. The hon. Prime Minister announced in September what this government's policy was with regard to pensions and their integration. Then he went overseas, and he returned to find a public storm raging. I quote, for example, from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of December 10, when it states that:

Mr. Robarts had earlier told reporters that, as far as he knew, municipalities that operate pension plans outside the provincial scheme would be free to integrate or stack the Canada pension plan as they saw fit.

The simple fact of the matter is that this was not government policy. It was in contradiction to the policy which he himself had enunciated two months before. But he apparently had forgotten about it.

So we had columns and headlines in the paper: "Spooner sticks to his guns on integrating pension plan. Defies uproar. Briefs Robarts."

What an unseemingly spectacle, that the first mate of the day should be bringing the hon. Prime Minister up to date on a policy which he had enunciated two months before. I quote again from the news story:

Mr. Spooner called the reporters to his office after a telephone conversation of nearly 30 minutes with Mr. Robarts.

Later in the afternoon, after the discussion had taken place, Mr. Spooner repeated the same policy he had expressed two days earlier. Asked if Mr. Robarts now agreed he said, "That's a very complicated field".

That's fielding the curves.

"I might tell you I suggest you call the Prime Minister again."

That is the kind of situation we have had from this government, Mr. Speaker. And back-benchers were equally in the dark.

Hon. members in Metro were invited—last November, if I recall correctly—to a meeting sponsored by a committee of CUPE, and the police and the firemen's association, in the community hall in North York. One of the hon. members on the government side of

the House, who appeared to be acting as the spokesman, at one point intervened and said that surely there was nothing wrong with the government altering the pension plan which they themselves had set up, but they were not going to interfere with the private pension plans; and of course we in the Opposition have to say that that is precisely the problem.

All private pension plans have to be approved by the department of the Minister; and if they become approved by the Minister, they become "approved pension plans" and they too are subject to the dictates of this government. So I assured the hon. member that if he felt a little embarrassed by discovering that he simply did not know what the government policy was, he should not be too embarrassed because the hon. Prime Minister the day before had revealed the same ignorance of the government policy, though he, himself, had announced it two months earlier in September.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive of anything more confused and bemuddled than that kind of situation. I thought that Judy LaMarsh had made about as big a jumble, a mess, of the pension issue in Ottawa as any human being might possibly do, but I must concede the palm to this government—they outdid Judy. Their confusion last fall was certainly greater.

But the point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, is this:

These are only two dramatic public revelations of the confusion and contradiction which characterizes so much of the policy of this government and its administration.

Last spring, Professor Krueger of Waterloo University spoke to a conference on regional development in the Royal York hotel. He delivered a speech that was based on a private report which this government had had and which it never yet has had the courage to make public. Hundreds of people at that convention listened to Professor Krueger as he gave an account of overlapping responsibilities, of inefficient, and therefore costly, administration of departments warring against each other like rival empires. I heard one person who had listened to Professor Krueger say that it had a positive Gilbert and Sullivan touch. It is the kind of thing you wanted to laugh at if it were not so serious.

This kind of situation can be resolved. As I said last year in discussion of the estimates of The Department of Economics and Development, it can be resolved only when the Prime Minister of the province, at the Cabinet level, knocks a few heads together and

resolves the conflicts among Ministers who are in the warring departments that operate as though they were competing empires. Until the hon. Prime Minister of this government does that they can continue on the government side to talk about such major objectives as effective regional government, they can continue to talk about moving towards regional economic development, but they will never be able to achieve it. As Professor Krueger said, it is impossible to achieve these major objectives until you resolve the chaos which exists at the provincial level at the present time.

The simple fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that we have got a horse-and-buggy administration under a Tory government that has been here for 22 years. We have moved into the jet age and the horse-and-buggy administration is not good enough.

Is it surprising, therefore, that loyal friends of the government have begun to refer to the Robarts Cabinet as "weary and old"? That is a quote from a *Globe and Mail* editorial—not my observation. The fact of the matter is that there is more dead wood in this Cabinet than there is lying around behind the barns of the abandoned farms in rural Ontario. Is it surprising that even friends of this government refer to it as solid—yes, it is as solid as a block of cement—but dull and unimaginative? Is it any wonder that the Throne speech reads with about as much inspiration as a laundry list of unfinished business?

I suggest that when the people of Ontario awaken to just how poor a government they have got, and bury it at the polls, as one day they will do, the appropriate plaque for the grave of this government will be, "In the fullness of time they got around to studying—studying the problems of the people but the people could not wait any longer".

The simple fact is that this government is not meeting the challenge of our day. It is not meeting the challenge in two areas that I want to pick by way of illustration—not in any sense as an exhaustive review; there will be opportunities later in the session.

The government is doing something. I will be fair and say it is doing more, in some instances, than was being done before. But the adequacy of public policies cannot be measured simply by the fact that something more is being done, even something more than in the past. It has to be measured in terms of whether enough is being done to cope with, and to solve, the problems of today, and develop fully the potential of our human and our natural resources. We are

failing to do that—tragically, in some instances.

Let me illustrate my point by referring to two areas—first in the scandalous prevalence of poverty amid our affluence, and secondly in the field of education and manpower training.

Mr. Speaker, the public of Canada today are slowly but surely becoming aware of the stark reality of widespread poverty affecting one quarter of our population. Who are the people who do not share equitably in the affluence of modern-day North America?

I think first of the hundreds of thousands of people who live on various kinds of categorical assistance—the old, the sick, the disabled, the widowed. Theirs is a subsistence existence. Often it involves the indignity of the means test. Even where rehabilitation is possible, rarely does it assist people to regain the dignity of self-supporting, gainful employment.

The Canada assistance plan will put this patchwork of categorical assistance on a more efficient basis. Conceivably it will humanize it in some degree by substituting a needs test rather than the means test. But Mr. Speaker, the Canada assistance plan will do nothing to reach beyond the present patchwork and maintain family incomes for those who do not fit into any of the present categories.

We have no sickness and accident benefit programme to cover those who are ill, who are hurt off the job. Professor Linden's study reveals that one of the greatest hardships faced by those victimized by car accidents arises from the fact that families receive little or nothing in the most vital area of concern—loss of family income when the breadwinner of the family is off work for some time.

Let me turn to another area of widespread poverty—our rural communities. Consider the results, for example, of the rural research study completed in eastern Ontario by the ARDA branch of the federal Department of Forestry. Here is an area where one-third of the income levels are such that no income tax is paid; where the per-capita welfare payments are twice the provincial average; where a survey of marginal farms revealed that 24 per cent in Lanark county are ready for abandonment or absorption—the figure in Leeds is 30 per cent and the figure in Glengarry is 63 per cent—where educational levels are such that 30,000 people over 15 years of age have no more than four years of formal schooling. This is Ontario, Mr. Speaker—indeed your part of Ontario, eastern Ontario—where, in summary, 30,000 to 40,000 people

and 2.5 million acres of land are urgently in need of being rescued.

The point is that the federal study revealed these conditions, but the responsibility for doing something about it rests with this province. I am informed by our ARDA branch that it is the intention to put four or five rural development officers into the field in eastern Ontario. Fine; but obviously, Mr. Speaker, much more is needed than a few rural development officers. If we are serious, the situation demands a massive effort of regional economic development along the general lines of TVA in the United States or along the lines of the current Gaspé project in eastern Quebec. Our regional development associations have never been geared to do this job. The government has been toying with them. When are they going to make them effective organizations—they or some other body? Speaking to a conference on poverty and planning, sponsored by the Woodsworth memorial foundation just a week ago here in Toronto, Professor John Morgan emphasized that the war on poverty involved two different objectives. One is the long term, the kind of economic and social development which will assure us that we are not recreating the next generation of poor while pretending to do something for this generation, that we must rescue these people from a culture of poverty which reproduces itself with the result that the children of today's poor are doomed to become tomorrow's poor.

But the first step to avoiding that tragic possibility is to make certain that this generation of poor is rescued from its poverty and given an opportunity to share equitably in the wealth of this province and this nation. Instead of talking about this or that programme which might help, has the time not come to recognize the fact that this quarter of our population is mired in poverty for the simple reason that the people have not got enough money? Instead of talking about this or that programme, perhaps we should get down to the point that they need money.

I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that money is not the only answer to the problems created by poverty, but it is the first and the basic answer. Why do we not recognize that fact and shape public policies to meet it, instead of skirting around all the issues with this proposal or that palliative?

We must face the fact, Mr. Speaker, despite any impression to the contrary, that our tax structure in Canada is so regressive that it has not resulted in any significant redistribution of income, and this basically is what is required.

I was not surprised, at this conference a week or so ago, to hear Finance Minister Mitchell Sharp, with his well-known right-wing philosophy, dismiss this contention as irrelevant, and not get down to anything so basic as making certain that we establish a genuine redistribution of income. Not for Mr. Sharp. He urged that we should concentrate on devising programmes to meet the needs of the poor, a sort of state-operated, community chest approach—this palliative, that kind of programme.

Repeatedly throughout that conference, Mr. Speaker, what caught my attention was that we were urged to face up to this basic solution, and it was interesting to note the frequency with which representatives of the academic world—such as Professor Morgan of the school of social work, whom this government has used on many occasions as a consultant, or Professor Melville Watkins of the department of political science at the University of Toronto—suggested that the answer may well lie in the new proposal of a negative income tax, something which is being actively considered in Great Britain today.

This is the technique, Mr. Speaker, whereby everybody files an income return. If their income is above the level deemed adequate in the face of our cost of living to maintain a family, then they pay an income tax; and I trust it will be on a more progressive basis than the one we have got at the moment. But if anybody's income return indicates that they are living below the designated level, then they do not pay any tax; instead they receive whatever amount is needed to bring them up to that designated level.

In one fell swoop, Mr. Speaker, this kind of technique, this kind of proposal, would wipe out the patchwork of categorical aid that we have at the present time. It would meet the needs of those who are missed because they do not fit into this or that category. It would maintain family incomes which drop because of health or accident, or the failure of car insurance to meet income needs when the breadwinner is idled. It would lift areas, like the widespread rural poverty of eastern Ontario, above the poverty level. Indeed, it would provide, in advance, an answer to how we maintain family incomes and distribute the collectively produced wealth of a technological age in which, we are now told, all of our needs can be met by the production of a small fraction of our workers in the very foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, I do not advance the negative income tax at the moment as a definitive proposal. The technical difficulties in applying

it will have to be examined carefully. Furthermore, in a federal state like Canada, where welfare is a provincial responsibility, and income tax has been for the most part centralized with the federal government, there are constitutional problems that will have to be faced. But, Mr. Speaker, this proposal provides a fundamental solution to the problem of poverty, not simply a palliative. This or some other technique must be devised to achieve an effective redistribution of income, which is the first and the basic answer to the question of poverty if we are going to be serious in our efforts to eliminate it and not just toy with the problem.

But whatever be the technique for achieving it, the objective in our war on poverty, the objective which public policies must meet, is to provide a guaranteed annual income below which no family will be able to slip into poverty. I want to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that this has been the stated objective of the New Democratic Party ever since it was founded in 1961; indeed of the CCF before that.

I suggest that when the Carter report on taxation becomes available at the federal level, when the Smith report becomes available in Ontario, we should enunciate this objective and reshape our taxation structure and related social policies to be able to achieve something approaching a guaranteed annual income for people.

Let us not kid ourselves for one moment. So far the so-called war on poverty is nothing more than a few skirmishes that have verbally been escalated into a war. Mr. Speaker, a verbal war is not going to meet the needs of the poor. Our needs, if we are going to meet the challenge of our day, is for a fundamental solution which will assure us that this generation of poor does not helplessly recreate itself, and so far this government has hardly got into the skirmishes, let alone getting into the total efforts to solve that problem.

I turn to a second area, Mr. Speaker, in which I want to discuss problems related to another example of how this government is simply not facing up to the challenge of our age, and that is in the field of education and manpower training. I recognize that all those who hum along on the good ship Robarts will find it a little unbelievable to attack the educational programme of this government; they might even think it is unfair; but I think the time has come to point to its weaknesses and its inadequacies and I am prepared to attempt to document them.

First, Mr. Speaker, let us get our achievements in the educational field into perspective. About a year ago, Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, who is now head of Ontario's institute of educational research, and one of the most thoroughly knowledgeable people in this field, made the startling statement that Ontario's educational system is 50 years behind the times. Faced with this statement in cold print, I imagine Dr. Jackson was mildly embarrassed; but, to his credit, when queried, he stuck to his guns. Five years ago, he explained, we were 100 years behind the times.

Now, what I want to suggest to hon. members on the other side of the House is, instead of dwelling so much on the point that we have caught up significantly in the last five years, I would suggest that the time has come when this House should concentrate on the fact that educationally we are still 50 years behind the times. As I suggested earlier, the adequacy of public policies must be judged not in terms of how much more we are doing now than what we did five years ago, but to what extent our efforts are meeting the needs of this day.

John Porter has made the same point in *The Vertical Mosaic*, his brilliant analysis of social classes and power in Canada:

Both the quantity and quality of education will determine a society's creative potential.

—Professor Porter suggests. And then he adds this:

No society can move into an industrial epoch with so much of its creative potential incarcerated in ignorance.

Then he points to the root of our problem. I suggest that Tories, and the Liberals who think that we have not had a class structure up until now, just reflect on this: Traditionally, Ontario has had a class-bound educational system, as exemplified by the academic collegiate system in Ontario paralleling the classical college system in Quebec.

While any child, whatever his family status, might get through our academic system, and if somehow or other he is able to cope with the financial problem, could proceed to university, the whole system was nevertheless designed to meet the needs of only the professional classes. In short, our collegiate system has met the needs of a small percentage, the six per cent, maybe now eight or ten per cent, of those who are seeking a professional career, while traditionally ignoring the needs of the more than 90 per cent who have pursued a trade or

gone directly to the labour market. Only recently have we faced this fact, and it is inevitable that in attempting to catch up on 50 years in five that we should have fallen far short of our goal.

Let me say right at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that I think the time has come when The Department of Education and The Department of University Affairs should each have its own Minister, a separate Minister, a different Minister. Both departments are big, and growing. It is impossible for one man to handle both, even a man of the kinetic energy and dedication to the task of the present hon. Minister (Mr. Davis). The consequences of this kind of impossible burden are becoming more and more apparent. Let me deal with a few of them.

First, we are taking too long to come to grips with problems that cry out for immediate solution. Second, there is a revival of smug unconcern for mediocre achievement, a tendency to hide the real problems with optimistic statements that are not justified by the fact.

For example, in the first category, this government finally indicated a willingness to grapple with the controversial issue of religious education in our schools. It established a committee and it chose as its head the man who may well be the best suited of any man in the province of Ontario in my view, Keiller Mackay; but it has taken this government a year—we are into another session—before it appointed the committee. Indeed, the committee was formally announced only yesterday by the hon. Minister in this Legislature.

Mr. M. V. Singer (Downsview): What is the NDP position on that subject?

Mr. MacDonald: Our position has been well known for a long time.

Mr. Singer: Not once in this House, not once, has the hon. member said it.

Mr. MacDonald: There is no justification for this kind of procrastination, once the government decided to grasp the nettle.

Another example, Mr. Speaker: There is a growing concern today about the aims of education in our day. Once again the government set up a committee, headed by Mr. Justice Emmett Hall. It is no reflection on this distinguished Canadian, who has real achievements to his credit in the line of public service, apart from those as a jurist, to remind the House that he is not an expert in the field of education. All the more serious,

therefore, that the committee has not a full-time staff to assist with the work. It is not good enough to have departmental personnel carry the committee's staff work as an added responsibility to their regular duties.

Many of the public representations which have been made to the committee in its recent hearings are, at best, peripheral concern in assessing the aims of education. I do not want to prejudice the work of this committee, Mr. Speaker, but the time has come, I feel, to express a growing public concern as to how effectively this important question can be answered by this committee, given its present limited resources and the manner in which it is operating.

But the classic case, Mr. Speaker, of this government's failure to grapple with a problem, after years of growing public concern, is the whole range of questions relating to grade 13. The hon. Minister may make a virtue of necessity by welcoming each university that establishes its own entrance qualifications on some basis other than a grade 13 certificate but that does not hide the fact that the situation is fast becoming chaotic. In the absence of government leadership, everybody is going his own way.

One news story the other day carried a rather plaintive note, that the hon. Minister was worried about those universities which have decided to take students from grade 12—because, said the hon. Minister, if the students should drop out of university at a later date, they would have no high school certificate. Well, Mr. Speaker, what about a junior matriculation certificate for graduates of grade 12, something that you have in every other province across this country?

The public outcry with regard to grade 13 results this past year has only underlined the need for clarifying without delay the transition from secondary school to the post-secondary institutions. We cannot afford to have a protracted, year-to-year consideration of the report of the grade 13 committee. The transition to post-secondary educational institutions is difficult enough for many young people; it should not be made more difficult by a lack of government initiative to clarify it.

Prolonged delay is creating a mood of exasperation which I suggest is getting a little dangerous. I was interested in an editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* which suggested this yesterday. The new chairman of the Toronto board of education, Barry G. Lowes, captured some of that feeling in his inaugural speech to the board when he said, of grade 13, "It is vestigial. It is an anachronism. The sooner we stop pecking at its carcass

with committees and give it a swift burial, the better." In other words we are getting to the point, Mr. Speaker, where whatever good there exists in grade 13—and there is some—is going to be thrown out with the bad, because this government has not given the kind of leadership that is necessary to clarify the situation.

But let me turn now to a second serious consequence that flows from the overburden of work upon one Minister in these two important departments. There is a most disturbing revival of the past practice of burying serious problems under pronouncements of complacent unconcern.

For example, the Throne Speech contains the statement that "the necessary supply of elementary and secondary school teachers continues to be recruited." Well, Mr. Speaker, that statement is reminiscent of years ago when the then Minister of Education used to defend the crash programmes to fill the teacher ranks with graduates from summer courses, and even argue that some of the province's best teachers were these relatively untrained recruits. I stood in this House and listened to that very statement being made.

What is the situation at the moment? Metropolitan Toronto has long been in the best position to "cream the crop," so to speak, of the province's teacher supply. Yet in this best-off area, Gertrude Fatt, assistant superintendent of secondary schools in Toronto, recently stated that 25 per cent of Toronto's secondary school teachers were new to the profession last September. That 25 per cent comprises graduates of the crash summer training programme. Therefore, Miss Fatt emphasized, "one sixteenth of our secondary school teachers have virtually no experience and are virtually untrained." She added that the problem will be worse next year because there are not enough qualifying as secondary school teachers.

According to the Don Mills *Mirror*, December 8, 1965, there are in North York this year 20 teachers who began their career with no professional training, and 99 with only eight weeks' training. The curriculum committee of the North York board reported that altogether there are 306 teachers with less than two years' experience teaching in junior high schools and collegiates.

At the holiday meetings of the Ontario secondary school teachers federation, a survey report was presented which revealed that last year 5,000 teachers joined the ranks of the secondary school teachers in the province of Ontario, and at the same time 3,000

left. The teaching profession apparently has developed a drop-out problem which is as great as that in the secondary school classes today.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I was very interested to notice in yesterday's *Globe and Mail* a letter to the editor from Tom McCusker, of the public relations committee of the Toronto district of the Ontario school teachers federation, in which he was commenting on the editorial based on Miss Fatt's comments in this connection. He added a couple of significant points.

Of the 3,000 people who left the profession, 1,200 gave excessive work load as their prime reason for leaving. "The profession therefore is proving itself unable to keep its experienced teachers", said Mr. McCusker. And he added a second point. "Large numbers of highly experienced teachers have been leaving the Toronto system." Just consider this, Mr. Speaker, as a former school teacher: "In 1950, the median experience of Toronto teachers was 25 years; in 1965 the median experience of Toronto teachers was three years." That gives you some idea of what is happening to the teaching profession.

All this comes at a time when the development of our community colleges will draw from the already inadequate ranks of secondary school teachers. At both the university and secondary school levels our teacher supply situation is obviously one that should not be slurred over with such disarming statements as the words put in the mouth of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor that "the necessary supply continues to be recruited." It simply is not being recruited.

There are a number of other areas in education where developments have been slow and—even worse—of a disturbing nature as far as they have gone. For example, community colleges. There is an urgent need for establishing these institutions by the fall of 1966. This year the first graduates of the four-year course which was launched in 1962 will be seeking an opportunity for further education. As yet, no community college has been designated anywhere in the province of Ontario. I discovered, and I checked earlier this morning, that there will be a meeting later this month, at which conceivably the first one will be designated. Already graduates from the four-year course in Metro have found that they have graduated from grade 12 and have reached a dead end. Ryerson has raised its standards and they have nowhere to go.

Even more disturbing, Mr. Speaker, is another feature of the proposed community

colleges. I do not think I am misrepresenting the situation. Certainly it is a reaction that is increasingly and widely accepted, and if I am wrong, it is time that this government corrected it.

Last winter there was a major public debate on whether the community college should be restricted to the technological field or whether there would be a core of basic academic courses which might ease the overcrowding of our universities by providing an opportunity for taking the first two years of arts closer to home with later transfer to a university. The hon. Minister appeared to take a middle course last year and even now he will undoubtedly argue that transfers can be made on an individual basis. But these transfer arrangements are so very vague, and combined with them there is growing evidence that the community colleges are being downgraded to an almost strictly technically oriented education.

The most conclusive proof of this, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is to be found in the recent announcement of the personnel of the council of regents for the community colleges. In the face of the urgent need for these institutions, once again the government took almost a year to establish the council of regents, which presumably is going to guide the destinies of this whole new development. Quite apart from that delay, there is only one academic person of any stature among them. It is no personal reflection on the remainder of that council to say that they are relative nonentities in the educational world.

In an article in the current issues of the *Canadian Forum*, David Stager, dean of men at New College in the University of Toronto, put the point succinctly in his outline of the objective of these new institutions:

The community college overcomes the geographic and cultural barrier of distance from an educational institution. The unique feature of the community college is that it puts two years of vocational, general and transfer courses at the post-secondary level within daily commuting distance.

If the Ontario community colleges, this important new development in our educational system, are to be restricted as much to the vocational and technical field as developments suggest—and this is certainly a matter which we are going to have to pursue later in this session—we are in danger of losing the kind of balance in educational opportunities which the community colleges originally offered, certainly when they were given the name of applied arts and technology. The word “arts” in is there.

But nowhere, Mr. Speaker, has our progress in the educational field been more tentative and uncertain than in the vitally important role of providing the necessary skills to maintain our economic development. The second annual report of the Economic Council of Canada speaks in emergency terms of the situation that this nation faces. Detailed studies, such as that of Metropolitan Windsor, confirm the general problem, that 48 per cent of the unemployed have no education beyond elementary school.

The Ontario economic council has sounded the same alarm, Mr. Speaker. But what is being done about it?

Nearly two years ago, for example, this government dangled a bit of election bait in the Riverdale byelection—which the voters of that riding rather intelligently brushed aside when they sent an NDP member to this House—by announcing that it was going to build a new adult training centre which would serve the needs of this great metropolitan area of Toronto. Inevitably it would also serve as a pilot project in the relatively uncharted field of adult training and upgrading of skills. This government, characteristically, is still bogged down in trying to find a site for the new building. How long is this inexcusable delay going to go on, in face of such urgent needs?

At the recent federal-provincial conference, held in Ottawa on poverty and opportunity, The Ontario Department of Economics and Development presented a rather illuminating paper. I read it with great interest. I quote:

The most immediate task for government—

says a department of this government:

—if it intends to promote the full utilization of manpower resources, both actual and potential, is that of undertaking a skill inventory of the current labour supply and demand situation. Thereafter—

in other words, only when that has been done:

—an assessment of the future will be possible. It also will then be possible to start on a manpower programme on a sufficiently planned basis.

Mr. Speaker, what has this government done on a skill inventory of the current labour supply and demand? What has the federal counterpart done at Ottawa? Let us face it, we are drifting around like a rudderless ship, even in face of the emergency cry of the Economic Council of Canada at Ottawa and here in Ontario, about the restrictions being placed on our economic development by a shortage of skilled manpower. We have not

even got the course charted so that we can tackle this problem.

Nowhere is this government, and the Liberal government in Ottawa, failing so completely to meet the challenge of our day as it is in this field. When are we going to take it seriously? At this point we are not even in a position to start, as The Department of Economics paper stresses, because we do not know what we have and what we need by way of skills. We have taken no inventory of our skills — the absolute prerequisite of developing a manpower programme.

The Department of Labour is now turning out what appears to be, Mr. Speaker, a veritable flood of new publications on what it describes as OJT — on-the-job training. But the amount of on-the-job training is pathetically inadequate. The kind of programme that emerged in LEAP, that Leaside education assistance programme, is outstanding, not only for its content, but more important and significant, for its rarity. Industry may generally be aware of the need, just as much as this group of industries in Leaside, but it is unwilling to pay the price or take the lead. I suggest the time has come when the demands of our economy are so urgent that management must accept its responsibility in this field, and we cannot hope to meet it by importing our skills and robbing other countries of their needs, while we are failing to develop our own.

I suggest the time has come when industry must be faced with its responsibility. I suggest that industry should be taxed specifically for manpower training. Wherever industry accepts its responsibility to train workers, it should be given a rebate on that tax. When it does no training, nothing should be returned. It is better that the training should be done on the job, with industry meeting its own needs, but experience has proved conclusively that there must be an economic incentive to encourage acceptance of that responsibility, except in a few sporadic cases across the province of Ontario.

There is a final area in the field of education where the attitude and policies of this government stand in the way of making opportunities more fully available, and that is the question of university fees. Some years ago, the hon. Prime Minister told a student group at Toronto campus that he was opposed to free education at the university level, because it did not jibe with his party's concept of free enterprise. The latest version of that outmoded philosophy was when the hon. Prime Minister repeated assertions last fall that higher education is a privilege, not

a right, and presumably, therefore, a privilege whose availability bears a direct relationship to the wealth of the family.

The New Democratic Party rejects this philosophy. It is as false today in opposing the removal of financial barriers to higher education as it was 100 years ago when it was used to oppose the establishment of public education, first at the elementary, and later at the secondary level.

But for the moment, I am not going to review all the arguments pro and con. I want to point out to this House how manageable is the financial burden involved in abolishing university fees.

This year, student fees across the whole of Canada represented an outlay of \$90 million to \$100 million. Now that the federal government has begun to accept its responsibilities for financing higher education, at least to some degree, I would suggest it is a fair proposition that half of that cost should be accepted by Ottawa. That would leave \$50 million to be met by the provinces. The share for Ontario of such a provincial commitment would be in the range of one-third, roughly \$17 million. Last year, the outlay for Ontario in capital and operational grants to the universities was \$163 million. This year, it undoubtedly will be higher.

Does anybody really believe that with an expenditure of that amount—\$163 million—this province could not afford \$17 million more, particularly when abolition of fees would remove the last dollar sign from higher educational opportunities at the university level?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The analysis is completely false.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. gentleman thinks my analysis is completely false, I invite him to get up on his own time in the Throne debate and deal with the issue, because perhaps he can—

Mr. White: That is what you are saying.

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps he can say where he stands and whether or not he agrees with his hon. leader, his co-partner from the city of London, that higher levels of education are a privilege and not a right.

No one can deny that in this province there are thousands of people who never seek entrance to university because they know far in advance that it is financially out of the question.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Oh, nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: This province cannot afford to leave so much of its human potential undeveloped. Some years ago, in a book entitled *Canada's Crisis in Higher Education*, by Dr. R. W. B. Jackson and W. G. Fleming, these two authors concluded, and I am quoting:

We seem to do an admirable job of squandering the priceless human resources available to us. In fact it can be argued on the basis of information at hand that we are utilizing to the full the talents of no more than one-third of our academically gifted young men and women.

If we have failed to utilize the two-thirds, of the academically gifted young men, how much more tragic has been the squandering of our priceless human resources when we recall that it is only in the past few years that we have seriously attempted to make technical education available to the majority of our young people whose inclinations may lie in that direction.

This province simply cannot afford the roadblock of an outmoded Tory philosophy. Any government which considers something as important as higher education to be a privilege, and not a right, is living in the past, and with it we can never adequately meet the challenge of our day.

I turn, in the concluding portion of my remarks, to discuss a number of topical issues. I want to discuss them within the framework of a common theme. At this moment, Ontario along with the whole of the North American continent, is enjoying a period of economic expansion; our unemployment levels are low. When one has said that, I do not think one should forget that within the low unemployment figures you have a hard core of the unskilled who have in fact become derelicts cast up in the labour market, and this government is doing pathetically little to rescue them from that position of a derelict.

There is a growing shortage of skilled labour; in some sectors we now have more jobs than there are workers. For the majority of our people the problem is not a job. They have that. Their problem is how to make their income meet their family needs and they are facing a losing battle with rising costs of living. Every time they get a wage raise, it achieves little more than to catch up on the cost of living increases they have experienced in the last year or two. Very little gain has taken place in income.

As a consumer, Mr. Speaker, the average person is relatively defenceless to protect his budget from the pillaging of unnecessary

middlemen, the fast buck artist and the unnecessarily high cost of vital services such as medical insurance and car insurance. Traditionally the government has not accepted an obligation to protect the consumer. Need I remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that no more than a couple of years ago this government was faced with a situation with regard to the used car field and it had to be blasted by headlines out of its lethargy and disinterest before it finally faced up to it and did something about it? Up until then they said it was the responsibility of the individual to protect himself by going to court.

We have set up a consumer credit committee. I had the honour to be a member of that committee, one of the most enjoyable and I think, effective committees that I have ever sat on during my time in this Legislature. This committee has presented a report which the Throne speech says is going to be translated into legislation. I look forward with almost bated breath to see how much of that report this government will have the courage to implement. But even if it implemented all, Mr. Speaker, it is only a beginning. In this field, this Tory government is just living in the past.

Let me try to make the point that I am going to present to all of the hon. members here by first reminding them of the cost of living index in Canada today and its components. Between the month of October, 1964, and October, 1965, the cost of living in Canada rose by 2.7 per cent, but the breakdown of the various components in that is even more interesting. Here they are:

Transportation 5.2 per cent; health and personal care 4.1 per cent; food 3.6 per cent; clothing 2.1 per cent; recreation and reading 2.1 per cent; housing 1.7 per cent; tobacco and alcohol 1 per cent. The two largest components of that rise in the cost of living, I would remind the House, were transportation and health care. Let us take a look at each of those.

In the instance of transportation we find a further breakdown reveals that taxi fares went up 9 per cent; street car and urban bus fares went up 9 per cent; gasoline prices went up 4.2 per cent, but the major source of the pressure in this highest contributing factor to our rise in the cost of living in the past year came from car insurance which rose 26.5 per cent during the past year.

I do not propose to deal at length with this issue here. There will be plenty of opportunity later in the session and I can assure you we in this group are going to

avail ourselves of it. But if further proof were needed both of the cost and the shocking inadequacy of private car insurance, it is now available in the Linden report. Professor Linden took the county of York in 1961 and did a sampling of about 1,200 accidents in which there was personal injury. The total economic loss of all those accidents in the county of York in 1961 was estimated conservatively at some \$15 million.

What happened in face of that \$15 million economic loss? Thirty-seven per cent of it, Mr. Speaker, was compensated by insurance companies or from the accident benefit fund—only 37 per cent. Twenty-three per cent of it was compensated by other third-party compensation on a non-fault basis, such as hospital insurance or workmen's compensation or life insurance or accident insurance. For the remaining 40 per cent, there was no compensation at all.

In short, Mr. Speaker, from this detailed study that gets down to the guts of the matter as to exactly what happens with the economic loss that the person sustains, private insurance meets only a little more than one-third of the loss, and 40 per cent of the loss is not compensated at all.

I will concede immediately that there are many factors involved in the high cost of car insurance and some of these are not the responsibilities of the insurance companies, but I suggest that most of them can be made the responsibility, in part if not wholly, of this government—in terms of safety precautions and the construction of cars and things of that nature.

Two or three years ago—or was it four or five years ago? I have lost count—even this government became persuaded of the inadequacy of private automobile insurance in this province and our unsatisfied judgment fund. The government set up a committee, and that committee brought in a report. The recommendations of that committee have been gathering dust for years while this government does nothing to protect the consumers of this province in this particular area.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) was chairman.

Mr. MacDonald: Right, the hon. Provincial Treasurer was chairman.

I was very interested in the hon. member for Lambton West who went off in that idyllic little outburst of his in which he describes select committees as grass roots democracy, as the government going down to the

people to find out what their views or problems are and helping to shape the answers. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that if this government continues a practice which they have done to such an extent up to now, this exercise of grass roots democracy through select committees, with the expenditure of tens of thousands of dollars, and then come in with recommendations on which they do nothing at all—

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): That is not correct at all.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, what has the hon. Provincial Treasurer done, for example then, on the car insurance one? Nothing at all of any substance on the things that really count.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The whole report of the committee.

Mr. MacDonald: This government is doing nothing, virtually nothing, to protect the consumer in this field with respect to car insurance.

Let me turn to another and related field. The second highest component in the rise of cost of living last year was health care, and this brings us back to this issue of medical insurance. I do not need to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that governments have been forced to intervene because the cost of private insurance became too high; that is why governments have gotten into this field. Too many people were inadequately covered or had no coverage at all, and society as a whole, indeed all political parties now, consider that this kind of situation is intolerable and governments must intervene with some kind of programme.

Well, this government has acted. Now we have their revisions in the medical insurance bill. When it introduced the bill last spring, Mr. Speaker, it was widely described in the province of Ontario as a fraud because it was designed more to benefit the insurance companies than it was to benefit the people. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that what this government has presented once again to this House is no less a fraud than it was last year.

True, this government provides coverage for categorical aid recipients, for low income groups, either wholly or partially, but these represent only a small proportion of our people. Sixty per cent of our people, the majority of our people, have group coverage which, even where their incomes are low, if they are involved in group coverage they are going to be left completely the victims of the high-cost private insurance at the moment.

The public has been left, for example, with the impression that private carriers are excluded from this because the government intervened in this area of categorical aid in lower income groups. It is simply not true, Mr. Speaker. Private insurance companies still dominate the field. Moreover, this government has assumed all of the high risk coverage leaving the private carriers to make even more profit out of the low risk coverage.

For example, this spring there was a great public outcry with regard to the differential in the standard policy that the government was going to impose upon every private carrier to make available. There was a public outcry because it was discovered that the highest rate in that differential for standard policies was going to be charged to those who were least in a position to be able to sustain it—our aged citizens and our sick people. Why, even the *Toronto Telegram*, which is capable of such a sycophantic reaction to this government's actions, even they became critical of the government when they realized this was in the government's Medicare bill.

The New Democratic Party, for example, introduced an amendment last year, saying that anybody seeking coverage individually, after he had canvassed the private insurance companies, should be able to buy it, if he desired, from the government through the branch that was going to be established in The Department of Health.

The interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the government has conceded on both of these points, but they did not do so—I have no illusions—because we were urging it. They did so because the private carriers could not and would not provide insurance at what this government knew to be a tolerable and acceptable premium level. So this government has moved in and taken over the high risks from the private carriers, leaving them with the low risks.

What does this result in, Mr. Speaker? We will have an opportunity on later occasions to go into this in greater depth, but the government is contending, for example, that the per capita cost of those for whom they are going to provide coverage is something over \$40.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the national average that was worked out by the Hall commission—and if I may just interject here I am getting a little weary of these people who would spend about five minutes with a pencil to figure out the cost of Medicare, of medical insurance, and then toss the Hall commission conclusions out the window, when they were

the product of the most detailed, authoritative and careful study of costs on the basis of experience in Saskatchewan. The Hall commission report has indicated that, in the year 1966, the average per capita cost for providing complete comprehensive coverage on a universal basis would be in the range of some \$26.

Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, Ontario's costs are higher than the national average, but if one gives a fair margin and takes the figure to \$30 per capita as a province-wide average, I am confident, on the basis of the authoritative studies of the Hall commission, that that is not an exaggeration.

What does it mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that if this government is going to take responsibility for all of the high risks at something more than \$40 per capita, since the province-wide average is no more than \$30 per capita, it simply means that they are leaving to the private insurance companies the low risk coverage, which may range down in many instances to as low as \$20 or \$22 per capita. In other words, we immediately get some indication of the greater profits the insurance companies are going to be able to make. Sixty per cent of our people in group coverage are going to be forced to continue to pay the high cost of private carriers; and in addition, through taxes, they are going to have to subsidize, because of this government's programme, the high risk coverage which the government is taking over, and relieve the private carriers.

That is a magnificent set-up, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly a magnificent set-up—for the insurance companies. And when I listened to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) on a CFRB programme on Sunday night, when one of those sharpshooters on that round table—that I have been the victim of on one or two occasions—said to the hon. Minister of Health, "Do you think that this is going to affect the private insurance companies?", in the most disingenuous way the hon. Minister of Health said, "I've never considered the private insurance company; I've never thought about this. You may be right. In fact, I have only talked to one of their representatives since last spring."

This is the hon. Minister who called the private insurance companies and the private carriers together in a secret meeting in the Westbury hotel in November, 1962, and said, "This is the kind of programme we want to put into effect. Now you build it. You thrash it out." And the government's Bill 163 in 1963 and the government's Bill 136 in 1965 were nothing more than minor revisions of what the private carriers worked out in

November, 1962. And why the hon. Minister of Health and the hon. Prime Minister, or anybody else, should try to kid the public of this province that the private carriers have not in effect shaped this policy, shaped this programme, to protect their interests, and we the people of the province of Ontario are going to have to pay the shot—

An hon. member: The hon. member cannot prove it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we will prove it before this session is over, to all those who are open-minded and can face the facts objectively.

An hon. member: In other words, all those who agree with the hon. member?

Mr. MacDonald: You know, I am interested, Mr. Speaker, in the interjection of my hon. friend over here: "all those who agree with me". Every single one of the amendments that the government brought into its bill here last week were amendments that we put in the House last spring and these same back-benchers, like automated rubber stamps, defeated them; and now the government brings them in—

Interjections by several hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I sometimes wonder whether or not it is possible for a Tory back-bencher to switch his policy line with any more or less intellectual integrity than the Commies switch their party line; because there was nobody on that side of the House who had the intestinal fortitude to get up and fight last spring for what we fought. And what you voted down, the government now introduces.

And another point, Mr. Speaker, since we have gotten into this issue, last Saturday's Toronto *Telegram* carried a story in which the hon. Minister of Health stated that they are already producing the literature which, on the 15th of this month, is going to go out to the whole of the people of the province of Ontario with regard to the details of this plan. Mr. Speaker, can you think of a more calculated piece of arrogance? This government introduces a bill, a bill which, because of our amendments last spring, has considerably changed in this session, and yet they come in with a bill which is still open to criticism and are going to ram it through without any change; and the hon. Minister of Health, in full arrogance, is producing the literature before the House has a chance to discuss it; and it is going to be sent out on February 15.

While we are on the issue, Mr. Speaker, I think if the hon. Prime Minister has any appreciation or respect for the function of this Legislature, other than being a group of rubber stamps who immediately do what the government dictates, he should call that bill quickly so that we will have some opportunity to suggest to him where he may improve it again, before he gets this literature distributed across to the province of Ontario.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is not the whole story. Regarding the \$150 a month coverage that is now going to be made available to people who want to buy from the government, I predict, Mr. Speaker that, just as experience in the province of Alberta proved, many people are simply not going to be able to buy it at \$150 a month, even with the subsidies which the government is offering. I remind this government that they are providing, roughly speaking, the same kind of subsidies that were available in the province of Alberta. And yet, in the province of Alberta, we discovered that there were 15 per cent of the people who refused to buy this insurance on a voluntary basis; and the largest group in that 15 per cent were those who were entitled to a subsidy. They simply could not pay even the remaining amount and they did not buy it; and these were the people who were going to have the greatest need if poor health should ever strike. In other words, this government is simply not meeting the need of universal coverage which is the basic justification for government intervention in the medical health insurance field.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the category of this government's failure to protect the consumers, let me turn to another point.

Three years ago—no, it was in 1960, six years ago now—a select committee report was brought in on drugs in the province of Ontario. This committee was established because the people of this province, as well as people across the whole of the North American continent, were shocked at the increasing amount of evidence that was coming out from American Senate committees with regard to the high profit levels in drugs. And, in typical Tory fashion, the Prime Minister of the day established a committee to look into this problem. And it came forth with a report in 1960.

Now I will concede, Mr. Speaker, that this report basically is made up of recommendations that will have to be carried out at the federal level. So my first question is: On all of these issues that have to be carried on on the federal level, what has this government done to see that the federal government has

done anything about it? There was a Tory government at Ottawa for three years before it collapsed in 1963. What did this government do to try to get the Diefenbaker regime to do something about this problem? I will tell you what it did.

Mr. Bryden: Nothing!

Mr. MacDonald: Nothing. The hon. member for Woodbine is right—nothing. But some of the recommendations, Mr. Speaker, are within provincial jurisdiction. For example, recommendation 4:

That a better method of disseminating information between manufacturers, pharmacists and the medical profession with special emphasis on a reference to price be devised to enable the medical practitioner to prescribe the most economical drugs of good quality.

That could be handled at the provincial level. Nothing has been done.

Take recommendation 9—a small one that was made by the pharmacists themselves by way of a proposal to the committee:

That legislation be introduced to permit a pharmacy when a licensed pharmacist is not in attendance to close the prescription department without closing the store.

In other words, to be able to cut down their overhead when many of these pharmacies are going out of business because of their costs. What has this government done? Nothing.

That a system of central drug purchasing for all Ontario institutions should be established.

We have had it for years in our mental hospitals; has it been done for all the other hospitals of the province of Ontario? I do not think so.

13. Chronic and needy patients who use large quantities of expensive drugs should be able to obtain them more readily and at a lower cost.

14. That retail druggists be encouraged to establish and develop a central mail order outlet whereby chronic and needy patients who use large quantities of expensive drugs can obtain them more readily and at a lower cost, having in mind that such an outlet would be a convenience to the patient, and prescription costs would be based on bulk purchasing.

In other words, here is another proposal that this government could have done something about. The fact of the matter is it brings in the Medicare plan which does nothing about

drugs; it has been sitting for five years on these recommendations, a product of—what was it?—grass roots democracy, to quote the hon. member for Lambton West, and it has done nothing about them. This is another classic proof of the fact that this government simply has not accepted its responsibility to protect the consumer in this province from the pillaging that goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I turn to a third area that is related, and I am glad to see that the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) has gotten out of the snowdrifts and is with us, because it is in the field of agriculture. Nowhere are there greater pockets of poverty than out in rural agricultural Ontario. And this government has done nothing effective to help the farmers bolster farm income through more effective marketing plans. In fact in many instances they have frustrated the efforts of the farmers to have effective marketing, or to carry through from the marketing point to processing. Farmers have traditionally faced the problem of a cost-price squeeze.

During the last year, to this traditional problem there have been added weather conditions, almost without parallel in living memory—first drought, and then wet weather. I was interested, for example, to note the comment of George MacLaughlin, who is a confidant of this government—he has been appointed to high positions—in which he pointed to the complete failure of the farmers to bolster their income over the years. And he suggested that, in compensation for the cheap food policy which agriculture is sustaining today, the farmers are entitled to capital assistance for development of individual farms and, more particularly, capital assistance for developing their marketing schemes and the processing requirements that flow from the marketing schemes.

Mr. Speaker, the frustrating nature of this government's policies for the farmer have been magnificently illustrated—and I take, as just one instance—during the past year, by the actions of this government with regard to the bean board. The hon. Minister went to Great Britain last spring and, overnight, he became an expert on the marketing of beans. He came back and immediately started launching public attacks against the bean board because of their marketing and pricing procedures.

He used the Ontario farm products marketing board as an instrument of government policies, with all their vagaries, to dictate to the bean board that they should separate their marketing board from the company which controlled and operated the processing

end. The bean board refused and we had a most interesting confrontation.

This government then took its next step. They brought in Price Waterhouse, presumably a reputable business management firm, and the remarkable thing is that Price Waterhouse came out with a report which documented every conceivable point that this government was trying to make against the bean board. It was like the government's proposal for negotiation on pensions. The government indicated what the answer would be, and it had every appearance of Price Waterhouse going back and writing a report which provided the answers that the government wanted.

Mr. Speaker, I am not just presenting my conception of this because one of the fascinating things of the past few months is that the bean board has brought forth its counter-report in which they have demolished the Price Waterhouse report. They pointed to inaccuracies, to bad judgment; to sum it up, they demolished it. Just let me quote their conclusion:

In conclusion, in our opinion, the Price Waterhouse and Company report appears to be poorly organized. It contains arbitrary assumptions and unsupported opinions. There is virtually no evidence that alternatives were considered before the actions were recommended. The report gives the impression—

note this, Mr. Speaker:

—of having been written to support pre-conceived conclusions.

I wonder who they got the conclusions from? I will suggest who they got them from—the hon. Minister of Agriculture of this government.

Much of the analysis and interpretation of the facts presented is open to considerable question. The report contains many inconsistent comments. Many of the conclusions reached do not fall logically from the evidence and the analysis.

May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you read through the report, the documentation of those rather general conclusions is a solid and impressive one.

However, in spite of such a reaction, this fall the hon. Minister of Agriculture was still adamant. He was still going to impose his will on the bean board and he summoned to Queen's Park these little boys who have got to come and get their advice from Big Daddy. He reiterated his dictate, and then something interesting happened. Within a day or two—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): That is not right.

Mr. MacDonald: —the hon. Minister changed his mind and called the bean board representatives in and said he had changed his mind. They could go back, they could make plans for the plebiscite to get authorization for a check-off so they could continue to expand their processing facilities. In other words, on this, as on the Medicare bill, the government completely reversed itself. The interesting question, Mr. Speaker, is why, and since the hon. Minister thinks I am being fanciful, I will leave him with that question and we will come back to it later in the session.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I will have an answer for the hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: I will give him the opportunity at any time he chooses, other than now—

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Now—

Mr. MacDonald: I said "other than now", to give his side of the story. But, Mr. Speaker, what I want to draw to the attention of this House, is that the fat now is really in the fire, because apparently there were two men on the Ontario farm products marketing board who had sufficient integrity that they were not going to be used any longer by this government for its political purposes and they resigned—Alden MacLean and Gordon Hill.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): For their political purposes.

Mr. MacDonald: Not for their political purposes, as the hon. Minister of Highways interjects. All they were doing was pushing what this government pushed last spring through to this fall, but the government switched its line and changed.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How does the hon. member know, he was not there?

Mr. MacDonald: And having been used by the government for six or eight months to suit its purposes, they were not going to let their integrity be abused for a complete switch in policy. I respect them for their integrity, though quite frankly I disagree with what they were fighting for.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The hon. member agrees with what is being done now, then?

Mr. MacDonald: I agree with what is being done now, right. You bet your life I agree

with what is being done now and I will be interested to know why it is being done.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: But, Mr. Speaker, why did it take—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: But, Mr. Speaker, why did it take this government some six or eight months to be badgered into doing what is the right thing? And why did it have to use and abuse honourable men on the marketing board for six or eight months, until it happened to switch its policy?

An hon. member: Did the hon. member's party force them into that, too?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: No, we did not force them into that.

Mr. Speaker, I will leave that particular aspect with you and come back to it later in the year, because it is another example of the extent to which this government does not protect the consumer. In the instance of the farmer, who happens to be producing many of the things that the consumer needs, this government has done a very poor job in assisting him to help himself towards effective marketing, and even more important, in face of vertical integration, to secure the necessary credit to move into the processing field so that the farmer has some control of his product. This government has not done a job, in this connection and in the context of a number of issues, including the bean board; we will get back to that later in the session.

I turn now, Mr. Speaker, to my final item in the context of this government's failure to protect the interests of the consumer, and it happens to be an item which has been ignored—I think I am correct—almost completely for 40 years in this House, though I submit it is an obligation of this government.

Down through the years, this government has sat idly by each time the Bell Telephone Company has sought a rate increase. It has never raised its voice to champion the cause of the home owner or the businessman, who, as an individual, is powerless to counter the marshalled resources of this giant corporation when it goes before the board of transport commissioners to bolster its already strong financial position. This government

has left the task to the federation of mayors and municipalities, which has to pass the hat among the already financially strapped municipalities to raise enough money to present a case on behalf of the telephone users.

It is interesting to note that governments in this province have not always shirked their responsibilities. In this connection, I have here, for example, Mr. Speaker—and to any hon. member, who might like to take a look at it at any greater length, I shall make it available—a bound volume of a brief presented on behalf of the Ferguson government in 1926, when it opposed Bell's application for a rate increase in that year. Let me give the House a few quotations from that Ferguson government brief to the 1926 hearings, so that hon. members may savour the flavour of a Tory attack in those days, when Tories still accepted an obligation to protect the public interests in this field. The brief pointed out that Bell began preparations for the 1926 applications just four days after the last date on which it had been turned down for a rate application in 1922.

This new attempt to place a new burden of taxation upon the telephone users and subscribers of Ontario and Quebec has been a long time in the course of preparation—

the brief said, and then it continued:

The telephone users and subscribers of Ontario and Quebec are now nearly taxed to death by the already high taxes in the form of extortionate long-distance and other telephone rates in addition to the depreciation-reserve extortion.

The brief points out that these reserves have been built up to more than \$38 million:

—deducted from the net earnings of the company and wrung out of the telephone users and subscribers of Ontario and Quebec within the last few years under the pretence of being used for depreciation.

In fact, the brief states only one-third of that amount has been spent for depreciation, while the remaining two-thirds was not spent. It charged:

Not one dollar of this latter amount has been spent or used for the purpose for which it was squeezed out of and extracted from the unsuspecting telephone users and subscribers of these two great provinces. It has been diverted and converted to other uses by the company.

Later, the brief dealt with another matter which is still very relevant today, namely,

Bell's relationship with its subsidiaries. This is what it had to say:

Reference in this connection might also be made to the covering up and the scurrying-to-cover tactics in connection with the disclosure of all relations and dealings of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada and its subsidiary the Northern Electric Manufacturing Company, which latter company is merely the directors of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada, and the Bell Telephone Company itself manufacturing apparatus and selling it to themselves under another name at high monopoly prices, fixed and agreed upon between each company and its directors thereby making it possible to empty the Bell treasury and create a deficit when a rate case is coming, or at any time it sees fit to do so.

That, Mr. Speaker, in case some back-bencher becomes puzzled, is still a quote from a Tory government's brief.

The Ferguson government brief returned once again to the burden of depreciation reserves placed on the telephone user. I quote:

On the 21st of December, 1925, the money supposed to be in the depreciation reserves of the Bell Telephone Company of Canada and unused and unspent for depreciation amounting to \$23,295,000 and the surplus amounted to \$6.8 million. The depreciation reserve and surplus has all been built up out of earnings, and represents no direct investment of the security holders. It was and is the result of a deduction from earnings and is all invested in property, plant and equipment of the company.

In other words the telephone users and subscribers of the two provinces of Ontario and Quebec paid and are still paying the high and excessive rates and charges under which this enormous fund and these reserves have been built up.

The Ferguson government brief therefore came to this stinging conclusion:

This is the most barefaced piece of villainy and imposition ever attempted upon a free people—

Mr. Bryden: The Tories were red-blooded in those days.

Mr. MacDonald:

—and its exposure before this honourable board will not be the last this corporate monopoly will hear about it.

The Ferguson government brief pointed the way out, and I quote again:

The only way that the public will ever be saved from this ever-growing financial snowball is for the board to lay down the principle that the Bell Telephone Company of Canada is not entitled to collect interest, return and increase rates from the telephone users on the reserves which are invested in the telephone plant, for the simple reason that the public have contributed that money and has nothing to show for it.

Mr. Speaker, dealing with the question of rights for new shares, extended exclusively to existing shareholders, another issue that is still of lively concern today, the Ferguson government brief stated bluntly:

The granting of subscription privileges for new issues of stock is simply a covert method of distributing a surplus.

The Ferguson brief therefore urged that Bell rates should be reduced by 25 per cent and, further:

—that the sum of \$10 million overcharges and excessive depreciation charges be either refunded to the telephone users and subscribers or that they be given the benefit thereof by a corresponding reduction in telephone rates forthwith.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the end of my references to the 1926 brief. But I gave them at some length to the House just in case—it is just a possibility, you know—just in case some of the back-benchers should begin to react instinctively that this is an unwarranted attack on a public utility.

We have had a succession of Liberal and Conservative administrations in this province since 1926. Indeed, since 1943, we have had 23 years of uninterrupted Tory rule, and not once has Ontario raised its voice in opposition to Bell's repeated and usually successful efforts to get a rate increase.

In 1957, for example, Bell sought a rate increase. There was a concerted outcry, so great that the board of transport commissioners refused to grant it, but this government did nothing to protect the consumer interest. The very next year, though there had been no appreciable change in Bell's financial position, the corporation was back with a further application for a rate increase. This time it was granted but once again this government was silent.

But consider for a moment what has happened since then, Mr. Speaker. The general financial position of Bell, as it is widely recog-

nized, has been a very strong one. Its annual reports in the 18 postwar years, 1946-63, reveal that Bell's operating revenues increased from \$77 million to \$503 million, its profits after taxes from \$8 million to \$68 million, and its dividends from \$7 million to \$58 million.

The Bell's real profit position has always been hidden from the public in a number of ways. One per cent is taken off the top of Bell's gross telephone revenues, amounting to some \$4.7 million, for payment to American Telephone and Telegraph, its largest single shareholder, under the terms of a management contract and patent pool. Considerable amounts of Bell's profits are drained off into unregulated profits of subsidiaries and affiliates, notably Northern Electric, from which Bell buys most of its equipment. Bell maintains a non-contributory funded pension plan which is excessively expensive, with payments almost three times as great as would be necessary under a pay-as-you-go plan.

Despite these many questionable techniques for keeping Bell's profit position within limits, this corporation has regularly, for more than six years now, made more profit than is authorized by the board of transport commissioners. The situation is this: In its judgments of 1950, 1952 and 1958, the board of transport commissioners fixed a ceiling of \$2.43 per share on Bell's earnings, equivalent to 5.9 per cent on overall capital and 6.6 per cent on common equity. Notwithstanding that ceiling of \$2.43, Bell's earnings have been the following, Mr. Speaker: In 1959, \$2.48; in 1960, \$2.52; in 1961, \$2.50; in 1962, \$2.66; in 1963, \$2.58; in 1964, \$2.71. In 1964 Bell's overall capital earnings were 6.3 per cent, though the permissive level was fixed at 5.9, and its common equity earnings were 7.3 per cent though the permissive total was fixed at 6.6.

In short, Mr. Speaker, through all of these years, Bell has been extracting from the Ontario telephone subscribers more money than it is legally entitled to and not once has this provincial government protested this exploitation of the consumer.

When this situation had gone on for year after year for six years, apparently the board of transport commissioners finally became a little concerned. With its regulations being openly violated, this sleeping watchdog decided to bestir itself. A new hearing was launched by the board last year. More than six months have passed since that public hearing concluded and as yet no judgment has been handed down. The purpose of this hearing—and I find this most interesting, Mr. Speaker—was not to inquire into Bell's viola-

tion of profit levels fixed in 1951, but was rather a general inquiry into the permissive levels of earnings for Bell in the future. With millions of dollars of telephone users' money illegally pocketed, Bell never even blushed. Instead this giant corporation seized the opportunity of the new board hearings to argue that its permissive level of earnings on overall capital should be increased to seven per cent.

Now, what does this really mean, Mr. Speaker? Forty per cent of Bell's capital is in bonds on which the interest averages 4.8 per cent. Therefore, if it is permitted to earn seven per cent on overall capital, its earnings on the 60 per cent of its capital which is in common equity could rise to 8.5 per cent. This, sir, is what Bell is seeking before the board.

In short, Bell is going for even higher profit levels in spite of its excessive and illegal level of earnings since 1958, and the board of transport commissioners, believe it or not, has been pondering since last June how much, if any, of this larger slice of the consumer dollar it is going to grant to Bell.

Even in face of this bid for higher profits this government left the battle once again to the Canadian federation of mayors and municipalities. The federation represented some 90 municipal corporations from Ontario and Quebec before the board as they attempted to match the unlimited resources of this big corporation in 24 days of public hearings.

The role of the board of transport commissioners is a passive one. It does not dig on behalf of the telephone users. For the most part it accepts the weight of the evidence presented to it and renders its decision in the face of that evidence. Inevitably the battle is an uneven one unless the weight of presentation on behalf of the consumers' interest is strengthened by some organization as powerful and influential as the government of Ontario. It is inexcusable that this government should have shirked its responsibilities in this way. Forty years ago Howard Ferguson had a far greater appreciation of the responsibilities of a government, even a Tory government, to protect the consumer from the exploitation by a public monopoly.

There were hours of evidence, Mr. Speaker, submitted to the board of transport commissioners during those 24 days of public hearings last June which I think this House should consider. For the moment, I would like to present to the hon. members just one aspect of Bell's financing—how it raises its capital. This is vitally important because Bell estimates that in its expansion programme it

will require \$1,250 million additional capital in the next five years. Indeed, in talking to one of its top officials just last week I was told that its capital requirements this coming year are in the range of \$250 million.

In 1958 the board of transport commissioners reaffirmed a debt ratio of 40 per cent for Bell; that is, 40 per cent bonds and 60 per cent shares. A strong submission was made by the federation of mayors and municipalities that this debt ratio should be raised to at least 50 per cent so that savings could be effected. As I have already indicated, debt capital cost the telephone subscriber much less than equity capital. Most privately owned electrical utilities operate on a 50 per cent debt ratio and government-owned public utilities are financed 100 per cent by bonds, thereby reducing the burden to the subscribers through a lower interest load.

But even more incredible, Mr. Speaker, is the manner in which Bell raises the 60 per cent share capital. The corporation has confined itself solely to disposing of new issues in two ways: first, through its employee stock option plan at a maximum of \$36 per share, in spite of the fact that the average market value of Bell's shares in 1964 was \$54.23; secondly, by rights offered to shareholders to purchase shares far below the market price. In 1964 those rights were offered at \$38.

In other words, employees were given a tax-free capital gain of \$18 on every share they bought; shareholders who purchased rights received a \$16 tax-free capital gain on every share they bought, and Bell itself netted millions of dollars less in capital than if the shares had been marketed to the public at the going rate.

Furthermore, in spite of Bell's extensive propaganda which alleges that it is a Canadian-owned company, with its stock widely distributed among the so-called little people of Canada, the largest single shareholder in Bell is American Telephone and Telegraph, which drew \$1 million in Bell dividends last year, and more than one-third—the latest figure is 37 per cent—of its shares are held by financial institutions. Furthermore, Bell's 15 directors are bankers, and trust and insurance-company directors who speak for the financial institutions who own the more than one-third of the corporation's shares.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the capital financing of Bell is done in a costly way, providing the maximum of benefit to those who now own its shares, with the subscriber paying the shot.

It is only fair to acknowledge that a corporation which has to go to the capital market as often as Bell, faces the problem of depressing the market values of its stocks by new issues. Sales of new issues at some discount is a normal practice. But the proposition of new issues being made available at a discount of approximately 30 per cent reduces the amount of capital that Bell does raise, and forces the corporation to resort to new issues even more frequently, so that there is even greater "watering" of its stock than is necessary.

Furthermore, Bell's new issues are restricted to an exclusive group—the present shareholders and employees. The public is given no opportunity to purchase Bell's new shares except insofar as the "rights" holders immediately market them. As they say in the United States utility field, "rights" should be granted to the consumer, too, by permitting some of them to purchase Bell's new issues at the market value, or at a modest discount. This normal practice would net a greater flow of capital to the corporation in face of its admittedly heavy needs for expansion purposes.

However, Mr. Speaker, I come now to my major point: Even if this government has neglected its responsibilities to protect the interests of the telephone subscriber from excessive exploitation by a monopoly utility in the past, it simply cannot shirk those responsibilities any longer, and I want to document the reasons why.

Bell is now starting to reap unprecedented profits arising from extensive expansion in the past few years, combined with technological progress. On every major factor in Bell's financial statement, its position grows more favourable every year. For example, operating expenses, exclusive of taxes, dropped from 68.04 per cent of total operating revenues in 1959 to 63.26 per cent in 1964. Net operating revenues, therefore, rose from 31.96 per cent in 1959 to 36.74 per cent in 1964. And operating profits, before depreciation and income tax, rose from 45.33 per cent in 1959 to 52.05 per cent in 1964.

Automation is constantly and increasingly reducing manpower needs, so that total payroll in relation to operating revenues dropped from 41.2 per cent in 1959 to 34.47 per cent in 1964.

Mr. Speaker, the real key to the future earnings of Bell is found in another set of statistics. Operating revenues per phone rose from \$116.63 in 1959 to \$129.46 in 1964. Operating expenses per phone, during the same period, rose relatively little—from

\$79.35 to \$81.90. Therefore, the net operating revenue per phone rose from \$37.28 in 1959 to \$47.56 in 1964, an increase of \$10 per phone.

This trend of increase in net operating revenues is certain to continue, and it is possibly going to reach \$60 per phone by 1970. Only a major economic slump might disrupt it.

In short, revenues are going up and costs, relatively speaking, are going down. The increase in revenue is a combination of more phones; a higher tariff per phone as urban areas grow into larger group-rate areas with higher rates, and extra services, not necessarily controlled by the board of transport commissioners—for example, Princess phones, business intercom systems and space telemetry. Costs, while fairly level, have declined relatively and in constant dollars, due to the advanced technology and automation. Employees per thousand phones have declined from 12.52 in 1958 to 8.32 in 1964, a decline of more than 33 per cent.

The board of transport commissioners heard arguments that unit costs of telephone service will continue to drop. I have given you the picture up until now; the trend will continue and accelerate. For example, Bell says a manual operator used to make 4.8 million connections in a lifetime while the crossbar switching system now used in Canada makes the same number of connections in three hours and 20 minutes. Moreover, electronic switching now used in the United States and coming to Canada in 1967, does the same job in 12 seconds.

The board was therefore urged to make sure that enormous cost savings due to modern technology are passed on to the public through lower rates. Instead, what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that Bell is seeking higher permissive levels for earnings which would make it possible that all these savings will go to the owner-investor, and none to the public. What is worse, Bell could seek a rate increase on a higher permissive level of earnings. The official proclamation of the board prior to last year's hearings stated, and I am quoting:

Existing rates, or any revision thereof, that may be requested in consequence of the board's findings, will be reviewed later if necessary.

Mr. Speaker, may I draw to your attention what the experts in the investment field are predicting for Bell? I would not expect the hon. members from that side of the House to accept my assessment of this, so let us go to

the experts. For example, the research department of one reputable firm, Bongard & Company Limited, has made the following appraisal of Bell's future earnings.

First, assuming that the board makes no change at all following last year's hearing, it estimates that Bell's earnings per share by 1969 will be \$3.03 and that the market value of the shares will range from \$52 to \$61. Now, Mr. Speaker, as an indication of just how conservative was this estimate, Bell's shares already—not 1969, but 1966—have reached the peak of that range without any change by the board of transport commissioners by breaking \$60 within the past few weeks, three years ahead of Bongard's forecast. You might bear that in mind if you think some of their later forecasts are exaggerated for they may be just as conservative.

Second, assuming more debt only—up, for example, to the suggested 50 per cent debt—Bongard estimates that Bell's earnings per share will be \$3.26 per share and the market value to range from \$62 to \$75 by 1969.

Third, assuming a seven per cent return on overall capital—this is what Bell has requested—Bongard estimates that Bell's earnings per share will rise to \$3.74 per share by 1969, with market values in the range of \$75 to \$86.

Finally, assuming that Bell is granted a permissive level of seven per cent on overall capital, plus a higher debt ratio, then Bongard estimates that Bell shares will reach \$3.93 per share by 1969, with market values ranging from \$86 to \$102.

Mr. Speaker, if you want a more up-to-date estimate, because quite frankly that one was made in November or December of 1964—we therefore have had an opportunity to see how conservative it is on the one where no change is made—but if you want a more up-to-date estimate, I was interested to note in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* column "An Investment I Like", carried on January 19 this year, by Gurston Rosenfeld of R. A. Daly & Company, the following. These are Mr. Rosenfeld's observations:

Common sense points to the elimination of the straitjacket of fixed profits per share. Bell's 1965 profit is estimated to be \$2.95 per share. If common sense prevails and the board of transport commissioners rules in favour of a seven per cent return on capital, Bell's 1966 permissive profit would be in the order of \$3.30 per share.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): What time does the market open?

Mr. MacDonald: That is the kind of comment I would expect from the hon. Minister, rather than recognizing his obligation to get out and protect the consumers who have been gouged for what I am trying to spell out for him.

And that, Mr. Speaker—just let me digress for one moment. Let us accept this proposal, this suggestion of Mr. Rosenfeld, that this year's Bell earnings are going to be \$2.95—and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is likely fairly accurate because their nine-months announcement of earnings was \$2.18 which, if projected, comes to \$2.92 for the whole year, so it will likely be in the range of \$2.90. That means that Bell this year is going to be illegally distributing more than 50 cents per share beyond the \$2.43 limit that was set by the board of transport commissioners in 1958.

It is interesting to note at the moment that Bell has 29,628,543 outstanding shares. With 50 cents excess distribution of earnings, illegal distribution of earnings, that means that Bell is going to be distributing approximately \$15 million that it has extracted from the consumers of this province and the province of Quebec in excess of the legal limit granted to it by the board of transport commissioners.

In fact that is not the whole story, Mr. Speaker. It is not the whole story for this reason. Earnings are distributed after they have paid their corporation tax, and the corporation tax is approximately 50 per cent. Therefore if they are distributing \$15 million, this means that Bell this year has extracted \$30 million illegally from the consumers of this province of Ontario—\$30 million beyond what they are legally entitled to for the service they are providing according to the law of the land.

An hon. member: Nonsense!

Mr. MacDonald: Not nonsense at all. That, sir, happens to be the fact.

In short, Mr. Speaker, rightly or wrongly, the investment world considers that Bell's permissive level of earnings is going to be raised by the board of transport commissioners and a forecast earnings of \$4 per share by Bell in 1970, with market values soaring over \$100, all of which is going to be paid for by the almost defenceless telephone subscriber.

Now traditionally, Mr. Speaker, the investor-owner interests have been paramount in the operation of Bell. I suggest to you the time has come to give the subscriber's interest a real place in Bell's operations. After a fair

return to the investor—and I would say to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) and I emphasize it, after a fair return adjudicated by the board of transport commissioners, not illegal excess returns—and returns in the past have been such that Bell has always been a favourite blue chip stock; after competitive remuneration to its staff, all increases in net revenue, I submit to this House, should be logically passed back to the subscriber in the form of lower rates. Who is going to champion the interests of the telephone subscriber? I suggest that this government should, and I do so along two lines.

First, this government should press for a change in the rule of the board of transport commissioners. If hon. members of this House think that I have been too harsh in my criticism of our federal regulatory body, and the sympathetic treatment which it has accorded to Bell, let me briefly give them some idea of the role played by a comparable regulatory body in the United States.

I have here, for example, records of a case that went before the supreme court of California when the public utilities commission of that state moved in because of excessive earnings. And listen to this: The PUC investigated the rates of Pacific Telephone and Telegraph, an affiliate of the American Bell Telephone system, because the PUC had a suspicion that Pacific may have exceeded its permissive level of earnings by 16/100ths of one per cent. They not only ruled against Pacific when they found this to be the case, they ordered them—after they brought down their order some two years later—to return \$80 million in excess earnings to the subscribers.

Pacific took the issue to court, and while the court ruled that the PUC may have exceeded its jurisdiction in ordering the rebate, it did not interfere with the PUC's vigorous regulatory action—and an appeal on the refund order case is still before the higher courts.

But, Mr. Speaker, listen to the PUC in California, a real regulatory body, not a sleeping watchdog. Listen to its explanation of the role of a regulatory body:

The telephone company is a privately owned utility, created and operated to make money for the owners. The commission takes the place of competition, protecting the consumer against charges imposed by a lawful monopoly which has virtually the power to tax. The company conceives its role as comparable to government; this has led it to believe that the company must be permitted in effect to

determine its own earnings, with the commission approving as a matter of law, the company's proposals.

Referring there, of course, to the Pacific's attitude. If you think that is a rather tough attitude, saying to Pacific, "You think you are government and can do as you please," consider this added comment of the California PUC:

Pride in one's work and a feeling that one is the best outfit—*esprit de corps*—are admirable in either military or civilian life. One should, however, retain a sense of proportion. And when a private institution occupies a position of unchallenged superiority, when it is widely regarded and popularly acclaimed as the biggest and the best, the growth of *esprit de corps* without proper perspective may lead to a sort of institutional paranoia. Petitioner [that is, Pacific Telephonel displays a number of symptoms. Its confidence in its own superior rectitude results in a conviction that the Bell system should prevail over everyone who offers disagreement on any point.

There is a regulatory system with some iron in its soul.

In comparing that kind of vigorous defence of the rights of the public with the role of our board of transport commissioners in Ottawa, our board, I repeat, is nothing more than a sleeping watchdog, with emphasis on the "sleeping."

Later in its statement, the California PUC outlined its approach to rate fixing. Mr. Speaker, listen to this:

To determine rates, the commission usually works from the date recorded by the company, making adjustments and allowances as necessary to protect the consumer from unfair or unreasonable charges, in order to establish rates that are fair and reasonable to both the public and the utility.

Rate regulation is one part of the direct, comprehensive, and continuous regulation to which utilities are subject. If profits are too high, rates are reduced; if profits are too low, rates are increased; it is unlawful to charge more, or less, than the rate fixed by the commission. If a utility pays excessive salaries to its officers, or if it pays unreasonable high prices for materials [to a wholly owned subsidiary, for example] or if it overbuilds its distribution system in relation to the number of customers, such excess expenditure may be disallowed. On the other hand, if its facilities are not

adequate, the utility may be ordered to build the necessary additions.

Later, the PUC was even more explicit with regard to its right to disallow excessively high salaries to top officials of the company:

The commission did not exceed its jurisdiction or otherwise fail to regularly pursue its authority when it refused to burden the consumers with all of the petitioner's increased salaries; it appeared that in a six-year period executive salaries—

this is of Pacific Telephone Company:

—increased 131 per cent, the number of executives increased 66 per cent, while the number of employees decreased 6 per cent.

Has anyone ever heard of the board of transport commissioners raising questions like that in a Bell application for rate increase? And why has it not?

Despite the supreme court's ruling against the PUC right to order a refund of \$80 million in California, the commission has argued—and it has argued brilliantly and with a verbal vigour in this statement that was rather delicious to read, instead of the gobbledygook of the normal legal document—that:

The refund is (a) constitutional; (b) supported by judicial precedent; (c) authorized by statute; and (d) consistent with commission precedents.

So the decision of the court in refusing refund has been appealed.

Mr. Speaker, who in Canada is protecting the public interest by seeking a refund to telephone subscribers of earnings in excess of the authorized limit that Bell has? Who? On the basis of 1965 alone, if it pays \$2.95 per share, that means an illegal distribution of earnings of \$15 million, and since that distribution is made after a 50 per cent corporation tax, that means that it illegally extracted from the telephone user \$30 million. Who is going to defend the consumers against this kind of thing? Nobody. Certainly not this government.

The role of the board of transport commissioners is a passive one. Clearly the time has come to press for a change in the role of the transport commissioners, to make it an inquisitive and truly regulatory body so that the public can be protected from the exploitation by a private monopoly such as Bell.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we come back to this government. This government should

supply leadership and funds to keep Bell under surveillance, and when hearings are called by the board this government should finance and lead the case for the respondent. Howard Ferguson used to do it; why not John Roberts?

An hon. member: He is thinking about it.

Mr. MacDonald: Is he thinking about it? I wish I could get the comment from a more authoritative source. In fact, if this government were doing its duty, it would not be sitting idly by while Bell illegally exceeds its permissive level of earnings. It would not be so silent when Bell seeks an even higher permissive level of earnings. It would be leading the fight to make certain that some of the benefits of Bell's monopoly position, and the technological progress, would not be going into the earnings which are forecast for more than \$4 per share, and \$100 market value for stock, all to the benefit of the investor-owner, but it would be making certain that some of those benefits were channeled back to the subscribers whose money has placed Bell in a strong financial position.

In short, Mr. Speaker, instead of sitting idly by in face of rate increases, the facts suggest that this government should be taking the lead today to secure a hearing before the board of transport commissioners for a rate decrease. There is every justification for it, and this party invites the government to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I turn very briefly—and I hope I can tuck this in before six o'clock—to the amendment. The speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition, which was concluded by the amendment, had no form and very little content that was not, in the words of Mr. Wintermeyer, platitudinous. The hon. leader of the Opposition complained of the government's patchwork approach. I agree the government's approach was a patchwork, but rarely have I seen or heard of a more confused and patchwork approach than what the hon. leader of the Opposition himself presented.

The hon. leader of the Opposition described the Throne speech as an uninspired document, with no co-ordination or cohesion, no sense of direction and purpose; in short it gave no indication of dynamic leadership. Mr. Speaker, precisely the same criticisms can be levelled at the Liberal amendment. I was not overwhelmed by it last night—the nuance was missed by people who listened to me—I was appalled by it. It was an uninspired listing of failures of this government with no co-

ordination or cohesion, no sense of direction or purpose; in short, it is no alternative in terms of dynamic leadership.

The Liberal amendment is just another laundry list of unfinished business, proving conclusively that there is no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives. To quote the *Globe and Mail* this morning.

They are both walking hand in hand down the same road.

Is that not a lovely analogy? How magnificently apt. They are walking hand in hand down the same road. Mr. Speaker, just let me assure you, we are not walking with them. The government's policies are inadequate, in not doing anything to really cope with the problem of poverty by getting at a guaranteed income, and all the other problems I dealt with earlier and will not repeat now, and in the failure of this government to develop dynamic economic and social developments throughout the various parts of this province, so that we can avoid the possibility of re-creating that poverty in the next generation, and can have a positive, comprehensive manpower programme that must be set up if we are going to be able to meet the needs of our economy, and which cannot be attempted until we have got some sort of an inventory of our skills.

The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) came in last year and deluded us into believing that this kind of thing was going to be done by the research department of The Department of Labour. Now The Department of Economics and Development goes to a poverty conference in Ottawa and it suggests that it is not being done; and only when it is done can you then start to work out a manpower policy. This government simply is not doing the job, as the Liberals in Ottawa are not doing the job.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): The hon. member does not even know the facts.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I know what my facts are.

Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman):

That the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, now before the House, be amended by adding thereto the following:

And, above all, this House regrets governmental failure to achieve even the basic prerequisites necessary to eliminate poverty and to prevent its recurrence in succeeding

generations and, to remedy this neglect, advocates that:

1. Government policy should henceforth be oriented towards a guaranteed basic income programme, dynamic regional economic and social development, and a comprehensive manpower programme based in the first instance on a skills inventory;

2. As an immediate, interim measure, old age security and related allowances should be increased to \$100 per month.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what the Tory party at Ottawa wants, what this government supported in the hustings, something which even Leslie Frost came out of retirement to support vigorously—the payment of \$100 a month—because said he, in most magnificent contradiction of most of his earlier statements, “The economy of this nation can bear this kind of thing.”

I suggest that this government should move towards doing it. It should be done by Ottawa. When can we get Ottawa to do it,

even though there is a majority in the House that wants it? I do not know. Such is the frustration of democracy at the federal level which we sometimes see here. But in any case, until we can get them to act, I suggest that the needs of these people are urgent, to quote Mr. Frost, and that this government should move immediately.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to deal with, probably, second reading of government bills, the orders number two to six. We will then resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.

ERRATUM

(January 27, 1966)

Page	Column	Line	Correction
51	2	48	Change to read: reformatory have recorded the following comments.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 2, 1966

Plant Diseases Act , bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	157
Stallions Act , bill to repeal, Mr. Stewart, first reading	157
Highway Traffic Act , bill to amend, Mr. Sopha, first reading	157
Crown Timber Act , bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, first reading	157
Expansion and improvement of privately owned woodlands , bill to provide for, Mr. Roberts, first reading	157
Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962 , bill to amend, Mr. Davison, first reading ..	158
Conveyancing and Law of Property Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading ..	163
Public Lands Act , bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	163
Provincial Land Tax Act, 1961-1962 , bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading ..	164
Bailiffs Act, 1960-1961 , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	165
Crown Administration of Estates Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading ..	165
County Courts Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	165
Fire Marshals Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	165
Jurors Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	165
Public Trustee Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	165
Sheriffs Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	165
Mechanics' Lien Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	165
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne , Mr. Walker, Mr. Ben, Mr. Welch, Mr. Dunlop, Mr. White	166
Motion to adjourn debate , Mr. White, agreed to	187
Motion to adjourn , Mr. Roberts, agreed to	187

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1966

The House met at 3.00 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome to the Legislature as guests today, in the east gallery, students from Riverside high school, Windsor.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, these amendments simply provide for a change in the name of The Plant Diseases Act in accordance with the proposed change in The Department of Agriculture Act and they also provide a penalty clause for violations of inspectors' operations.

THE STALLIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to repeal The Stallions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE HIGHWAY TRAFFIC ACT

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE CROWN TIMBER ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, a number of changes are being made to The Crown Timber Act for the purposes of ensuring that Crown timber on areas held under licences are fully utilized, clarifying the intent of a number of sections, strengthening management provisions, of discontinuing the issue of new pulpwood scalers' licences, but the existing licences will be continued, and of providing greater flexibility to the penalty provisions of the Act.

PRIVATELY OWNED WOODLANDS

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the expansion and improvement of privately owned woodlands.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the House, I would like to explain more on the introduction of this bill than I would normally do at this stage of its progress through the Legislature, because I am sure it is not a contentious bill. On that basis I ask this indulgence.

This bill which it is proposed to cite as The Woodlands Improvement Act, 1966, has as its major objective the improvement of privately owned woodlands in the province, mainly in southern Ontario. We propose to do it by providing, at government expense, the facilities for planting and for stand improvement under contract with the owners, who will join with the department in this attack on a major problem in southern Ontario.

This will be accomplished by designating a number of areas for tree planting and woodland improvement by negotiating with land owners in these areas where they are willing to enter into contracts to carry out the objectives. The overall programme can be illustrated by pointing out that we are aiming at rehabilitating an estimated 7.8 million acres of private forest land in southern Ontario. Of this, 2 million is now idle land requiring tree planting and 5.8 million acres is woodlands in need of silvicultural treatment and management to bring it back to a more productive stage.

This programme will benefit the land owner, the forest industries, the community and the province as a whole. The 1,343 secondary wood using industries in southern Ontario require 112,000,000 fbm, 224,000 cords of hardwood annually. The furniture industry uses half of that total. Among the hardwoods, maple is of particular importance. Latest available statistics show that the secondary wood using industries employ about 27,000 people having an annual payroll reaching up to \$100 million, with the gross value of their manufactured products exceeding \$300 million.

A survey of secondary wood using firms in southwestern Ontario in 1965 revealed that half of their wood requirements were imported from outside Canada. Species such as mahogany will continue to be imported because Ontario does not produce these species. However, the new programme is intended to produce the high quality native-grown material required by industry and reduce the need for future import. The pulp and paper mills near the private land areas in southern Ontario now import much of their requirements largely from Quebec. This programme will more than double availability of native-grown pulp wood by planting open forest land and the utilization of lower grade hardwood from improved woodlands.

Many woodland owners are reluctant to carry out non-revenue producing improvements of a long-term investment nature necessary to rehabilitate the forests. The Woodlands Improvement Act will assist very materially in reducing that long-term investment in tree planting and woodland improvement. I point out that this is a voluntary programme, though we will require the co-operation of groups of owners in the various areas where the operations are to be undertaken.

To illustrate, we already have demands sufficient for immediate action in Simcoe

county, North Dumfries township of Waterloo county and Renfrew county. There are many other areas which we expect will follow suit. The programme should be eligible for cost-sharing benefits under the federal-provincial rural development agreement. The land owner will purchase the trees from the department as at present, the department will supply the services of planting and of stand improvement up to a maximum amount per acre, to be determined. The owner will undertake to protect the area for the period of the agreement, which will probably be 15 years. By that time it is anticipated that the value of the asset will be sufficiently evident to all concerned to warrant further development, and of course it will belong to the owner.

We foresee yearly expansion in this programme for a considerable period ahead and a resultant increase for all yields, and particularly hardwood yields, in southern Ontario.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Eighteen years after the Kennedy report recommended urgent action.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE, 1961-1962

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton) East moves first reading of a bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): The purpose of these amendments is to prevent discrimination in employment because of age except within the limits set out in the provisions added by subsection 2 of section 1 of the bill.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), a copy of which has been submitted to him.

Would the hon. Minister inform this House what weaknesses in existing procedures for the hiring of university professors permitted a university to bring into its faculty an imposter and what steps he is taking to correct these weaknesses?

An hon. member: Impossible!

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, one might start out by saying: "Will the real Mr. MacDonald stand up?"

Mr. MacDonald: Are we sure it is the real Minister of Education?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the selection and the appointment and the terms of employment of university staffs are the exclusive prerogative of each individual institution. The universities consider the right to make appointments to be an important aspect of their independence, their autonomy and they alone make the decisions, as I am sure the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville knows.

With this principle, as I said in some small speech last night, I am in complete agreement. The procedures which universities have followed have worked remarkably well and excellent staff are being recruited to our institutions. I think the one example to which the question refers should not be allowed to detract from the soundness of the principle involved.

Mr. Speaker, I would further add that the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman) has asked a somewhat similar question as this institution is in his own area. I would suggest that the same answer might suffice for his question as well.

I might, while I am on my feet if I may Mr. Speaker, answer a question directed to me by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) yesterday with respect to a statement made by Dr. Wendell MacLeod. I am instructed that while information about accreditation is a confidential matter as between the accreditation group and the university, at the present time no Ontario medical faculty or university is involved.

Mr. C. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner).

Can the hon. Minister report any steps Ontario is taking to correct the irregularities in the municipal winter works incentive programme, as pointed out by Auditor General Maxwell Henderson?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): I must first assure the House that The Department of Municipal Affairs has never found any irregularities, other than those of a very minor nature, in its administration of the federal-provincial municipal winter works incentive programme.

I assume that the hon. member's question is based upon certain reports which appeared in the newspapers this morning. Let me state that I have merely seen the item in the newspaper this morning. I have not had an opportunity to secure a copy of the auditor general's report.

The Department of Municipal Affairs administers the winter works incentive programme in Ontario, as agent of the province and of the government of Canada, on the basis of a memorandum which is exchanged each year between the governments of Ontario and Canada.

Applications are submitted and claims made in accordance with the terms of that memorandum.

The applications, as submitted, are subject to audit and in connection with this audit, the accounts, records and supporting vouchers of the municipalities are examined. The techniques that are used in connection with this examination are under the control of chartered accountants on my staff.

The examination techniques have been reviewed with, and approved by, the provincial auditor. As a matter of fact the audit is carried out on his behalf and it is he who certifies the claim that is made on Ottawa for its portion of the cost of the programme.

In addition to the provincial auditor's part in the verification of the claims under this programme, may I point out that the administration of this programme, including the department's verification techniques, is reviewed regularly by agents of the auditor general, Mr. Maxwell Henderson. As a matter of fact, in this connection, I should point out that Ontario has never taken any objection to the agents of the auditor general visiting the municipalities in order to test some of the records of the municipalities. The auditor general's agents were in the offices of the department during 1965, for instance, and I am informed that they were completely satisfied with our administrative methods and our verification techniques.

Therefore, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I may say that, as far as Ontario is concerned, it is unnecessary for us to take steps such as those suggested in the question of the hon. member.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), of which he has already had notice.

Does the province intend to increase its grants for hospital construction now that Ottawa has indicated its grants will remain the same for two years beyond the original cut-off date of March, 1966?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I must point out first of all that the hon. member is in error as to the cut-off date. Actually the present agreement runs

to March 31, 1968, and the two years extension announced by the federal government will take us then to March 31, 1970. I have not yet had time to discuss this decision or this pronouncement of the federal government with my hon. colleagues in the Ontario government and therefore I am not in a position to answer the question of the hon. member.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld).

Would the hon. Minister inform this House what steps have been taken by the historical branch of his department to assist financially members of the Guelph historical society in their efforts to preserve the home of Colonel John Macrae, the author of the poem "In Flanders Fields"?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, in answer to this question: As I mentioned yesterday, I should explain that our department has no general authority or funds which would enable us to assist financially with the acquisition and preservation, renovation or operation of historical buildings as such. As a consequence, our department would be unable to give financial aid to the society if they had in fact made any written request for this assistance which, to the best of my knowledge, they have not.

Mr. Paterson: Would the hon. Minister answer a supplementary question? Have Mr. Goodman and his associates requested any assistance from the department of the hon. Minister in the preservation of the Sir John A. Macdonald home here in Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I think I can best answer that, Mr. Speaker, by saying Mr. Goodman himself has not but others have, and the same answer would apply.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health.

Since the Legislature has not yet had an opportunity to debate the government's revised medical insurance plan, and since the government is planning a mass distribution of literature concerning it, commencing in mid-February, as announced in the *Toronto Telegram* on Saturday, would the hon. Minister assure the House that copies of all such literature will be provided to hon. members prior to distribution across the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is "Yes"; and I can assure the hon.

member that the hon. members of the House will have ample opportunity to debate the measure before there is any distribution of literature.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister will permit a supplementary question? What agency has been authorized to prepare for, and to conduct, this mass distribution?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid I cannot answer that question, Mr. Speaker. This is all in the hands of a management team that is setting up the branch.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). Would the hon. Attorney General advise what steps are being taken to investigate the opinion of the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve), expressed in recent newspaper articles, that a \$1 million trade fraud in milk is being operated between eastern Ontario and Quebec?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the anti-fraud squad of the Ontario provincial police has been instructed to investigate.

Mr. Singer: May I ask the hon. Attorney General a supplementary question? Would not, in his opinion, a more suitable way of bringing these charges before the people of Ontario, have been to announce them in the House rather than to do it in the newspapers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has nothing to do with curtailing the opinion that anyone feels free to express to the newspapers.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) copy of which has been submitted to him. What is the hon. Minister doing about the fact that, according to Allan Cass, an official of the children's aid society of London and Middlesex county, about 500 children of those counties are living in neglect at home because there is no better accommodation available to them?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I assume, as the newspaper reported, the question relates to potential neglect of children living within their own homes. I can assure the hon. member that I will seek details from this society as to the allegations.

I might also state that public funds are available in total to the society in dealing with the question at the local level.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health. In view of the reports from both the federal Minister of Health and the provincial Minister of Health that Ontario has points of disagreement with regard to the federal plan on Medicare, will the hon. Minister enunciate for the House those points of disagreement?

An hon. member: That is a good question.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer for the federal Minister, the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare. I can assume the hon. member that I did not state there were points of disagreement existing between the federal government and ourselves relative to this matter. We asked for clarification of certain points and we asked for explanation of certain others, and the Minister of National Health and Welfare undertook to do this for us.

Mr. Oliver: May I ask my hon. friend a supplementary question? Was he correctly reported in the *Toronto Daily Star* yesterday, where it was said that he had no powers to agree to any plan that might be offered by the federal government?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I was not in a position to give a commitment on behalf of the Ontario government at that time because I had to ask for clarification of certain points and further explanation of others?

Mr. Oliver: A watching brief the hon. Minister had.

An hon. member: Rather a noisy watching brief, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Oliver: Well, a watching brief, nevertheless.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, on Friday last, I believe it was, the hon. leader of the Opposition asked a question which I was not then in a position to answer. The question was: In view of the needs of doctors, has the Minister inquired of the college of physicians and surgeons whether there are doctors established in Ontario who took undergraduate courses in universities which the college of physicians and surgeons now excludes? If so has the Minister asked for an

explanation from the college for excluding internationally recognized doctors from practising in Ontario?

The answer, sir, is that there are doctors presently practising in Ontario who were granted a licence before the Ontario college had completed its study of their schools. As stated in reply to a previous question, the college has explained the reason for excluding certain foreign-trained doctors from licence to practice in Ontario.

I am not sure what the hon. leader of the Opposition means by "excluding internationally recognized doctors". I can only repeat that the college is charged with the responsibility of assuring that all who are licensed to practice in Ontario have had adequate training, at least equal to that demanded of Canadian- and Ontario-educated and trained doctors.

Mr. Speaker, also on Friday, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) put a question which I was not then in a position to answer. How many students from Jamaica and Haiti had been admitted by the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons to practise medicine in Ontario during the last two years? The answer: one from Haiti. Students from Jamaica are not identified by the country of origin but are included in the graduates from the University of London, England. That university grants the degree for the University of the West Indies which is located in Kingston, Jamaica, so that we do not know how many came from that university *per se*.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, if I could. Does the hon. Minister of Health not think it somewhat ironical that doctors who are holding responsible positions in Ontario, who graduated from the undergraduate schools which the college of physicians and surgeons is now saying have inadequate training? Therefore they are giving this the reason for barring other doctors. They are recognized by the United States, and have also practised in Edinburgh, and are now teaching at our universities and in some cases have been chief interns. Are they being disbarred for the one reason that they went to the same undergraduate school as doctors today who are now practising? I ask the question: Does he not think it is ironical that this is the reason?

Mr. Speaker: Would the leader of the Opposition pose his question?

Mr. Thompson: Get it clear, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Health permit a supplementary question to the reply he gave to my question?

Mr. Speaker: To the member's question?

Mr. Renwick: Yes; the question which I placed with him last Friday.

In view of the reply of the hon. Minister to my question, and to the question of my hon. colleague from Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis), will the hon. Minister not now agree that it is, with rare exceptions, the policy of the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons to admit only qualified persons of white colour to the practice of medicine in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I can only very vehemently state that this is completely and totally wrong. Of the 6,000 doctors, as I stated last week, licensed to practise medicine in Ontario in the past 15 years, 2,000 of them, sir, one in every three, is a foreign-trained graduate; and we do not care what the colour of his skin is. If his training and preparation to practise medicine fits him to do so in Ontario, according to Ontario standards, then that is the only qualification that is asked.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare, notice of which has been given. How many of those persons in receipt of old age assistance, or old age security payments, are receiving supplementary assistance from the province?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Speaker, the latest figure I have is for November, 1965. It is an accurate figure. I might state, first of all, that supplementary assistance is actually paid by the municipality, which is reimbursed by the province to the amount of 80 per cent. Old age assistance cases number 1,430; and old age security 3,314.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), notice of which has been given.

What amount is the province of Ontario spending to clear up pollution present in Lake Erie and Lake Ontario?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, since the question is worded in such general terms, it is difficult to know what the hon.

member wants. However, for his information, I am pleased to provide the following.

Lakes Erie and Ontario form the outlet for most of the waters from developed areas in this province. In the past ten years, there has been an expenditure by municipalities of over \$722 million to provide sewage works. At the end of December, 1965, the Ontario water resources commission had under development, under construction or in operation, 191 sewage works projects valued at over \$102 million. In addition, the pollution control activities of the OWRC, accounts for a major portion of its budget which, for the current fiscal year, totalled just over \$4 million. The waste disposal and pollution control programmes of industries in Ontario involve the expenditure of over \$100 million and will continue to increase as more facilities are provided.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the hon. Minister. The question asked "to clear up pollution present in the lakes," and I do not think he answered this question. He told us the capital expenditures to prevent pollution going into the lake, but not what is spent to clear up the pollution present in the lakes.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I might say it is all part of the programme, and if the hon. member was listening, he would—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, is that not what the hon. member wanted, the overall picture?

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): No!

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Well, I answered the other question, if he was listening.

In addition, the pollution control activities of the OWRC account for the major portion of its budget, for which the current fiscal year total is just over \$4 million. Is that clear?

Mr. Thompson: No, but he wants to know about the dead sea portion of Lake Erie.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: All right now, just a minute! The waste disposal and pollution control programmes of industries in Ontario involve the expenditure of over \$100 million and will continue to increase as more facilities are provided.

Mr. Thompson: That still does not answer the hon. member's question.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is what the hon. member asked.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), notice of which has been given.

Would the hon. Minister of Public Works inform this House of the details of the purchase of the building which will house the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health? Specifically: (a) How much did the government pay for the building; (b) from whom did the government purchase the building; (c) who is the owner of the land on which the building stands; (d) how much is the government paying in annual land lease; (e) what was the selling price on the previous sale of the building and when did that transaction take place; (f) on what date was the building purchased by the government?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answers to the hon. leader of the Opposition's questions are:

(a) \$3,150,000; (b) The Gunnar Realty Limited; (c) The Ontario hospital association; (d) \$37,500 per year; (e) the information is not available; and (f) December 1, 1965.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) a question?

Would the hon. Minister inform the House when the study by the Ontario highway transport board of The Public Commercial Vehicles Act and regulations was completed and whether he intends to table the board's report in the House?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the inquiry by the Ontario highway transport board has been completed and I am assured that the report will be in my hands by the end of next week. As the study was made on ministerial directive the report is not a public paper and until I have had a chance to study it I am in no position to say if I will or will not table it.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE CONVEYANCING AND LAW OF PROPERTY ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 1, An Act to amend The Conveyancing and Law of Property Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC LANDS ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves second reading of Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 3 is one of the type of bills, that we see here frequently, where each section contains a number of principles. I wanted to address myself to the principle in section 3 of the bill.

As I read this, the hon. Minister is suggesting that certain restrictions running against some 36 acres of land in the town of Niagara be removed by this statute. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the time that I have been in this House matters of this sort have come before the House, not in the form of a government bill but in the form, usually, of a private member's bill.

The interference with restrictions by the Legislature sometimes is warranted but usually is only warranted after the private bills committee have had an ample opportunity to study and examine the reasons for it. I would think, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in this case we might want to find out if there are opposing opinions from some of the residents in the town of Niagara.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): I have no objection to this bill being put to the committee, if that is what my hon. friend would like.

Mr. Singer: My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that it should go to a committee in a form whereby notice is going to be given to all of the residents who are going to be affected. It may well be that the municipal council is in favour of it; but I do not know, for instance, if copies of the bill have been circulated to all the residents who are going to be affected.

I would like to inquire, for instance, from the surveyor-general what his opinion is. Is this going to affect boundaries and titles? Could there perhaps be a subdivider in the background who has an option to purchase all of these lands and who can only proceed with his project if and when he is able to remove this type of restriction?

Unfortunately my concern is, and perhaps I am at no great variance with the hon. Minister, my concern is that in coming before the House as part of a public bill, and if it follows the normal procedure of a public bill, the availability of information, the full opportunity to inquire, is denied to us. I would be quite content if the hon. Minister is prepared to send this to committee and to give

us his undertaking that, prior to it being called before the committee, all of the owners who will be affected will be notified and given an opportunity to appear; and in addition if the surveyor-general of the province is made available to the committee for such questions as the committee may want to direct to him.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would be quite happy, Mr. Speaker, to have it referred. Yes, that would probably be the proper place for it to go.

Mr. Singer: I am sorry, I did not hear that. Natural resources? I do not care what committee.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would be glad to have it referred there and there would be ample opportunity if my hon. friend has anybody whom he thinks might be interested. Actually, I do not think that there is anything at all.

This reservation under section 3 is something that is 100 years old and if my hon. friend has found any reason for questioning it I would be only too glad to have him give it to us. As far as I know, it is just a matter of straightening away a cloud on title that is over 100 years old and has no particular significance, except the difficulty of getting rid of it. I would certainly be glad to have it in front of the committee and if there is any question about it at all we would be very glad to have it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is more than just having it referred to the committee. I am concerned about the question of notice. I do not know how many owners—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We would have to go back 100 years to look up people; it is about 100 years old.

Mr. Singer: There are some 36 acres here; there might be 100 different owners affected, who might have a variety of views. If there is going to be action taken by the government they may all be very happy with it. I honestly do not know, but, if they do not know about it, it seems to me that the reasonable procedure would be to see that they do get some form of notice and be given a form in which they can express their concern if they have any.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If there is any reason for it I would be glad to do it. At the moment I know of no reason for it.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, speaking to the same bill and fol-

lowing my hon. colleague's remarks, I wonder if the hon. Minister could enlighten us at this time as to what he has in mind in connection with the words "substantial compliance"?

Mr. Speaker: I would just like to point out to the member that questions really should be posed during the committee stage of the bill. We are now debating the principle of the bill and I think perhaps any remarks that the member would have should be based on principle. Perhaps, within the principle, he could ask rhetorical questions that the Minister would answer at a later time. But if it is just a specific question it should be left to the committee stage of the bill. I only point this out to the member as being regular practice.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think that behind the hon. members' question was the fact that we are always concerned about discretionary power on the part of government. I am certainly curious to know that, if we pass this, in principle who would decide the definition of "substantial"?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I think it would be a matter between the parties; and the department would have something to say about it. But I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that all that this particular amendment does is bring back what was in the statute and was the law as a result of that up to 1942, I think it was. In 1942 there was a change that left out this particular remedy. In 1961 there was an amendment brought in. At that time there was a gap between 1942 and 1961 which had given rise to quite a number of difficulties on the part of people who have complied, as we think, with the requirements in relation to the patents they are applying for, and so forth.

By making this amendment now, we are just simply going back to the state as it was prior to 1942, and it will enable us to deal with that hiatus between 1942 and 1961 which at the moment is a period in which we cannot clear title under that particular method. It is really helping the settler and so forth to get his title cleared up.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PROVINCIAL LAND TAX ACT, 1961-1962

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 5, An Act to amend The Provincial Land Tax Act, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE BAILIFFS ACT, 1960-1961

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 7, An Act to amend The Baliffs Act, 1960-1961.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Will this go to the legal bills committee?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it would be my thought that this bill, as well as those mentioned in orders 8 to 15, inclusive, would all go to the committee for study. I might say that I, on first reading, mentioned the purpose of these bills. In essence that was the principle and I would not expect to say anything more on any of these at this time. They will all go to committee.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CROWN ADMINISTRATION
OF ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 8, An Act to amend The Crown Administration of Estates Act.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 8, so far as there is a principle involved in it, section 2 would appear to indicate that the public trustee could sell land free of any dower claim without any provision in the statute for notice to find out whether any person was in fact entitled to assert a dower claim or a claim for courtesy. I would hope that, in committee, if the bill goes to committee, the hon. Attorney General would give some adequate explanation of the basis under which such action would be taken.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would say that the purpose of the bill—it is not too clear here, but the intention is that the conveyance from the public trustee would pass the property to the purchaser free of the claim of dower. That does not destroy or kill the claim for dower. The funds would be available to meet such a claim should it arise.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE COUNTY COURTS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 9, An Act to amend The County Courts Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE FIRE MARSHALS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Fire Marshals Act.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, subsection 2 of section 1 of the bill appears to provide for the repeal of a tax which was designed to cover, in part, the expenses of the office of the fire marshal. We would be interested to know what amount of tax has been collected annually under that section and to what extent provision is being made, if necessary, to provide additional funds for the office of the fire marshal.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I will undertake to furnish this information in committee. I do not have it here. I may say that, generally, this Act came forward with the recommendation of The Treasury Department.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JURORS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 11, An Act to amend The Jurors Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE PUBLIC TRUSTEE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The Public Trustee Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SHERIFFS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 13, An Act to amend The Sheriffs Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE MECHANICS' LIEN ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 14, An Act to amend The Mechanics' Lien Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would like to join with previous speakers in extending congratulations to my seatmate, the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) as well as to the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) for their fine, thought-provoking speeches in moving and seconding addresses in reply to the Speech from the Throne.

Congratulations are also in order to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) on their byelection victories last September. I had the pleasure of meeting the hon. member for Nipissing during one of our committee sessions in northern Ontario last year, but I have not as yet had the privilege of meeting the hon. member for Bracondale. I recently read an interesting newspaper item about him and I would like to quote in part:

He promises to bring some colour to the Liberal ranks. He has the reputation for being a loner and a rebel. He could introduce some fire into this party.

These few words provide an interesting introduction to this hon. member. Certainly, I think many hon. members in this House would agree that the Liberal ranks could certainly use some colour. And, as the session proceeds through the long winter days and nights, I will certainly look forward to the fire which this rebel will introduce to this House.

Since leaving this House last June I have enjoyed a busy but interesting seven months. The select committee on aging, of which I am a member, has been engaged fairly continuously compiling information on which to base their report which will be presented later this session. I have appreciated the opportunity which has been presented of travelling to many areas of this province and meeting the citizens, especially in northern Ontario. Even though I realize we live in the banner province of Canada, there are many problems still unsolved. There is much to be done. And I have appreciated the opportunity of broadening my horizons.

I would like to digress from the Throne speech for the moment to say a few words on the very serious situation in my home city of Oshawa, and I refer to the Oshawa newspaper strike.

This strike went into effect last Thursday morning and the newspaper has not published since. Monday morning the company applied for a court injunction against mass

picketing which was granted—and I say that very briefly—and a meagre, token picket of three pickets was to be permitted at each of the three entrances. Mr. Speaker, I realize full well there have been many court injunctions on mass picketing during the past few years. The subsequent remarks I make on this subject are directed primarily to the injunction of Monday morning which so directly affects the city of Oshawa.

The surprising point to me in this matter is that the day prior to the court hearing one of the Oshawa labour leaders predicted to me almost exactly what the court decision would be. There is something wrong with these court injunctions of mass pickets, especially so when an ordinary citizen can fairly accurately predict a court decision before the court is even held and the evidence presented.

To a large extent these injunctions are making a mockery out of our courts among large numbers of law-abiding citizens. If these rulings are automatic, why bother holding a court hearing? I would hasten to point out that I would be the first one to support court action against picket line violence, but in this situation there was no violence. I questioned the Oshawa police chief and there was not one single incident of violence on the police blotter.

We in this House generally support the principle of collective bargaining. We support lawful procedures leading to a strike, such as arbitration hearings and a subsequent cooling-off period before a lawful strike can be called. Picketing is a very important part of any strike and if we have a labour law which can stop bona-fide members of a union carrying out a peaceful, lawful picket, then it is time this law was changed. I do not know the exact wording of this law nor am I a member of the law profession, but I have been told by an authority in our Department of Labour that this section of the labour statutes was never intended to be used as it has now developed, that the courts are putting the wrong interpretation on the law.

I have already stated that I do not have the professional knowledge to argue either one of these points. But as a layman, I will argue against a practice which has developed insofar as this particular labour statute is concerned. It has grown from words on a page to a Frankenstein in the eyes of the labour movement across this province; a Frankenstein which today finds hundreds of honest, law-abiding citizens prepared to carry out mass picketing in defiance of a court ruling because this action appears to be their

only defence. This action seems to them the only way to preserve their rights against this type of court injunction.

I regret to say that at this moment I do not know where this matter is going to end. Our Department of Labour brought company and union together yesterday afternoon, but apparently little was achieved. Both Mayor Lyman Gifford and Oshawa's police chief are gravely concerned over the present explosive situation.

I would urge The Department of Labour to re-examine this area of our labour statutes. It be true that there is nothing wrong with the wording of this law, then let the proper authorities call for an immediate understanding of the court's interpretation. Our present position in this area of labour legislation and ruling is wrong. It has solved nothing in the present Oshawa situation and can only lead, as it has done in the past, to argument and violence.

The Speech from the Throne which was presented to this House last Tuesday demonstrated—and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) will like this—the Speech from the Throne demonstrated once again that the Robarts administration has a primary interest in people. In fact, even that eminent pillar of journalism, the *Toronto Daily Star*, called it a "protect the people" speech. This is reflected in the government's announcement of introduction of legislation covering legal aid, consumer credit, the proposed Ontario council of health, new securities legislation and additional educational opportunities.

Introduction of legislation based on the recommendation of the select committee on consumer credit is an important step and deals with an area in which the actual homeowner becomes involved on numerous occasions. It is inevitable, I suggest, that the Throne speech is phrased in broad terms. Detailed information on the various programmes will be forthcoming when the legislation is actually presented to the House.

I was particularly interested in the fact that 10 items in the speech related to manpower problems, reflecting the government's concern over the skilled labour shortage and other problems in this field. The expansion of the on-the-job training programme is an important move. The economy of this province is continued at a high rate and automation has not as yet seriously affected our employment picture. We must continue to press forward with retraining programmes in view of the ever-increasing threat of automation.

The establishment of an Ontario development corporation will be welcomed by the small businessman, especially in the northern and eastern parts of the province. The aim of this new corporation will be to provide capital to small businesses which want to expand or to people with sound ideas for establishing new businesses. Financing will be made available on reasonable terms and conditions, particularly in the areas where capital funds are hard to find on reasonable terms.

I agree with the hon. member for Armourdale when he said the small businessman is a very important factor in our provincial economy.

Many hundreds of citizens in Ontario will be interested in the legislation of The Department of Public Welfare to consolidate and extend the present benefits of the old age assistance, disabled persons, and blind persons' allowances. The suggestion of a welfare programme based on needs will be welcomed by many of us in this House who find ourselves involved in this area of responsibility from time to time.

I note the hon. Opposition leaders have referred to the Throne speech as Irish stew. Well, even though I am not Irish, I must admit I sometimes eat Irish stew and I have never yet found too much wrong with Irish stew.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for York South used that old cliché "too little and too late" which, even though it is a catchy phrase, has been used so many times it is being worn somewhat thin. I realize the job of the Opposition is to oppose, but as we enter the sixth year of what has been referred to as an economic boom, it is understandable the hon. leaders of the Opposition must of necessity reach out desperately for straws on which to attempt to build the foundation of argument against this government.

When we consider, Mr. Speaker, the tremendous progress and development which has taken place during the past 20 years; our high rate of employment, our economic position; really, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that these things just happened. I suggest to this House they were brought about by sound constructive programmes under the leadership of the very progressive government of this province.

The great riding of Oshawa continues to grow and expand at a very rapid rate. The city of Oshawa which forms the major part of the population of the riding reported another substantial increase during the past

year. This city now has a population of 75,000 and is averaging approximately 4,000 to 5,000 each year.

The residential areas in my riding, which are just east of the Metro boundary, are also increasing at a very rapid rate and here we are faced with a considerable problem. The areas of West Rouge and Bay Ridges contain many hundreds of residential homes with little industrial assessment to balance the costs of necessary services. These South Pickering township areas are described in the Goldenberg report as a dormitory municipality with residential property representing about 90 per cent of its taxable assessment. They face real problems in financing rising school projects and municipal costs.

In the Bay Ridges area a survey shows that over 95 per cent of the residents leave the township to reach their place of employment, the vast majority going to Metro Toronto. Pickering township submitted a brief to the Goldenberg hearing claiming their entitlement to financial assistance from Metro to meet the costs of serving these dormitory municipalities. This, of course, brings out an interesting situation which is developing in many areas of the province, and I refer to the spill-over problem in municipalities which are adjacent to large urban cities.

The large city is not in a position to force or prevent the development of such residential areas by the local township councils, even though it would have to be admitted that the brand-new subdivisions are simply going to serve as dormitory areas for the larger adjacent city.

In his report, Mr. Goldenberg recommended that the provincial government should give recognition to such special situations through appropriate adjustments in the system of grants to municipalities and school districts including the municipal unconditional grant.

I would request that every consideration be given to this recommendation in the Goldenberg report; regardless of the opinion of the government or its reaction to the report, this particular section, as outlined on pages 168 and 169, is very valid and must be given very serious consideration with a view to alleviating the financial strain under which these township residential home owners find themselves.

I mention the financial strain under which a large number of my constituents find themselves in these dormitory areas but they are not alone, of course. The tremendous expansion of population, with the resultant demand for services of all kinds, causes the inevitable

problem of increasing financial need and a call on the average home owner for increased municipal taxes. Possibly the most serious problem at municipal level is the ever-increasing costs of education.

During the past year the select committee on aging has travelled to many parts of this province, and nearly every group presenting briefs dealt with the problem of citizens on fixed incomes and the ever-increasing municipal taxes which they are called upon to pay. Many suggestions were offered as solutions, the most popular being that pensioners should be relieved of their obligations in regard to educational costs. These elderly citizens are anxious to maintain their own homes but it is evident they need some additional financial assistance. The first solution to this particular problem, and most assuredly the most popular, is an increase in the old age pension to at least \$100 per month.

It does not take much thought to realize the present meagre \$75 a month is quite inadequate to maintain even a modest standard of living, and more especially is this true of those citizens living in urban areas.

I note the recent Canadian conference on aging, meeting in Toronto, suggested \$139 per month is the financial requirement for an elderly person living alone. A small financial subsidy to assist elderly citizens to remain in their own homes might well be given consideration. It would be much less costly to maintain an elderly citizen in his own home by means of such a subsidy than it would be to maintain him in subsidized housing or a home for the aged.

In discussing the financial problems of the elderly citizen, and their difficulties in regard to municipal taxes, I do not wish to leave the impression that this elderly group is alone when municipal taxes are being considered. To the average home owner, municipal taxes are an ever-increasing financial strain, with the costs of education providing in many cases approximately 50 per cent of the tax bill. There are municipalities who advocate the government should take over the entire costs of education.

While I feel strongly that the municipality should retain a loud voice in school administration it may well be the day is fast approaching when the entire costs of education will have to be assumed by the province. There are many of our municipal taxpayers today who ask the question: "Why should education be supported by a property tax?"

Back in the early days, when education was purely a local matter, perhaps it could be justified. Today, however, education is so

essential to the progress, wealth and social well-being of people that its efficiency and scope should not be tied to land assessment and land taxes. In addition, it is very important that educational opportunities be equal throughout the province. The province, by taking full control of all taxes for the support of education, would be able to guarantee the fullest possible educational opportunities for all.

If the province assumed the full cost of education it would be faced with a staggering financial cost. It is obvious there would be a need for revision in our taxation system. One possibility might well be a provincial education tax; in other words, tax people, commerce and industry directly to finance education. If such a tax revision were introduced, my municipal taxes certainly would be reduced but my total taxes would not. The major achievement and advantage would be a broader and fairer taxation base for education.

I have discussed this taxation problem with many citizens and there is strong support for the suggestion that we should tax property for services to land, and tax people for services to people. One thing is certain: The municipal tax picture has reached the saturation point in many areas of our province. We must press forward toward a revamping of our taxation structure.

The report of the Carter Royal commission on taxation will be tabled in the House of Commons later this year. It is anticipated the report will present a challenge of sound government financing at the federal, provincial, and municipal levels. I am sure there will be general support in this House for this anticipation to become a reality, and a hope that the Carter report will present a new picture of taxation, a picture which will solve some of the present financial problems with which we are confronted.

During my first speech in this Legislature, I spoke on the need for regional planning boards supervised and encouraged by government. Last year the central Ontario joint planning board was organized in my area, encompassing six municipalities, from Bowmanville on the east to Whitby on the west.

The dynamic growth and development throughout this area during the past few years has been spectacular. Continual pressure is on the city of Oshawa to annex surrounding township lands which would mean, of course, the providing of underground services which the city cannot afford to provide. The residential spill-over into the surrounding townships, lacking municipal water and sewer facilities, is providing a real headache in

many of our major residential areas throughout the province of Ontario. These problems will not diminish but will continue to grow. The question may well be asked: What is the answer?

We hear and read a lot these days about improvements that might be made to govern our municipalities more economically and more efficiently. One has only to look at the duplication of administration services and maintenance equipment to realize that more efficiency could be given to the ratepayers. I suggest we are rapidly reaching the stage where, in our own best interests, bigger municipal units of government must be adopted. We must have a re-examination of our existing municipal structure, finances, and the lines of communication between local government and the province.

One of the big factors complicating the situation is the uneven population, industrial, and commercial growth throughout this province. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) has pointed out on several occasions the inequalities in the administration of the existing tax base of our various municipalities. There is undoubtedly an urgent need to improve standards and practices in municipal assessment.

In our province today there are more than 900 local governments attempting to provide programmes of uniform standards of service for the benefit of the citizens whom they serve. It is becoming increasingly evident that new and more modern administrative procedures are urgently needed. With the increasing growth of our province, it becomes more and more clear that local government units can no longer be entities unto themselves. We must recognize that action taken by one municipality will inevitably affect its neighbours. In this area, I refer to roads, water distribution, sewage collection and so forth.

Regional government, its place in our provincial development and how it should operate, has been widely discussed. The select committee on The Municipal Act and related Acts suggested that, as a practical start, the adoption of the county in whole or in part, or with additions thereto, be the basic units of regional government. Our hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has stated that regional government, based on the metropolitan principle, with the county as the basic political unit, is a possible solution to our problem. There are varying views expressed by local government representatives and community leaders. It may well be that the county base for regional government could operate effectively in many

areas of our province. I would hasten to suggest, however, the differences that can occur in economics, social and physical patterns would necessitate a flexibility of approach, no hard-and-fast lines can be established.

There would be need of the highest degree of co-operation if any successful form of regional government is to be achieved. It must be remembered that local government is an essential element within our democratic system and the elected municipal officials can be understandably on guard in the protection of their local autonomy.

In one area of my own riding there are three local governments governing individual sections of a very highly populated area which involves ever-increasing problems. I am sure one government in this particular area could plan better, assess better and thereby serve the needs of the people more efficiently. A more highly trained and better paid staff could be retained to provide the most efficient government.

The regional system would also improve the management of the tax base and ensure more effective equalized assessment, and in the overall picture a better standard of services could be provided.

On the disadvantage side would be the problem of political representation. There would undoubtedly be disagreements over the division of responsibilities between the local government and the regional level. While levying and collection of taxes would be on a more equal basis, the establishment of a regional government would not offer any new taxation sources. This is one of the basic problems facing local government today, indeed it is an ever-increasing problem which is confronting all levels of government.

This problem of community expansion, regional planning and government is obviously the major problem facing our province today. Many municipalities across this province are literally bulging at the seams. Their boundaries do not conform with the lines of economic and social development. They are anxious to move forward, they are looking to the future, they are looking to our government for direction. Certainly the problems which lie ahead are many and complex but they must be tackled without delay. Many dollars can be saved and much more efficient form of government can be established.

I feel the time has come when this government must take a more determined attitude in the development of the regional government programme. I realize that studies are being undertaken in various areas throughout the province. Careful studies and planning

are vital to the success of this important aspect of our provincial development. But let those studies be objective, with a view to definite action based on the results of such studies.

I was surprised to read recently that in the past 20 years, since joint planning boards in this province have been permitted, not one official plan has been approved by all municipalities in the planning area. In the interests of the overall development of this great province we can no longer afford to tip-toe around the fringe of this matter. We cannot permit individual municipalities to hold up future progress. We must grasp this problem in both hands and, in co-operation with our progressive elected municipal officials, we must take strong decisive steps to push forward this important programme which will provide a system of government which will more adequately and efficiently serve the needs of the people of Ontario.

In a few short months we in Canada will stand on the threshold of our 100th birthday. What will this 100th birthday party bring to Canada? I suggest the greatest birthday present we here in Ontario could present to Canada would be a sincere dedication to work diligently toward the preservation of a united Canada.

If we are to have a united Canada we must work to strengthen and make richer the historic partnership between English and French Canada. We must ever bear in mind that Canada is a country of two basic cultures and these two cultures will remain the cornerstone of the future development of our nation. We must have the complete allegiance of all our citizens and this allegiance to our nation should stand above our relationships with our province or any voluntary association to which we may belong—in other words we must first of all be Canadians.

We must be willing to support whatever measures that changing times and historical transition may prescribe for the continuation of this great union and to this end subscribe to and foster whatever constitutional, economic and social changes are necessary to achieve this paramount goal.

One hundred years ago the fathers of Confederation, at their meetings in Charlottetown and Quebec city, were faced with problems which in comparison dwarf those of today. They looked at the political and economic structure of the several colonies and saw weakness and instability on every hand. But these men also saw the possibilities and potentials inherent in the concept of Canadian Confederation. They saw that Confederation

provided the mechanism by which a nation could be built for the benefit of all Canadians. These great men drafted The British North America Act—a document that has served us well for almost 100 years. Today we have reached a period in our history where changes in this historic document to some degree are necessary, and we must look beyond our own immediate concern. We must look forward with the same foresight that these fathers of Confederation displayed towards a strong united Canada.

The potential for the future development of this country is unlimited and in comparison our problems of today seem insignificant. We must never become so concerned over specific problems that we fail to grasp the concept of a stronger and more vital Canadian nation.

Today there is a change in the attitudes of our people. We are beginning to look objectively and realistically at the existing relationships between our various cultural groups and the contribution they are making and can make to our community life. The influence of any individual in the promotion of understanding between provinces is, by itself, negligible. It is much more important that there be a climate of opinion favourable to the promotion of understanding in our relationships if we are to achieve the desired unity which is so important to all Canada.

Mr. Speaker, as we arrive at our 100th birthday I suggest to this House that we are blessed in being permitted to live in the most stimulating and exciting period in the history of this country. Let us take advantage of our opportunity; let us put patience, understanding and education to work for all our people.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): I count it an honour and a privilege to be rising as a member for the riding of Bracondale to make my first speech in the legislative assembly of Ontario.

In listening to the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) I must admit that I was compelled to look at the sketch on my desk and then at the aisle there at least three or four times to determine whether or not he was speaking on behalf of the government or on behalf of the Opposition. Frankly, I would more than welcome him over to this side of the House as I am now in a better position to appreciate at least why he, if not the other hon. members, are on this side of you, Mr. Speaker, rather than on the right.

I am able to represent a constituency in which I have worked many years, one in which I have counted among my many

friends and supporters many thousands of its constituents and one in which I know there are many others who, whatever their political affiliation, wish me well.

I would like to interrupt here, Mr. Speaker; when I started speaking someone else was in the chair.

Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your appointment. I might say that, sitting here for a week as I have, I was not quite certain whether I should offer condolences or congratulations as I find you in a position which, frankly, I would not envy. Sitting in the middle of the House here, you must be completely impartial; you have to listen to many dull speeches and cannot interject or correct the errors of many hon. members. You seldom absent yourself from the House, as do many of the hon. members here, and you must listen to all this dull stuff that comes out. So, although I think perhaps condolences should be in order, considering that you have the confidence of this whole House, you are worthy of congratulations and I offer them heartily to you, sir.

I have divided feelings as I stand here today. They are feelings of both pride and humility, determination and diffidence, confidence in my own capability, and uncertainty, which many must feel at such a moment, in my ability to discharge to the fullest my responsibility to what I believe is the truly enormous task that lies ahead.

It has been my good fortune in recent years to have had the opportunity for public service and, to the public which has given me that opportunity, I am truly grateful. I give them my formal promise at this time that I will bend every effort to discharge my duties to them, to that wider public throughout the province and the country, and to my party and myself with all the energy and dedication that is at my command.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may add that I have been a little disconcerted by recent events that seem to me to smack of something more than coincidence; in fact, I crave reassurance.

First of all, I have just been elected and the riding I represent is soon to be wiped from the map. Now, I ask you, is that fair? Moreover, when I ran in Bracondale I found myself contending against one mortician or, if you like, funeral director, whose motto was "The last man to let you down", and whose workers' motto was "Bury Ben". I find myself seated beside another, both of whom would do the last thing in the world for me,

so I merely want to go on record at this time to the effect that if one of these men is to bury me, please I would prefer it to be a Liberal.

Mr. Speaker, we are assembled here, at what I believe to be the most critical and challenging period in the history of this province. As I look around me, first at the small number of my own party gathered on this side of the House, and then towards the heavy majority opposite, I am brought to a full realization of the magnitude of the task ahead. Were the record of this government as formidable as its hon. members I think I would be at an utter loss. As it happens, it is not.

The record of this government—permit me to say it—the record of this government with all its long tenure of power, with the tremendous wealth and resources it is able to command, with all its potentiality for admirable service, is not a good one. In fact, if you will allow me, any objective survey of recent history demonstrates that the record of this government, seemingly so well entrenched in complete majority, is appallingly bad. If this were an over statement it is not merely to serve political ends. I would be guilty of a disservice to the public were it so. In the short time I propose to take I cannot hope to deal with this record at length so, with your indulgence, I am going to cover as much ground in as short an interval as I can.

In a few words, Mr. Speaker, the record of this government is one of complacency, omission and neglect. This is so, not merely in those areas of government activity that are rarely brought to the attention of the public; it is the blunt unpalatable truth with regard to areas of vital importance to the welfare and the prosperity of this province. Truth travels slowly but it eventually reaches the public, and in time it will reach even this government. There is a cold wind rushing upon these gentlemen and I predict that, when it has passed, most of them will have vanished from this House.

For 22 years this government has been in power in this province. That is a long time, too long to be reviewed in any short space but—and I give you notice—I intend to rise frequently in this House, if the strength and opportunity are allowed me, to deal at length and in detail with each of the issues I raise today. There are, I admit, many of them.

Any candid, non-partisan student of Ontario affairs who has surveyed the record must be struck by a flaringly unfavourable discrepancy between the government's achieve-

ments and its failures. In the most crucial areas of civilized concern—in health, in welfare, in the administration of justice, penal reform, planning, in many others—the Conservative government of Ontario has failed to discharge its obligations to the people, even in those areas where it acknowledges them.

Notwithstanding this, it is an arrogant government, swollen with complacency, and gone to seed through indifference and neglect. What other government in Canada has so curtailed the right of this Opposition to make the voice of the people its members represent heard in this House? What other government has so restricted the opportunity for debate? What other government has shortened legislative sessions to such an extent to permit itself to rule by edict and ukase? What other government is so paralyzed by the prospect of an open discussion and debate?

With all those antennae and listening posts and channels of communication that government is supposed to have, with all the enormous resources of the richest province in the land, it is a government that has lost touch with the people; a government that is forever stopping at the lotus pool and gazing admiringly at its own reflection while the proper business of the province remains undone. With a very few notable exceptions, it is a government gone to seed through indifference and neglect.

Here I must give credit to the government for its housing policy. I have always taken the position that the large low-cost housing communities being created by the municipal governments were economical ghettos that would become physical ghettos; that low cost housing units should be small in size and spread throughout the whole community so that no one need know the occupants in the apartment next to his were having their rent subsidized. To me the roof over the head of an unfortunate is not enough. He must be given an equal place in the community, and I feel the present policy is going a long way in accomplishing some of my desires in this regard.

It is a government distinguished by a complacent, self-rewarding and self-perpetuating Cabinet supported by long grey lines of refined, well-dressed, personally attractive and generally incapable men. Altogether they comprise a government generally devoid of interest, impulse and vitality. A bored government and a boring government; a government of men not merely prematurely old at 60, but old at 28.

It is a government steeped in the pleasures of pomp and vanity and the pleasures of pushing other people around. It is a government that regards the right of the members who make up this Opposition with the same disdain with which it regards the public. The members of the Opposition have known about this for a long time and now at last the public is beginning to understand.

The first obligation of most governments is to govern; the first obligation of this government is to ask for forgiveness. Twenty-two years is a long time, and it is interesting to hear hon. members of that heavy majority advert to their experiences.

It reminds me of a story. Now, it is a story not directly applicable, of course; it is just a story, Mr. Speaker. It seems that a general in the American Civil War was speaking harshly and deridingly of one of his associates in command. "But, sir" protested an aide, "that man has been through 22 campaigns." Whereupon the general pointedly replied, "So has that mule there, but she is still a jackass."

A recommendation has been made that a court for youthful offenders be established. What has the government done to implement this recommendation? As most hon. members know, one of my special areas of concern is the courts and penal system of this province. In this area as well I have been struck by what must be the near total incapacity, if not sheer indifference, of the hon. Minister involved.

The word "informed" is one we often associate with the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) but, alas, not in the sense that the hon. Minister would in fact like all of us to associate this word. The hon. Minister is consistently uninformed, ill-informed, and misinformed to an extent that would be comical if his lack of initiative and comprehension of his role did not bear on one of the great areas of human concern.

The other day I asked the hon. Minister if he was aware that the so-called "baby doll pyjamas" was the normal attire for those inmates at Guelph reformatory in isolation in D wing. The hon. Minister replied that he was not aware that such was the case and denied it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I visited Guelph reformatory everyone in solitary confinement was wearing the baby dolls. And I was informed by Mr. Sanderson, the superintendent, that everyone in detention in that area did wear the baby dolls and that they were the standard garb for those in isolation. I there-

fore interpret the hon. Minister's remark as an admission that he was not aware of this situation, but that he denied that he was unaware of it.

What has the hon. Minister done since assuming office? He is in the proud position of being the Minister responsible for some of the most hopeless and damning institutions on this continent. He is the Minister who, with appalling judgment and consummate arrogance, rises in this House to speak of the possibility that the government would restrict "surprise" inspections by members of the Legislature to the institutions which are his responsibility. This may not be laudable, but it is understandable because any candid scrutiny of The Department of Reform Institutions, any thorough inspection of the province's penal system, reveals that that department and that system are in a shocking and deplorable state.

He is the Minister who rises in this House to make the statement that \$25,000 would not be a large enough salary to lure psychiatrists into full-time jobs in Ontario institutions and then inanely resumes his seat without dwelling upon the problem at length. Obviously if \$25,000 is necessary to obtain adequate competent psychiatric help in our jails, that is the price the government must be prepared to pay. He is the Minister who blandly, in a blinding flash of fleeting insight, says he is, "Aware that much remains to be done in reform institutions." This is a bland and impudent understatement, and may be his solitary apt and significant statement on record.

He is the Minister who virtually exonerates himself from all responsibility for the shocking state of the system under his control with the airy statement that this country is not going to forge ahead in penal reform until the federal government creates a separate department to handle reform institutions.

This is ministerial responsibility? This is discharging the duties of office? Obviously, this province is not going to forge ahead in penal reform or anything else when the Ministers of this government persist in running to Ottawa and burying their heads in mommy's apron every time they run into a problem; every time the going gets rough.

He is a Minister who says he is concerned about a frightful and deteriorating situation in Millbrook reformatory and at once adds the incredible statement that "It is not within the power of The Department of Reform Institutions to change it."

We are left with a penal system that is deteriorating rapidly, with all the profound,

disquieting implications that deterioration has for this province. Let me read you a statement. It begins:

We are setting up a department to deal with certain institutions . . . and this new legislation is intended to stress reform rather than punitive methods.

Mr. Speaker, that remark was not made yesterday or last week or a month ago. It was made 20 years ago by the hon. George Drew, then premier of this province.

As visualized by him, inmates in reformatories were to spend most of their time in classrooms. There would be special schools for guards to ensure they were fit and competent for their work.

What has been the record since? Even a Minister must be satisfied from the reports on Mercer and Millbrook reformatories that the heaviest burden placed on the inmates of those two institutions is boredom—sheer boredom.

How do the classrooms in Guelph prepare the inmates for their release? Will the short terms they spend in the woollen mills, tailor shops, the body shops, the piggery or the cattle barns, prepare them for the place in society they are entitled to by virtue of being part of this country? Or have they lost all rights to citizenship and participation in the daily affairs of our province and our country?

A survey several years ago showed that under Britain's probation system 75 per cent of first offenders placed on probation have not been convicted again. In contrast, the Canadian prison scheme here has failed to rehabilitate 70 per cent of those committed to its charge.

Twenty years ago the hon. George Dunbar, the first Minister of that new department, suggested with a smile, that the motto of the department should be "Segregation, education and salvation". Today in all its bleak and frightening aspects, the motto could be, "Incarceration, intimidation and subjugation."

I intend to return to this department and its Minister at a later date.

As for the poor in this province, no people have received so much verbal sympathy and so little practical support. And this is a province which, with all its wealth and resources, numbers too many persons who are poor. No real attempt has been made by the government to assess the nature and depth of poverty; no genuine concern is shown for the problem of the poor.

Why does a province that provides 40 per cent of the national income require those who are living on pensions and fixed income

to pay education taxes—as the hon. member for Oshawa pointed out? Should not the cost of education be paid from income tax and income tax alone? Since those who earn the most probably benefited the most from their education, thereby owing the most to their education, should they not pay the most towards the education of others?

An hon. member: Is that Liberal policy?

Mr. Ben: That is my policy and it is the Liberal policy. When Nelson was asked the secret of his success he replied, "I was always 15 minutes before the other fellow". This government is always 15 years behind.

In so many fields this government has failed to perform. It has failed even to observe the traditional and hallowed forms of procedure by replying to questions put in this House. Where is the youth service branch of The Department of Education promised almost two years ago?

Where is concern for the poor in a province where two million are impoverished, 500,000 are living at bare subsistence level, and 700,000 are destitute?

Where is concern for the emotionally disturbed children in the province when there are estimated to be between 280,000 and 560,000 such children?

Has the research programme the Deputy Minister announced to be the answer to the problem? The people want more results and not just more research.

Where is the planning council for Toronto hospitals promised by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) for last July 17?

Where are the changes in the Ontario hospital school for the retarded, promised more than a year ago, today?

Where does the government stand on Medicare, on pensions, on welfare, on prisons, on nursing education and on other issues in so many important fields?

The public does not know where the Ministers stand, the Ministers do not know where the Prime Minister stands, and God only knows where the Prime Minister stands. It is like the old epigram, how does it go?

Hail to the city of Boston

Home of the bean and the cod

Where the Lowells speak only to Cabots

And the Cabots speak only to God.

This government is vulnerable and knows it. The only justification for continuance in office is performance and this government has failed to perform. It stands like those

elaborate Hollywood sets, impressive in front and empty behind. And what sort of leadership is given by that party? It is an uninspired and uninspiring leadership characterized by confusion, obfuscation and delay.

I will always associate the quality of that leadership with a remark made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts): "The main antidote for unemployment is increased growth and production," he said. I had an uncanny feeling when I read this, that I had read something similar before and then I remembered. I think it was Herbert Hoover or Calvin Coolidge who said: "When large numbers of people are out of work, unemployment results."

I have a notion that the voters are going to respond the next time to these government promises the way a certain young lady responded to the proposal from a young farm friend of hers. He said: "Marry me and I will paint the house and the barn inside and out. I will put in electricity, I will buy a brand-new stove and refrigerator. Will you marry me?"

She answered: "Honey, let us leave it this way. You do all those things and then ask me again." The government had better start getting things done if it wants to woo the electors.

But it is not only the poor who are neglected by this government. It neglects the average man, the man on the street. Consider one area in which this has been made perfectly clear. A guaranteed family income is an absolute social necessity when the wage-earner has been struck down by illness. This unalterable fact has been ignored for too long, and I, for one, intend to follow every avenue until action is taken to ensure that a person who is stricken by illness or is a victim of an accident, can be assured of monetary security for his family during the crisis.

By providing salary insurance during periods of hospitalization and convalescence, a tremendous burden and a great concern would be lifted from the shoulders of the afflicted family. I cannot think of anything more demoralizing for a man recovering from illness, than to be forced to concern himself with his family's finances. During these times, the family is under great emotional strain and is experiencing what is often a difficult and fighting period of readjustment. It certainly must be disconcerting for the person who is ill, and it must hinder his recovery to be faced with this added burden. A form of salary insurance such as I pro-

pose would induce some wage-earners to undergo medical attention promptly.

All too often people delay seeking medical assistance for fear of the financial problem this would impose for their family.

I firmly advocate assistance that would allow a moratorium to be declared on loans, mortgage payments and financing if the breadwinner is medically certified unable to resume his normal occupation. The family, the basic unit of civilized society, has enough problems to cope with during a period of illness and if they are to avoid destruction they should be aided in every possible manner.

This is the 20th century and we are supposedly living in a wealthy nation. This is a positive step that we can take, and must take, to help provide stability within a family in these demanding times. As someone once said, democracy is a poor form of government but is the best we have. However, under the arbitrary rule of the many government-appointed boards and commissions, and so on in this province, your chance of getting just treatment can be shockingly reduced.

Persons charged with misdemeanors should not have to be faced with a night in jail. Rather they should be either released on their own recognizance or released on bail they can afford to pay. Today, intolerably—as the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) once put it—bail means jail.

The family court system as we know it should be scrapped. In the first place it should be given a proper name and called a counselling service. For the many young people who come before these courts today the court renders an inappropriate, if not actively harmful, service. The court approach is *ad hoc*, unsympathetic and too often shows a lack of comprehension of the background and environment of the child. The child has frequently been formed in an amoral, if not an immoral, environment and the court fails to take this into full account.

Re-education is the key to making these children good and productive citizens and society is not well served by branding them as delinquents.

Youthful offenders should be kept out of jails as much as possible. The high number of repeaters only bears out substantial evidence that jail in Ontario today is only a training school for crime. Instead of grouping veteran criminals and impressionable newcomers, there should be segregation in our jails. Young people particularly should be lodged in rehabilitation centres or halfway houses where they can be helped, instead of damaged for their lives. The hon. Minister of

Reform Institutions readily admits that there is insufficient professional staff in our institutions and evades the responsibility by doing little or nothing about it.

Another area of concern is low interest home improvement loans which should be made available as an incentive to homeowners to check the growth of slums.

New Canadians should be offered a chance to attend evening courses established by the government and designed to help them understand Canadian laws, customs and the entire cultural pattern. And yet what is the record? Recent figures show that more than 300,000 immigrants have gone to educational classes since World War II, but only 15 per cent have graduated or received certificates, Mr. Speaker.

Obviously there is something wrong with the system. The immigrant not only has to contend with the top-heavy bureaucracy of this government, he cannot even get from it the sort of education necessary if he is to find his rightful place in community life.

The hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) is therefore still another of many of this government's ineffectual Ministers. In this crucial area he is clearly failing to do his job.

Consider also the position of people on welfare in this province who, under the present system, are forced into utterly unproductive lives. They cannot turn their hands to any socially useful work. If they do Big Brother pounds his fist on their door and their meagre dole is promptly cut off. Instead of this mean-spirited, oppressive and gratuitous system we should establish one allowing the welfare recipient, within specified limits, to supplement his welfare cheque with the income from part-time work. This is good for the province, good for the recipient and gives him self-respect and a sense of purpose in life.

But it is not only the poor and the unfortunate who are given short shrift by this lethargic and indifferent government; a government that, before an election, plants its feet towards the future and after turns its face to the past. Even children, the hope of this province and this nation, are the victims of this government's laziness, dismissiveness and neglect.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes I have taken this afternoon I have not attempted to cover the whole field of my interest or my concern with regard to the problems confronting this government. To deal with any one of them at sufficient length would require an afternoon and that would be only a beginning. I will return to each one of these

subjects and others at a later date as time and opportunity are allowed me. It may be sufficient for me to say at this time that I believe the record of this government is one of shameful neglect in areas of vital concern to the welfare of this province. I will demonstrate this in detail when I am able to deal with this record in a logical and progressive way.

I am grateful for your attention, Mr. Speaker, and may I express my thanks.

Mr. R. Welch (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I would want to echo the words of commendation already directed to you, sir, and to add a word of welcome to our new colleagues in this House—the hon. members for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) and Nipissing (Mr. Smith).

May I also take this opportunity to pay tribute to those employed in the civil service of the province. I am sure many in this House appreciated the efforts of Mr. William Rathburn, who took the time to discuss our civil service on a radio broadcast at the beginning of December last year. We tend to take these people for granted; but, as a private member in this House I did not want to overlook the tremendous help they provide in looking after the affairs of one's constituency. Many work behind the scenes, attendants for whom nothing is too much trouble; the staff of this particular House when it is in operation; secretaries, departmental staff; and so on. It is a pleasure to work with these people in the interests of our citizens.

In studying the Speech from the Throne, it becomes obvious that this government, notwithstanding what has just been said, recognizes very well the need for increased investment in our human resources. We will have to await the introduction of the Budget to learn the amounts involved, and perhaps any remarks on this subject should be postponed for the Budget debate.

Sufficient to say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that when one considers the fluidity of the Canadian population, and studies the inter-provincial differences in ability to support education, our federal government is going to have to provide more financial support for education.

The Economic Council of Canada very recently emphasized the importance of this increased investment in human resources, and we have been reminded that: "our people are mobile as no people before them—making the nation their home." But more of this at Budget time.

There are several matters I would like to discuss in this particular debate.

The agricultural industry is a very vital part of the economy of the riding of Lincoln.

I know that our rural people are looking forward to having further information on the subject of crop insurance referred to in the Speech from the Throne.

The Department of Agriculture, of course, is to be commended for joining with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation farm department in sponsoring the short course entitled, "This Business of Farming." These television broadcasts, as you will recall, were shown through the co-operation of local television stations and other organizations interested in the agricultural industry.

It should also be pointed out here that, last November, the provincial Department of Agriculture sponsored a trade mission to England and Western Europe with a view to promoting new markets for our fruit and vegetable products.

We were fortunate in having two very active growers from Lincoln as members of this mission.

Our people are enthused with the possibilities that are available for the export of our processed products. There are vast potential markets in the United Kingdom and Western Europe.

Of course, there are many problems, but there are two major problems which face the fruit and vegetable growers in the Niagara peninsula. The first has to do with the shortage of suitable farm labour, and the second the curtailment of rail transportation.

In 1964 and 1965 fruit crops in the peninsula were below average. 1965 crops were approximately 20-25 per cent below 1964, with cool weather extending the marketing season. With present labour shortages, if this situation were to reverse, serious crop losses could result.

Producers in my riding cannot compete on the general labour market as farm prices have not kept pace with increases in other aspects of the economy.

Of the various sources of farm labour explored over the past few years, the largest and most available source appears to be our northern Indians. Many of these people show a propensity for farm work and a mechanical aptitude. I am advised that, after two years of trial employment of northern Indians as seasonal farm workers, the whole programme is in grave danger of failure because of some related problems.

A suggestion has been made—and I would underline it for the very serious consideration of the House—that an Indian centre be established in Lincoln county, similar in many respects to the centre for continuing education in Elliot Lake. It is envisaged that this centre could accommodate some 300 to 400 Indians, with both single and married quarters. It would include classrooms and recreation facilities.

Through the programme at the centre, educational levels could be raised where necessary, with the students working part time on local farms. And in addition, in co-operation with local industries in my riding, working with the directors of the centre, some of our Indian friends who qualify could be given further trades training under an apprenticeship programme. This would be a very imaginative step which would be of tremendous help to the northern Indians who travel to our part of the province and, at the same time, relieve a critical labour shortage. This would appear consistent with government policy already announced with respect to our responsibilities in this regard.

On the subject of transportation, the curtailment of rail service for the shipment of Ontario fruits and vegetables, and increasing costs, are serious problems facing Niagara producers, as well as those in Essex county and the marsh areas. This applies particularly to the rapid increase in express rates. The substantial rate increases make shipment to many points prohibitive and tends to restrict distribution of our products to the major centres in the province.

The cancellation of special fruit rates for LCL—less than car lots—shipments means, in effect, a 55 per cent increase in express rates. This is a real hardship for my agricultural people and it is hoped that something can be done about it.

In completing this section of the address, I am anxious to make a brief reference to our ARDA programme and, in particular, to emphasize the importance which we must continue to attach to it.

I am hopeful that a pilot project initiated in the township of Gainsborough, in my riding, might be the first of many steps to reclaim acres of valuable agricultural land and make it possible for the people in the area to make a decent living from their farm labours by supplying the food needs of our nation and, indeed, the world.

Mr. Speaker, reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the programme of The Department of Highways in 1966. At

this point I would be remiss if I did not pay tribute to the hon. Minister (Mr. MacNaughton), to his deputy, Mr. MacNab, and to all who are involved in the work of that great department. I never cease to be amazed at their patience and understanding as they meet with the many delegations who come from all parts of my riding, and as they work with all of the officials—both elected and appointed—from the various municipalities throughout the county of Lincoln. Officials of the department and our various municipalities work very closely together to carry out an extensive road programme for our people.

Many matters have been placed before the hon. Minister. One of recent interest was the presentation by a committee appointed from the councils of the counties of Lincoln, Welland and Wentworth. This committee prepared a brief for the government in order to outline the value of the Niagara escarpment as a provincial resource, and to interest this government in providing the direction and financial assistance necessary to construct a roadway and integrated parks system from Queenston to Hamilton.

This tri-county scenic drive would assure, to a very large population, a uniquely varied park area and at the same time preserve a tract of land of so high an order of interest as to constitute what might be called a national asset. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that this project would be favourably considered by the department. The possibilities for development of forty miles of road and parkland are almost limitless.

Turning to another important consideration, we would underline the importance of the St. Catharines area transportation study. The cost of this report was paid for substantially through government grants. It provides a detailed outline of the transportation system necessary to serve the great city of St. Catharines and its expanding area for the next 20 years.

I would like to draw the hon. Minister's attention to an excellent series of articles dealing with the report written by Mr. A. E. Kingsley, which have appeared in the *St. Catharines Standard*. The articles have been reprinted in booklet form and have been widely circulated.

St. Catharines is a very fast-growing community, and tremendous development and expansion is taking place in our sixth largest city. One raises the question here as to whether there might be some need to review the transportation study referred to, particularly with reference to priorities of work to be done.

The uninterrupted crossing of the Welland ship canal is of particular concern in our area. We are grateful to The Department of Highways and the seaway authority for their decision to construct a tunnel under the canal at Carlton street in St. Catharines. However the question is now raised with respect to the development of Glendale avenue in St. Catharines, and the crossing of the canal at this point. It would seem that an uninterrupted crossing should be provided here as well.

McKinnon Industries Limited have located their plant No. 2 and their large administration building on the east side of the canal on Glendale avenue; and as a result this has introduced thousands of cars to an already inadequate roadway. Glendale avenue is also experiencing increased traffic as it connects the Queen Elizabeth highway to the new Highway 406. It is hoped that a re-examination of this location and its problems might be included in the programme of the department working with the municipality and the seaway authority.

It is indicated in the speech read to the Legislature recently by His Honour, that the subject of welfare is to receive legislative attention.

May I presume at this point, Mr. Speaker, to make the following suggestions:

First, with respect to our assistance programme, or our assistance pensions, with the qualifying age for the old age security pension being annually reduced from 70 years to 65 years, we should seriously consider reducing the qualifying age for our provincial "means test" assistance pension from 65 years to 60 years of age. We are presently helping widows and unmarried women starting at age 60.

Now it is true that the others can be helped through general welfare assistance, which is subsidized by an 80 per cent grant from the two senior governments, but I would suggest that the benefits to the recipient are really not as great as they would be if combined in our present provincial programme. Several advantages would follow:

First, we would aid municipalities by assuming full responsibility for those in this age group who qualify.

Second, it would mean a great deal to many of our senior people who, through poor health—not bad enough for disability pension—and/or age, cannot obtain full-time employment and who would have a basic income with the privilege of earning a little more on part-time work.

There would be nothing wrong with maintaining the so-called "means test" subject to

comments which I would like to make now concerning regulation in this regard.

With respect to these regulations I would think that realistic levels of allowable income in addition to the provincial assistance provided should be considered with respect to all of our assistance programmes, particularly in view of the present-day cost of living.

I think, also, that we are obligated to consider another procedure when determining eligibility for some of our programmes. The emphasis, I feel, should be on need rather than means. Perhaps this could be best explained by way of an example.

The province is presently paying, along with the federal government, an 80 per cent grant with respect to what is called supplementary aid.

Without going into all the details, local municipal welfare officers can pay up to \$20 per month by way of supplementary aid to the recipients of our so-called means test pensions and to recipients of old age security provided that the income of a single person does not exceed \$105 per month including the pension and a married couple's income does not exceed \$185 per month including the pension. It is my understanding that as soon as these people go \$1 above the allowable income limits they then are disentitled to any supplementary aid. This would leave one with the impression that such an approach does not really reward thrift and a desire to help oneself.

Would it not seem fairer if we worked from the top down and simply deducted the excess over the allowable income from the amount of supplementary aid to be paid and then paid the difference as supplementary aid?

Now if need is to be the meaningful criterion then surely we can work out regulations for all of our programmes which will provide our people with the ability to maintain themselves at a respectable standard of living.

And before leaving this general heading I want to say how much I appreciate, as a private member in this Legislature, the help received from everyone in The Department of Public Welfare. In particular may I single out the Deputy Minister, Mr. James Band, who goes above and beyond to assist the private member in the exercise of his day-to-day responsibilities. Mr. Band and our various regional administrators and their respective staffs are tremendously helpful in this regard.

Now turning to another subject, Mr. Speaker, the Niagara peninsula, with its four major urban centres of St. Catharines, Niagara

Falls, Welland and Hamilton, represents about 12 per cent of the population of Ontario by 1961 figures, and has increased at a rate of 32 per cent between 1951 and 1961—a growth rate which I would suggest is well above that of the province.

With the estimated increase in population for the Niagara region to a some additional 1 million people in the next 20 years over our present 460,000, it is estimated that there will be an obvious need for another 4,250 acres of land for park purposes, with perhaps some 1,500 acres being lakeshore areas.

I would like to suggest that the government consider at least two proposals in this connection:

First, through a generous grant from The Department of Lands and Forests a master development plan has been completed, covering the third Welland Canal regional park located in the city of St. Catharines and the town of Thorold.

This park, as proposed, will provide much needed camping and picnic areas and at the same time will preserve historical evidence of the region.

The site, comprising a total of 708 acres, is traversed by the remains of the waterway and locks of the old third Welland Canal operated from 1887 to 1932.

I would strongly urge the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) to study the master plan for this park very closely in the hopes that the government will become very much involved in the comprehensive development of this land for public purposes. I would like to pay tribute to the fact that a local committee has been working very hard on this project.

The second suggestion, Mr. Speaker, concerns the members of the Niagara regional development association who have also been very active in the establishment of Lake Ontario frontage for park and recreational purposes.

The Fifty Point Park made up of acreage within the townships of North Grimsby and Saltfleet will be readily accessible by the Queen Elizabeth highway.

I know that the hon. Minister is very familiar with this site and it is hoped that it will be recognized as a must because the area is already the subject of much real estate speculation.

It would seem to me that the purchase of this Lake Ontario frontage would fit in with the \$200 million, 20-year programme announced by the government in 1962 for land acquisition designed to acquire parts of the

shoreline of the Great Lakes and other needed lands to provide for future parks and recreational needs.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I would feel that the time has come for some bold steps if future generations are to be provided with the opportunity to know something of their past—which which has contributed to our greatness as a people.

Naturally, this is very relevant to the area which I am privileged to represent in this Parliament. We should also consider this in the light of the recent report of the Ontario economic council concerning Ontario's tourist industry.

Perhaps the government would consider the establishment of a provincial commission or foundation equipped with powers and resources to enable it to negotiate the purchase of property of all kinds deemed by research personnel worthy of acquisition for the public. This should be a co-operative effort, however, with the government simply being one of the parties, for I would hope that we could attract into such a proposition interested individuals and groups prepared to accept their share of responsibility with respect to this work as well.

But in doing so, let us keep in mind the welfare of the municipalities where this property is located. There should be a very close relationship between such a government foundation or commission, call it what you will, and the elected councils of the various municipalities of this province.

The town of Niagara-on-the-Lake, for example, is very rich in historical treasures. But we have to keep in mind that its duly elected council has the responsibility to provide the same municipal services for its people as the residents in other towns have come to expect. Therefore, if the province was to take a great deal of property over and thus remove it from the assessment rolls insofar as taxation is concerned, naturally the results would be quite obvious and disastrous.

Niagara must be kept as a living community. It should not be impossible to work out some programme based on joint planning procedures with the municipality to accomplish all the ends that are desired—namely, the town to have the resources for its daily routine and the province to protect, for all of our people, the historical property involved.

While we are talking about Niagara-on-the-Lake, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) will look favourably on holding a special session of the Legislature or the Cabinet at Niagara some-

time during 1967. This will help not only to mark our national Centennial but as well to commemorate the 175th anniversary of the first Parliament of Upper Canada, which of course met at Newark, the former name of the town of Niagara-on-the-Lake.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, some reference should be made in a speech such as this to the question of the Canadian nation and its future.

As we approach the Centennial year of the Canadian federation we must continue to underline the importance of our unity as a nation. It is most unfortunate that in recent years so much emphasis has been placed on our so-called differences and difficulties.

The ever-growing numbers of young people in this province and throughout the country must surely query the obvious lack of confidence and optimism with respect to our national future which reveals itself in so many quarters of the adult community.

It goes without saying that narrow parochialism and excess regionalism must give way to the demand that we as a people have a truly national identity. It really means something—I can assure hon. members I say this with great sincerity—to be known as a Canadian, which it has been our privilege to declare since the passing of The Canadian Citizenship Act in 1946.

Enriched as we are by the traditions and background of our ancestors from other lands, we strive to make our respective contributions to our period of man's history as citizens of this great country, either by birth or by adoption.

Yet it should be pointed out here that there is at least one piece of legislation on the statute books of this province which denies us the right to be designated by our true national status.

I would therefore hope that the government would look favourably on amendments to The Assessment Act—and for that matter any Act which might apply in this regard—to the end that citizens of this country may be described as "Canadian" on assessment rolls of our various municipalities.

I am proud that the present government of this province, under the able leadership of the hon. Prime Minister, is pledged to support a strong federal government and a united Canada.

It is imperative that we follow his lead in recognizing Canada as a nation, that it is more than a group of provinces joined together for particular purposes. It is an entity that transcends the parts.

We all have much to give to our country in the way of understanding one another's points of view. If we are to develop our full potential, the cultures of our two founding races, plus the enormous contributions made by the waves of immigrants who have come to our shores in the past 100 years—many of whom have settled in the great Niagara peninsula—all of these must be taken into account.

The hon. Prime Minister of this province has recently stated that he sees "no difficulty in reconciling the need of our country for a strong central government with the present and continuing strength of the provinces." With this type of attitude in our province, the great province of opportunity, it is hoped that all of the leaders of today will meet the challenge of nation building with the same spirit as did our forefathers 100 years ago.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, it was about ten months ago that we debated a motion which embodied what has come to be known as the Fulton-Favreau formula, and which embraced an address and a bill to be laid before the Lords and Commons at Westminster entitled: An Act to provide for the amendment to the Constitution of Canada in Canada.

Recent events appear to have dashed the high hopes we all held last spring—I hope to dash them only briefly and not permanently. We are told by members of Parliament and editorial writers that the Fulton-Favreau formula is dead. I hope it may turn out that this interment is premature, somewhat like the news of Mark Twain's death which he found to be premature when it was reported to him.

It is not, however, a matter for any levity; it is, I think, a matter for some lament. If we treat the formula as dead, if others treat the formula as dead, it provokes the question: What is to replace it? If we dwell too much on its features, which are considered to be part of its extremis, then we may not be able to bring those features back into some new mechanism.

The critics of the formula have referred frequently to its rigidity and its inflexibility. I find that criticism rather hard to understand, because really there are only three important areas that are said to be entrenched in the formula. The word "entrenched" is used to mean required agreement of all provinces as well as the Parliament of Canada to produce a change. Those three areas refer to the use of the English and French languages,

and to education, and to certain aspects of the Constitution of Canada, its executive government, and the responsible and representative nature of that institution.

It does not seem to me unwise that these features should be entrenched. Indeed, it seems to me possible only to progress with them entrenched if we wish all provinces to be able to subscribe to the Constitution-amending formula.

Within the other areas there is an excellent provision for the delegation of the authority to legislate between jurisdictions. This would require the agreement of four provinces and the Parliament of Canada. It seems to me that this provides a good deal of flexibility, and it may be a provision which will wish to be resuscitated or revived in future constitutional discussion in Canada.

It does not require a very vigorous effort of the imagination to visualize a situation in which four provinces and the Parliament of Canada, for example, would be prepared to delegate legislative powers in the fields of securities legislation to the Parliament of Canada. The Porter commission recommended the Parliament of Canada should be enabled to take over the supervision of all the near-banks and similar financial institutions.

I believe our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has suggested that that would be a sound policy. It would require only three other provinces and this province, plus the Parliament of Canada, to bring that about under the delegation provisions of the Fulton-Favreau formula. This could be done and yet still not disturb the province of Quebec, which certainly does not wish to transfer authority over its near-banks to the Parliament of Canada largely because of the very special position which the caisses populaires hold in that province.

Another field in which some useful delegation from one level of government to the other might take place is in the matter of divorce. I can hardly imagine the time coming in our lifetime when the Parliament of Canada would be prepared to act to liberalize the grounds for divorce. I know things change but I do not expect that change to come very soon. However, again it does not take a great effort of imagination to think of four provinces and the Parliament of Canada willing to allow provincial governments to legislate upon divorce; and, as provinces tend to be somewhat more homogeneous in their attitudes towards divorce, one can imagine a liberalization of divorce laws in a number of provinces. That would not be fragmentation of Canada; United States is not fragmented, although it

has as many systems of divorce law, as many jurisdictions, as there are states.

If we ever do get down to the actual business of Constitution amending in Canada, I have one favourite project which I hope the constitution makers might give consideration to and which has, I think, rarely been mentioned. I would like to see a system developed of uniform electoral districts, both for provincial and federal elections. This has been achieved in the United States. It has a number of obvious advantages. The disadvantages of the present system are made very clear to me, for if the federal plan of redistribution is carried out in its present form, my constituency will embrace parts of four different federal constituencies and the electorate are confused.

It is easy to see how you could develop a system of uniform electoral districts in some provinces, where the mathematics are comfortable. Saskatchewan will have 14 seats federally, and has 52 seats in its provincial Legislature. It will be at once clear to all hon. members, Mr. Speaker, that 14 times three equals 52 and an electoral district could return three provincial members and one federal member. This is the system, approximately, which is followed in Prince Edward Island. The mathematics defeat me, however, as to how in Ontario, which decides that 117 seats is a proper representation in the provincial government, which will have, I think, 85 seats in the federal government, how we could produce uniformity under the circumstances. Again, as I say, it has been achieved in the United States and, I think, to the benefit of the electorate and to the benefit of political parties.

I have the same optimism that has just been expressed this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) and the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch), that the problems of Canada will be solved and are, indeed, solvable. We have, I think, dwelt perhaps rather much upon our problems, as if we were the kinds of persons who are always discussing illnesses and recent operations. One knows how very boring those kinds of people can be. I think we should dwell as much, too, on our progress and on our bright future.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to say a few words about the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto. Last month, the hon. Prime Minister announced a proposed plan for the organization and government of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, which was, in effect, a modification of the proposals of the Royal commissioner, Mr. Goldenberg. What the

final shape of the legislation will be we cannot know until it is introduced into this House, until it has gone through all stages of the legislative process. The hon. Prime Minister has indicated that he is not inflexible, and is prepared to consider further amendments and changes.

I believe that what has already been proposed by the hon. Prime Minister represents a workable and sound system of government for Metropolitan Toronto. It embodies most of the main principles of Mr. Goldenberg's report, and departs from it in one or two places where a departure seemed obviously essential.

I, myself, would have preferred a somewhat more radical solution than that which has already been advanced by the hon. Prime Minister. I would like to have seen a solution which drew the borough boundaries, having full regard to the geographical and man-made barriers which are obvious barriers to municipal services, such as Highway 401. I would have liked to have seen a solution which would have rationalized the position of wards 1 and 8 in the city, in relation to the Don valley parkway, and in relationship to East York and Leaside. I should have liked to have seen the boundary extended from Steeles avenue north to Highway 7—about to become Highway 407—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Hear, hear!

Mr. Dunlop: Thank you very much.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Do you think we will get it?

Mr. Dunlop:—and thus help provide immediate control over planning in a difficult fringe area.

Also, I would have liked to have seen more representation provided on the borough councils. I was impressed, when I was in England last autumn, with their two-tiered system of local government, as it is applied in the Greater London council. The boroughs, as will be the situation here, will deal almost entirely with matters of purely local character. Each borough's representation is based on one councillor for 10,000 of population, producing rather large borough councils but ones in which the councillor is very readily available to the residents of his ward.

It is interesting that the upper level—that is, the Greater London council—which would be the analogue of our metropolitan council, is not to be elected on the same system as the borough councillors. Indeed, the Greater London councillors are to be elected on the basis

of the parliamentary constituencies. This is to avoid, in their minds at least, a parochial approach.

I would like to have seen a solution here which provided for separate election to both the metropolitan council and the borough councils, with the only common denominator being that the mayors of the boroughs would also sit on Metro council. It seems to me that it is important to have a very clear system of direct election and specific responsibility, particularly in relation to the second largest taxing and spending body in the province of Ontario.

I should like to have seen boards of control done away with and executive committees, with their powers, chosen by the councils at the borough level, or the Metro level, in their place. Of course, producing larger borough councils and producing executive committees, all would tend towards the introduction of a party system into our municipal government. That, I very much favour. I would not favour it in many of the small municipalities in this province, but I do favour it in our great municipalities. The parties would not necessarily, I believe, be exact photocopies of the parties which exist in this Legislature and in the Parliament of Canada. One has observed the development of the party system in great American cities and finds that it has some local modifications. We find in New York and in Cleveland, parties with such names as Fusionist, and even Liberal.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): But basically still Republican and Democrat.

Mr. Dunlop: I am glad of that interjection from the hon. member for York South because I gather his party proposes to enter municipal politics, and I think its decision was right. I hope that the party I support will do the same.

Mr. MacDonald: Hear, hear! Let us cut out the hypocrisy for a change.

Mr. Dunlop: We did not introduce it. Those are changes which I would have liked to have seen, but if they do not take place I shall not feel that any great harm will come to this great city. I think the system which has already been proposed is sound, and it has the advantage of being capable of being harmonized with the two-tiered system of municipal government throughout the province. I hope, as I know many hon. members in this Legislature hope, that the two-tiered system of local government throughout the province will be strengthened, putting more

power in the hands of county councils, directly elected with uniform assessment, able to deal with problems of much larger areas in the automobile era, and leaving the municipal governments at the second tier with the local problems.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) and the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) on their splendid speeches in proposing and seconding the address in reply.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure to rise in this Throne debate, sir, and to join previous speakers in congratulating you on the dignity and efficiency which you bring to this Chamber. More than that, I would like to congratulate you on the authority you are exercising in the region adjoining the Chamber itself, the improvements in the lobbies for the members and for the interest you have shown in the facilities and services available to the members. I should like to thank you, sir, for myself and my hon. colleagues and to extend those thanks also to members of your staff.

May I congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) on his election as Deputy Speaker. The unanimous pleasure that was expressed when that election was held last Friday is ample testimony to the integrity and ability that the hon. member brings to this important position.

I should like to congratulate the two hon. new members, for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) and Bracondale (Mr. Ben), and to say that I enjoyed the remarks made just now by the hon. member for Bracondale. As a matter of fact, I understand that he is on tape as saying he is going to run for the leadership over there and so I suppose this may be said to be the first shot in his leadership campaign.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: My congratulations go also to the mover of the address from the Throne, the distinguished hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox), and to the seconder, our good friend, the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton).

May I take just a moment also, Mr. Speaker, to thank the government whips, the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil) and the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris). Their assistance has been invaluable to me and of great service to this House and to the public of this province as evidenced by the fact that I am the ninth Conservative speaker on

his feet in this Throne debate while the Opposition have had only three speakers. It is further evidenced, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that when the committee on government commissions met a day or two ago the Conservative members outnumbered the Opposition members four to one. So I do thank these government whips for the work that they have done.

Mr. Speaker, I have a little potpourri to offer to the hon. members of the House today, a few matters which are of concern to the province as a whole, some items that are of particular interest in the London area and a few corrections for the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) and those others who may have strayed from the path of truth and righteousness during the past few days.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): As seen by the Tories.

Mr. White: May I start by informing the House that at the annual meeting of the young Progressive-Conservative association in London last Saturday morning that great organization—to use the words of my friend the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton)—that great organization passed a resolution, I think 74 per cent of the members supporting the motion, that the voting age in Ontario and in Canada be lowered to 18.

Mr. MacDonald: Hurray!

Mr. White: May I spend just a moment or two on that idea. I have had the pleasure of lecturing to students at high school intermittently and of teaching a succession of courses to university students at the University of Western Ontario.

I have some—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Were they in favour of lowering the voting age to 18 years of age?

Mr. White: Seventy-four per cent in favour of lowering the voting age to 18, yes.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a little candle in the Tory house.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. White: Well, I am going to raise another one.

I know from this experience, Mr. Speaker, that these young men and women are intelli-

gent and dedicated to the public welfare. I think, sir, that the current events courses being offered and the current events clubs which have formed on high school and university campuses prepare these young men and women for a vote in a way perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that our own scholastic experience did not.

Even at that, I recall having voted at the age of 18 or 19 in the navy. I think the way in which I voted at the time was entirely satisfactory, I voted for Mackenzie King and for George Drew, and I never had reason to regret either one of them. I have never voted NDP and that is also a source of some pleasure to me.

Mr. Speaker, may I point out that if we were to lower the voting age the students, many of whom would still be in high school, some of whom would be in tertiary educational institutions of one kind and another, would be introduced to the idea of voting while they were still in what I will call this rather controlled atmosphere; that is to say they could be encouraged by their teachers to participate in political discussions leading up to the election itself, and I think might be encouraged in the years to come to vote regularly in a way that may not now be the case.

At any rate I did want to put the views of the young Progressive-Conservatives from London on the record here in anticipation of some further debate on the resolution which is on the order paper.

May I spend a few moments on the idea of regional government? The hon. member for York South—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Why is the hon. member running down the House leaders so much?

Mr. White: The hon. member for York South quoted Professor Krueger from the University of Waterloo as saying that our approach to regional government was outmoded and insufficient. That, I may say, sir, is not a universal opinion. I cite as my authority Professor Edward Pleva, the head of the department of geography, Middlesex College, University of Western Ontario. I think I am correct in saying, sir, that he will be considered to be perhaps the dean of the discipline in this province. He was good enough some weeks ago to provide me with notes from a speech which he gave entitled: "Can expanding urbanism and a prosperous agriculture exist in the same region?" The speech was given, I think, December 8.

I note in particular the remark of Dr. Pleva, and I quote:

Fortunately, Ontario has had a high level of planning legislation and planning practice available to local government through excellent and far-sighted permissive legislation.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): What year was that?

Mr. White: This is December 8, 1965—about six weeks ago.

The province is already deeply involved in the regional impact through regional highways, area schools, regional hospitals, regional water supply and sewage disposal systems and other involvements. The province likewise has taken a leading role in the location problems of new major industries.

Now, sir, I could go on at some length but I am going to abbreviate that portion of my remarks except to say that some weeks in advance of the Ford announcement about their new plant at Talbotville a meeting was held at the University of Western Ontario in which the hon. Minister of Highways explained a 20-year regional highway programme—I use “regional” in that context advisedly, Mr. Speaker and at which time the hon. Minister of Highways, the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), the hon. member for Elgin, the hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Olde), Dr. Pleva, the head of the geography department of the university, the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Pittock), the general manager of the Lake Erie development association and myself took part in a separate meeting to concern ourselves with regional government or regional development and planning more particularly.

It was decided at that time, and in the several meetings which followed, when I met with both Dr. Pleva and Mr. Fisher, the general manager of Lerda, that a request go to the Ontario government asking for the modest sum of \$11,000 to carry out a three-phase study of regional government in that part of Ontario.

At about that same time, as I said, the Ford Motor Company announced that it would be building a very large new plant at Talbotville, and of course this quickened our interest and heightened the urgency of the request that we put to the government. I am glad to say that that request is getting the sympathetic support of the several Ministers concerned, and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall)

is hoping to have an answer for us in the very near future.

There is one aspect of regional government, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me a little bit and that relates to the city of London and the county of Middlesex particularly. For some time it has been acknowledged that our county courthouse facilities and jail facilities are inadequate. Those of us at Queen's Park who represent that area have done what we could to encourage municipal council to move ahead.

The warden and the council of the county of Middlesex have been prepared for some years to build a new courthouse. The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) is willing to help with grants for a regional jail. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) is prepared to help in those ways made possible by statute. The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is prepared to assist with respect to combining the registry offices. It is with a great deal of disappointment that I must say to the House that all of these endeavours have been unsuccessful because of the intransigent attitude of my good friend, the mayor of London, and from the portion of council that he has been able to attract to his cause.

How we at Queen's Park can shake that loose I do not know, but I am very concerned indeed because the consequence, quite frankly, is that the constituents in my riding and adjoining ridings are not being provided with adequate courtroom and jail facilities.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It should be provided by the hon. member's friend, the hon. Attorney General.

Mr. White: That is what the hon. member says. I do not agree with that. There are certain responsibilities which are well handled at the local level. This is a regional concept, of course; it is a county-city courthouse; and we are talking in terms of a regional jail, so it is not what you would call the exclusive responsibility of a single municipality. In fact, there are literally dozens of municipalities involved.

How the government here can cope with that kind of delay I do not know. I make mention of the circumstances and of the problem which I say concerns so many of my constituents in the hope that ideas will be forthcoming.

Mr. Speaker, I have been concerned for some years, and made mention of the fact previously, that the Legislature of Ontario, through certain statutes, grants very large

powers to professional and vocational groups; I have thought, from time to time, that these powers were not being well used. You may recall that, a couple of years ago, I suggested that there be well defined appeal provisions for teachers or doctors or lawyers, or anybody else who felt that the hierarchy of his profession in some way was making it difficult or impossible for him to make his earning in that profession.

I turn for a moment to the increasing standards that are being imposed in many of these professional groups. This obviously is being done in the name of increased, or improved, service to the public. Of course, the result is that the supply side of the market is shortened and the prices are driven up. I am not suggesting that the leaders of the reputable and prestigious professions are doing this deliberately, but I do say, speaking as an economist for a moment, that this is the inevitable consequence of continuously raising standards.

May I cite a few statistics in support of this argument? The number of arts and science graduates since 1956 has increased from 6,861 to 15,820; in effect, a trebling of the number of university graduates. The number of educationists with degrees has increased from 1,456 in 1956 to 4,920 in 1964. The number of PhD degrees has increased from 266 to 450, approximately double. The number of nursing first degrees from universities has increased from 120 in 1956 to 400 in 1964. I have got figures on the population of Canada here, and on the number of hospital beds, and certain other figures which I will omit.

I would like to contrast this with the performance in the medical profession. I do not do so in any spirit of acrimony, or with any wish to attack the profession, because undeniably the medical profession is, as it has always been, the pre-eminent professional group in this country, and the sacrifice and service of individual doctors is a story well known to all of us. I do say though, sir, that it is incredible to me that the number of MD graduates in Canadian institutions has held more or less steady as indicated by the figures—and by the way, all these figures are taken from DBS statistics. In 1956, 826; 1957, 875; 1958, 847; 1959, 842; 1960, 879; 1961, 842; 1962, 846; 1963, 826 and 1964, 850.

Now, then, Mr. Speaker, as you will have noted, there has been virtually no increase in the number of medical graduates from Canadian universities in the last ten years. If this were a general condition—if there were not increasing numbers of nurses and teachers and lawyers and engineers—then I would have

to seek the solution at the level of government, federal or provincial, or perhaps even municipal. If this were a more general situation, extending from one faculty to another in the universities across the province, I might be tempted to blame the university hierarchy; but, in view of the fact that this would seem to be the only professional group that has not increased the number of graduates, one must conclude that the medical profession, or the college of physicians and surgeons, or some other such medical body, is responsible.

This is going to be a matter of increasing concern with the great new medical health insurance programme that we have here in Ontario, and I would hope that the study committee announced in the Throne speech by the government will pay particular heed to this deficiency. It is pointed up, Mr. Speaker, by the unhappy fact that infant mortality in Canada is very high compared to some other countries. Canada's death rate in infant mortality is higher than Australia, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, France, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Ireland, Norway, Scotland, Sweden, Switzerland and the U.S.A. Our neo-natal mortality rates are higher than Australia, Denmark, England and Wales, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway and Scotland. And so we, as legislators, and the medical profession as such, have no reason to be complacent about this performance to date.

Mr. MacDonald: Better send a copy to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Mr. White: Incidentally, I have been discussing this problem with friends of mine in London who are doctors, and they point to a number of reasons, none of which I have been able to substantiate, quite frankly. They blame such things as the shortage of teaching beds, to the shortage of qualified instructors, to the shortage of sophisticated research facilities, and so on. I have not yet satisfied myself that those reasons are valid.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): A cause of concern to the hon. Minister.

Mr. White: I should like to deal with a little practice in The Department of Transport—and I am very glad to see my friend, the hon. Minister (Mr. Haskett) in his place here—that I think typifies large government and which I think we have largely succeeded in heading off in this province. It is astonishing to me the high degree of efficiency, politeness and speed with which our public servants are able to operate.

But here is a little practice, quite frankly, that is very much of a nuisance and which I suspect will be credited by citizens as evidence of bureaucracy. I have a letter from a constituent in which he complains that he is able to get his car licence some time in December before leaving for Florida but that he is not able to get a licence for his trailer home until either March 1 or March 31, at which time, of course, he is in Florida.

Mr. Singer: Set up a commission to investigate.

Mr. White: Now the man has one of two alternatives: He can either take the risk of running his trailer back to London in the hope that he will not be pinched, or else he can mail a letter and his old licence to Queen's Park. But I think in either case, Mr. Speaker, and notwithstanding certain explanations offered to me by The Department of Transport, I feel confident that this can and should be changed so that the period at which these licences are available will coincide.

Mr. Sopha: We could open an office in Florida.

Mr. White: I have a number of other topics, Mr. Speaker, but I think perhaps rather than embark on the next one, which happens to be the workmen's compensation board, that I will save those remarks and certain other criticisms that I have about the

errors in the speech by the hon. member for York South. I think I will save those, sir, until next day and, with your permission, I will move adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to proceed with order No. 7 on the order paper, the second reading of The Medical Services Insurance Act. At five o'clock I would like to adjourn that debate and revert to notices, and complete order No. 16, that is, the adjourned debate and the two motions respecting hate literature. And, if we have time before six o'clock, then we will proceed with the third motion under other motions on the order paper.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder, before the hon. Prime Minister adjourns the House, is he in a position to confirm or deny the rumours that the Budget will be down next Wednesday?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I think it will be. There might be some slight element of doubt; that is why I have not mentioned it. There is a very slight element of doubt, but that is our target date and I think the Budget will be brought down on Wednesday next.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, February 3, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 3, 1966

First report, standing committee on standing orders, Mr. Ewen	191
Department of Agriculture Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	192
Town of Thorold, bill respecting, Mr. Morningstar, first reading	193
Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, first reading	193
Tilbury public school board, bill respecting, Mr. McKeough, first reading	193
City of Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading	193
Township of Saltfleet, bill respecting, Mr. Ewen, first reading	193
Liability of occupiers of premises, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, first reading	193
Appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies and to define the commis- sioner's powers and duties, bill to provide for, Mr. Singer	194
Board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Windsor, bill respecting, Mr. Thrasher, first reading	194
City of Kitchener, bill respecting, Mrs. Pritchard, first reading	194
L'Institut Canadien Français, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading	194
Gananoque high school district, bill respecting, Mr. Apps, first reading	194
Guelph district board of education, bill to establish, Mr. Worton, first reading	194
Town of Hespeler, bill respecting, Mr. Reuter, first reading	194
City of Sudbury, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, first reading	194
City of Port Arthur, bill respecting, Mr. Freeman, first reading	194
Huntington University, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, first reading	194
Strathroy Middlesex general hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Apps, first reading	194
City of Brantford, bill respecting, Mr. Gordon, first reading	194
Board of education of the township of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading	195
Parole Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, first reading	195
Kenora Rink Company, bill respecting, Mr. Gibson, first reading	195
Township of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, first reading	195
City of London, bill respecting, Mr. White, first reading	195
Township of Charlotteville, bill respecting, Mr. McNeil, first reading	195
Salvation Army, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	195
Canadian national exhibition, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	195
Toronto aged men's and women's homes, bill respecting, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, first reading	196
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading	203
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Thompson, agreed to	209
Notice of motions Nos. 1 and 2, concluded, Mr. Trotter, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, Mr. Bryden, Mr. Wishart, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Robarts; carried	209
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	217

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and today we welcome, as guests, in the east gallery, students from the F. H. Miller public school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth) from the standing committee on standing orders and printing presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices, as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the corporation of the township of Saltfleet praying that an Act may pass empowering the corporation to relieve owners of farm lands from part of certain special assessments, yearly, so long as such lands continue to be used for farming.

Of the Kenora Rink Company praying that an Act may pass dissolving the company and transferring its assets to the corporation of the town of Kenora.

Of the board of education of the township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass annulling certain trusts and permitting it to sell certain lands owned by it by virtue of The Township of Toronto Act, 1962-1963.

Of the Toronto aged men's and women's homes praying that an Act may pass enabling it to hold real property at 43-55 Belmont street and 102 Davenport road in the city of Toronto; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Toronto praying that an Act may pass to enable it to issue and sell sinking fund debentures and to make provision for the management of the sinking fund.

Of the Tilbury public school board praying that an Act may pass enabling it to establish, and vest certain property denied to it, in the "William J. Miller Trust."

Of the Strathroy Middlesex general hospital praying that an Act may pass to change the name of the Strathroy general hospital to the Strathroy Middlesex general hospital.

Of the corporation of the city of Port Arthur praying that an Act may pass dissolving the board of park management and establishing a board to be known as the Parks, Recreation and Community Centres Board of the city of Port Arthur.

Of the corporation of the city of Brantford praying that an Act may pass to incorporate the Brantford and district civic centre commission.

Of Huntington University praying that an Act may pass to permit the board of regents to increase its membership.

Of the board of education for the city of Guelph and the public school board of the township school area of the township of Guelph praying that an Act may pass to establish the Guelph District Board of Education.

Of L'Institut Canadien Français praying that an Act may pass to increase its powers to hold property and its honouring privileges.

Of the Canadian national exhibition association praying that an Act may pass enabling it to change the membership; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the township of Charlotteville praying that an Act may pass confirming a by-law to issue debentures for school renovation and equipment.

Of the corporation of the city of London praying that an Act may pass to authorize the corporation to refund certain business and property taxes; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Thorold praying that an Act may pass to relieve the corporation from any further obligation imposed on it by the plan of refunding of the corporation's debenture debt; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Gananoque and the corporation of the united

counties of Leeds and Grenville praying that an Act may pass to enlarge the Gananoque high school district.

Of the corporation of the city of Kitchener praying that an Act may pass permitting certain by-laws compelling completion of proposed apartment building; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Hespeler praying that an Act may pass permitting it to pay the cost of certain curb and gutter work by a special rate.

Of the corporation of the city of Ottawa praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to enter into certain agreements for the purpose of maintaining and operating a community television system; and for other purposes.

Of the governing council of the Salvation Army, Canada East, praying that an Act may pass exempting certain real property owned by it, as defined in The Assessment Act.

Of the corporation of the city of Sudbury praying that an Act may pass to establish a parks and recreation commission.

Of the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Windsor praying that an Act may pass vesting certain lands and premises in it in fee simple.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Department of Agriculture Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the changing of the name of The Department of Agriculture to The Department of Food and Agriculture. It also makes such further amendments necessary because of the change of name and because of the broader implication of this name. This bill describes our current and long-range activities, our policies and responsibilities.

While The Department of Agriculture initially was concerned with basic agricultural activities, there has been a gradual recognition of the fact that agriculture cannot start and stop on the farm but must take in the

much broader field of marketing in a very co-ordinated way.

We have therefore over the years developed marketing policies which in certain cases have taken producer marketing boards well along the marketing road. Our department has concerned itself with the quality of agricultural products and has worked with consumers in agricultural and food matters. We have been concerned with the techniques of food processing and with the licensing of processing establishments.

In brief, The Department of Agriculture, since its establishment in 1888, has through all its programmes and policies worked to assist the farmers of Ontario to produce food. Indeed, so well has the department fulfilled its function that experts from our departmental staff have been requested by, and been available to, developing countries in order to facilitate their own food production.

It is therefore quite obvious that this broader concept suggested in the new name of the department, The Department of Food and Agriculture, is not only much more fitting and more descriptive of our current activity, but as well of the responsibilities which we must accept for the future. The establishment under The Department of Agriculture a short time ago of the Ontario food council gave public indication of an acceptance for the first time of a broad working team which existed in agriculture and the food industry. This team must work together in a co-operative understanding way if the food and agriculture industry is going to meet the future demands which will be made of it.

Mr. Speaker, as you are aware, the Ontario food council, which is operated with success and acceptance, is made up of representatives from producers, processors, wholesalers, retailers and consumers. The food council has been encouraging the most effective form of food production, processing and distribution, consistent with fair returns on investment to all participants and with our ability to produce food and be as self-sufficient as possible in order to maintain and expand our agricultural food products industry.

With rapidly changing trends in food production today the farmer is becoming more aware of the importance of the consumer. Today's modern farmer recognizes that the end result of all his efforts as a farmer is the production of food, not just for himself and his family, but for those who will benefit from the efficiency which he has developed in the operation of his farming.

Food and water are basic essentials for human survival. As our population expands, indeed as world population expands, there is increasing emphasis on the importance of food, not only to the producer but to the consumer both within and beyond our borders. In this broader picture, which certainly requires the thought and planning of all governments, our province of Ontario will play its part.

However, Mr. Speaker, in the purely domestic field, in the growing industrialization in this province, there will be increasing pressures on our farmers and on our processors to adequately meet the demands. This will require teamwork, in which we are prepared to give the necessary leadership. These amendments, which on the surface appear relatively simple, will provide the framework and the guidelines for future planning and long-range policies necessary in the interests of the food and agriculture industry and of the consuming public.

TOWN OF THOROLD

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Thorold.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, the amendment to The Judicature Act proposed, defines the grounds on which an interim injunction in a labour dispute may be granted, and requires at least six hours' notice in applications which now may be made *ex parte*. In short, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to curb the abuse by management of court injunctions to destroy legal strikes, such as the present strike at the *Oshawa Times*.

TILBURY PUBLIC SCHOOL BOARD

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Tilbury public school board.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF OTTAWA

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF SALTFLILET

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Saltfleet.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

LIABILITY OF OCCUPIERS OF PREMISES

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the liability of occupiers of premises.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, for a long time the common law has been in a very pronounced state of confusion with respect to the duty of occupiers of premises to render and keep the premises reasonably safe for those who come on them. The common law placed in categories the people going onto premises, generally defined as invitees, licensees and trespassers. The first two categories refer to persons who are lawfully on the premises, invitees being those who come on to do business with the occupier, his servants or agents. Licensees are those who are tolerated—for example, canvassers. This group—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Would the member keep to the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I am. This grouping leads to confusion of thought, and in many cases unjust results.

The intent of this bill is to do away with the categories of invitees and licensees and to impose upon the occupier a common duty of care. That is to say, the occupier will be liable for negligence, the failure to carry out the duty imposed upon him to keep his premises reasonably safe, and to prevent injury occurring which he might reasonably have foreseen.

The English law was changed in 1957 by the passing of a statute upon which this one is modelled and it has worked quite well in securing justice to those who must needs, in the ordinary course of their lives, go on the premises of others and are injured, usually through no fault of their own.

APPOINTMENT OF A COMMISSIONER

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the appointment of a commissioner to investigate administrative decisions and acts of officials of the government of Ontario and its agencies and to define the commissioner's powers and duties.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to establish in the province of Ontario an official who is recognized in other jurisdictions under the name and title of ombudsman. The intention behind this purpose is to provide, for the citizens of Ontario, an impartial official who would stand in the same relationship to the Legislature perhaps as the auditor does, who will be able to listen to and, where necessary, deal with the continuing infringement by civil servants upon the rights of the citizens of the province of Ontario.

ROMAN CATHOLIC SEPARATE
SCHOOLS FOR THE CITY
WINDSOR

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor-Sandwich) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Windsor.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF KITCHENER

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre), in the absence of the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Butler), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Kitchener.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

L'INSTITUT CANADIEN FRANCAIS

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell) moves first reading of bill intituled. An Act respecting L'Institut Canadien Français.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GANANOQUE HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Gananoque high school district.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GUELPH DISTRICT BOARD
OF EDUCATION

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Guelph district board of education.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF HESPELER

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Hespeler.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF SUDBURY

Mr. Sopha moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Sudbury.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Port Arthur.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

HUNTINGTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. Sopha moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting Huntington University.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

STRATHROY MIDDLESEX GENERAL
HOSPITAL

Mr. Apps, in the absence of the hon. member for Middlesex South (Mr. Olde), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Strathroy Middlesex general hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF BRANTFORD

Mr. G. T. Gordon (Brantford) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the board of education of the township of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE PAROLE ACT

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Parole Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Was notice given of this bill?

Mr. Speaker: Notice was given yesterday.

Mr. Bryden: It is not on the order paper, Mr. Speaker. I think hon. Ministers should obey the same rules as other members.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister have the unanimous consent of the House to introduce the bill today?

Mr. Bryden: We will let it go this time. We do not want to spoil your press release.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I would point out that it happens to be on the order paper.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Act is to increase the complement of the Ontario parole board.

Presently constituted, it has three full-time and two part-time members. By this amendment there will be five full-time and two part-time members. By law, a board meeting must include three members of the board.

Our Ontario parole board interviews personally all those eligible for parole. On the basis of a seven-man board, two teams will be available. All prisoners with indeterminate sentences are eligible for parole but, because it is physically impossible for the present board of five to visit all institutions in the province, it has been necessary to restrict placement of such prisoners to a limited number of institutions.

A larger board will permit: (1) Placement of more offenders, mostly the younger ones, in institutions closer to home and thus permit more frequent family visits.

(2) The extension of our training centre programmes to four additional institutions this year. (3) Specific training programmes

to suit the needs of the local community so that trainees will be better qualified for local job opportunities upon release.

(4) Increasing the number of institutions to which indeterminate sentences may be sent will further reduce the number of inmates in institutions such as Guelph and Burwash.

KENORA RINK COMPANY

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Kenora Rink Company.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

Mr. Mackenzie moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF CHARLOTTEVILLE

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Charlotteville.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE SALVATION ARMY

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Salvation Army.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION

Mr. Cowling moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Canadian national exhibition.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Would the hon. member explain the purpose of the bill?

Mr. Speaker: It is not the practice of the House to ask for an explanation of private bills.

TORONTO AGED MEN'S AND WOMEN'S HOMES

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Toronto aged men's and women's homes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question, which was submitted yesterday, for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall).

In view of the proposal made in the address by the hon. Eric Kierans to the Toronto society of financial analysts, would the hon. Minister consider implementing immediately the idea that a detailed analysis be made of imports and prices paid by American subsidiaries operating in Ontario?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question: No, I am not in a position to implement a proposal of this nature.

The federal bureau of statistics compiles statistics by industry and commodities only. There is no detailed analysis of the imports of American subsidiaries. Furthermore, these statistics are at the present time only available in Canada on a Canada-wide basis. The information regarding prices paid by American subsidiaries operating in Ontario, as well as that of any other company, is confidential and no manufacturer will reveal his manufacturing operating costs.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that answers the question asked by the hon. member, but I would like to make a few observations in view of the presentation of Mr. Kierans' speech in Toronto. I think it has had a very adverse effect in many areas of our economic growth and what will happen to it. I would like to think that if he makes any more statements of this kind, he will make them in his own jurisdiction so that if he wants to commit economic suicide he does it down there and not so the headline, or the dateline, appears in world markets as "Ontario".

If he believes foreign investment has any adverse effect in Canada, perhaps he should do what we are doing in this province. We have taken steps over the years to minimize the effects of foreign manufacturers investing in this province. We have invited our friends in Quebec to join us on sales missions, in investment opportunity missions. We have held five manufacturing opportunity shows in this

province in which 22,000 products, formerly imported, were shown and more than \$44 million worth of quotations were issued. I would like to believe that this resulted in at least \$26 million of business for Ontario manufacturers.

In fact, we sampled the Ontario manufacturers last May to see whether we would hold another manufacturing opportunity show and they advised us they are so busy with work received at previous shows that they are working to capacity. They asked us to postpone it for another year.

I am sure that if Mr. Kierans is having this kind of problem, manufacturers' opportunity shows in Quebec would correct some of the problems that he has outlined in his speech here in Toronto. Our "shop Canadian" programme, designed to replace imports, is twofold and is directed to the industrial use of components here and also the sale of retail products by Canadian manufacturers.

There are approximately 1,400 American manufacturers in this province—roughly 10 per cent of our manufacturers—that are controlled by American interests. One of the things we are working on constantly and very successfully is inviting American manufacturers to invest in this province. I could not answer the question of the hon. member yesterday because I was in Chicago presenting the Ontario Sheridan Park research science city to 20 American manufacturers and I believe two of those are committing themselves very shortly to invest in our research centre. I am sure hon. members will be interested to know that more than half the tenants who have now taken property in Sheridan Park are American-owned. They are good corporate citizens and I think we are doing them a disservice in some of these statements that have been emanating from friends like Mr. Kierans.

I might say that in 1964 we brought into this province, because of the climate created by this government, 163 branch plants, and we made 12 joint ventures and 104 licence agreements, and 1965 will be even better.

Certainly it would seem to me that this is a good way for others in other jurisdictions to offset any adverse effects that foreign investment has on a province.

Mr. Sopha: According to the hon. Minister, it does not have any.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It has some but I think they can be offset.

I would also like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is our belief that international monetary

policies are the responsibility of the federal government, such as international trade, and I believe we should co-operate with them and work with them as we are doing. We have used their offices all over the world and I believe that this is the proper way to make these presentations.

We in this province have a great interest in what is taking place in this field, but we feel it is in the mutual interests of all Canada to make known our wishes in this regard to those at the federal level who can best deal with them. It is obvious there is a great shortage of capital in almost every country in the world, particularly those that are highly industrialized. Great Britain is going through a difficult problem right now; Italy is going through a difficult problem; Japan has just gone through one and is getting back on its feet. We are going to have these problems, and I think taking pot shots at the Americans is not going to solve them. They are our best supplier and they are our best customer and I do not believe it is in the interests of the world or of Canada to criticize them in this regard.

If Mr. Kierans believes his province's problems are difficult now, I perhaps would suggest he should consider what they would be if the American dollar was devalued because of difficulties that the Americans face at the present time. It would be obvious the Canadian dollar would follow and it would be obvious it would follow in panic.

The world-wide international problems of the United States are of great significance to the free world. I wonder how many of us recognize it. If they can be solved we are all going to benefit, even without making a contribution. If the United States fails in their efforts to solve some of these problems externally, Canadians at least, I believe, should get ready to stand up and be counted because the world is going to have some most difficult times to deal with.

I would like to conclude, Mr. Speaker, by just suggesting, like the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) when asked to comment, like many of the prime ministers across this country, who I am sure agree with the comments I have made this afternoon, that I have every confidence in the constitutional government of Canada and I hope others will see it is in their best interest to do likewise.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that Mr. Kierans did not express opposition to foreign investment but rather said that it was vitally

necessary, would the hon. Minister consider reviewing his statement so that we can face up to the problem of American government direction of economic developments in Canada—that economic development should conform to guidelines of the Canadian government rather than the American government? That is the issue. In other words, would the hon. Minister mind getting his policy into conformity at least with that of John Diefenbaker to protect the sovereignty, economic and political, of Canada?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Well, there are more opinions on this matter of American domination in our economic expansion—

Mr. MacDonald: They are all to be found in the Tory party.

Hon. Mr. Randall:—perhaps than anything else at the present time, but I would just like to suggest that at the moment, while the guidelines in the United States have been laid down by Mr. Johnson, he has not issued any directives to industry in general, specifically, to do what he asked. He has asked for a voluntary effort. There has been no pressure applied, legislatively or otherwise, to force them to change their method of doing business.

My experience with most of the American companies who are concerned with this indicate that they are trying to co-operate but certainly not at the expense of the Canadian operation.

As for the second part of the problem, yes, I think there is room in this province to do more research with reference to the matters the hon. member has brought up; and we are, in our economics department, setting up a statistical department this year to perhaps gather more information that we can use in the interests of the province. But the matter of imports coming direct, as we suggested earlier, is very difficult to control, because if a commodity such as steel is brought into Montreal it may be distributed in nine other provinces, it may stay right in Quebec, or it may stay right in Ontario. But I think, when we do set up our statistical department, we will have the machinery with which to investigate some of the matters the hon. member has brought up.

I would like to know about them, yes, but I think at the present time we should be careful that we do not upset the apple-cart in so far as our expansion is concerned—certainly when tight money is not only a problem in Canada, but is a problem everywhere. I appreciate the opportunity of expressing to the hon. member, through his

questions, my feeling in this matter, and I am sure that I have a very keen interest in what this province is going to do and what this country is going to do about the guidelines in the United States; but I am also aware of the difficulties that they are experiencing. I think we should—

Mr. MacDonald: I wonder if the hon. Minister has read Mr. Kierans' speech?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Yes, I have read it very carefully. I would suggest that the hon. member read Mr. Levesque's speech of last week—and it took Mr. Kierans the first three days of last week to explain Mr. Levesque's speech to the Montreal businessmen.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let us not get off on that.

An hon. member: You do not know who your friends are.

Mr. Ben: I should like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, notice of which has been given. Would the hon. Minister inform this House: (1) How many full-time psychiatrists are employed by The Department of Reform Institutions; (2) What are their salaries; (3) What is the average educational level of the custodial staff at Millbrook and Guelph reformatories; (4) What is the mean educational level of the custodial staff at Millbrook and Guelph reformatories—as shortly as possible?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first one, the number of full-time psychiatrists employed by the department is one; his salary is \$18,000 a year, reaching to a \$20,000 maximum. As to questions numbers three and four, I am sure the hon. member will realize it requires a great deal of research and tabulation in order to ensure accuracy, consequently I shall take the questions as notice to provide him with the information at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) touching on a motion for the return of a report made on Monday. Could the hon. Attorney General inform this House when these reports will be tabled?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I do not know to what the hon. member refers. I had no notice of this.

Mr. Speaker: Was the member's question on the order paper? Well, therefore, the

answer will be placed in the order paper whenever the answer is obtained by the Minister, unless the Minister wishes to give it in the House. I am informed by the Clerk that it is a notice of motion for a return. It therefore will only be returned when it is ordered by the House.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Does the government plan to make representations to the Royal commission, Mr. Justice Rand, in the matter of the continued tenure in office of Mr. Justice Landreville?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have not discussed the matter with my hon. colleagues in the government. As far as I am concerned I have not made representation to the hon. Mr. Justice Rand, who was appointed by the federal Minister of Justice to inquire into the matter of Mr. Justice Landreville. Mr. Justice Rand, however, was here by appointment on Tuesday, the first day of this month, and some of you may have recognized him. He came into the House with me and observed our proceedings for a while, and I returned with him to my office and spent perhaps an hour in discussion with him, during which time I reviewed with him fully the part which I had had to play, or my department had had to play, in the matter of Mr. Justice Landreville. I undertook to make available to him, and exhibited to him at that time actually, all the material which we have in this whole matter, including the inquiry conducted by the Ontario securities commission, the transcripts of evidence, the reports, all the exhibits, everything which had to do with or was related to this matter. That material has all been made available to him and will be at his disposal. I had not thought, unless he requested a representation, that we would volunteer with any representation. However, we are doing everything to assist his inquiry.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General permit a supplementary question?

Does he not think this is a matter touching upon the administration of justice in the province of Ontario; and, if an inquiry is to be held, that he, as Attorney General, should make representations to that inquiry, regardless of the fact that the appointment was made by the federal government under the Constitution?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think it is a matter touching on the administration of justice, Mr. Speaker, in this province; and I think that,

so far as this department of this government is concerned, we acted in a very complete and thorough prosecution of Mr. Justice Landreville. The courts disposed of that matter. The disposition of a judge of the supreme court, or of the lower courts, is a matter for the federal government to decide.

As I have stated, I made the fullest representation to Mr. Justice Rand of the whole matter and am laying before him all the material, all the evidence, everything, without a single exception, relating to the matter, and I expressed to him, in the course of our interview, my views in the matter.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have three related questions for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given.

1. Will the hon. Minister explain why the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons differentiates among universities in white western countries as to acceptability of undergraduate medical standards, but excludes all universities in countries like India and Pakistan?

2. What criteria has the college of physicians and surgeons applied to Indian medical schools to justify its refusal to accept the students from any of these schools?

3. How does the hon. Minister explain the college's recent exclusion of Indian medical schools, when more Indian students wrote the medical council of Canada examinations in 1964 than students from any other country and had the highest passing rate of any country in the world?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have taken this question as notice, for the reason which I gave to the hon. member last week.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Frankly, I should like to ask the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will take this also as notice.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! Whenever there is a question being asked, and the Minister takes it as notice, if the member has a supplementary question in mind, I think he had best ask it after the original question has been answered.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I would gladly have done so, but since the hon. Minister has already said he wishes to take it as notice as

well, then I think I am bound to give it in this House.

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest that the member ask it at that time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Then I have another question, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile).

What action does the department intend to take in the case of 500 children described by the London children's aid society as in need of foster homes or other supported services?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question yesterday from the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine), I stated at that time that I would seek details from this society as to the allegations contained in the newspaper report. This has now been done and I am waiting for the report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I rise to correct a statement which was made by the hon. member for Bracondale yesterday in his maiden speech during the Throne speech debate.

I do so—

Mr. Sopha: Point of order!

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member state his point of order?

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, there is no provision in the rules of the House for a Minister of the Crown to take this opportunity to correct any statement made by any member on this side of the House. Clearly the rule is designed, as I apprehend it, sir, that a Minister may make a statement before the orders of the day on a matter of public policy or of public interest.

This is not such an occasion. If it is desired, on the other hand, to correct a statement made by a member during the course of the Throne debate, it ought properly to be made in the Throne debate, and can adequately be made by a member from that side of the House or this hon. Minister, sir, who has not yet spoken in the debate.

Mr. Speaker: May I point out to the member, though I would agree with him in part, that perhaps correcting something that some member has mentioned in a question or in an address in either the Speech from the Throne or the Budget, if he is following that member on some day close to the date

on which the reference was made, the correction would be better given at that time.

But May's *Parliamentary Practice* states that a Minister may make any statement that he wishes before the orders of the day, in a ministerial statement, and that he may also correct any reference that has been made to anything coming under the purview of his department.

The Minister is simply correcting what, in his opinion, has been a misstatement by the member for Bracondale regarding his department, in the member's address yesterday, therefore the Minister has the right to correct that statement before the orders of the day.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. If your Honour's statement of the interpretation of the rule is to be taken literally, I am sure that your Honour will realize that this leaves the field wide open. Supposing I, or any other member of the House, said something in respect to the Minister of Agriculture's, or the Minister of Lands and Forests's, department that he took objection to, surely we are not going to open a debate on any subject that might be mentioned by an Opposition speaker?

Now surely, sir, it is stretching the rules to suggest that a Minister has the right to reply to statements made about his department in a public debate. The opportunity is there for the Minister to make his speech when the opportunity presents itself in the debate itself; if we are going to have Ministers getting up from day to day, taking objections to anything that is said on this side of the House, we are going to be in a regular hodge-podge so far as the rules of the House are concerned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I am rising on a point of order, because I claimed that the hon. member has stated that I misled this House. Surely any member of this House is entitled to rise on a point of order, which is what I am doing.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I have in my possession a reply to a letter which I had asked our Clerk, Mr. Lewis, to direct to the Clerk of the House of Commons, Sir Bernard Cox, two years ago, dated February 18, 1964. Anticipating perhaps there would be some question about this matter today, I had the Clerk hand me the reply to this letter this morning. The reply refers to the questions that I had asked on ministerial statements before the orders of the day and the correcting of mis-

statements of fact. I will read in part the reply:

However in this case the position in your Legislature does not correspond exactly to that which obtains here, where Ministers have a certain advantage over members.

He thought that my suggestion was eminently sensible, when I had suggested that I was allowing Ministers to make statements if they were not too controversial and lengthy in nature. I am quoting again:

By our practice, after the conclusion of questions, before any other business is entered upon, Ministers have the right to make unprompted statements on any matter which falls within their province—

he quotes May, 16th edition, pages 364-65:

—and in doing so they are not by any means required to abstain from controversy. A private member cannot do this but he is entitled a little later in the order of business to make a personal explanation. These are subject to well-defined restrictions.—

and he quotes May, pages 379-80:

—and must be seen by the Speaker though, in advance, in order to ensure that they contain nothing controversial.

Now, I may proceed with another paragraph that may be relevant:

Ministers are, of course, also members, and they fairly frequently use the machinery of personal explanation in order to set right a misstatement of fact which they themselves have made. If, however, a misstatement by another member of a fact relating to a Minister's official responsibilities requires correction which could not be made during the course of an ordinary debating speech, the Minister would probably make it by way of a ministerial statement rather than by a personal explanation.

Now I contend, in this particular matter, the Minister should perhaps have risen on a point of order at the time that the member made the statement.

Mr. Singer: It was in midstream, was it not?

Mr. Speaker: When the Minister asked permission to make this statement today, he assured me that he did not rise on a point of order at that time to interrupt the member for Bracondale, it being the member's maiden speech.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Now, I rule that the Minister has the right — and I took this matter up with him before 12 o'clock today—to correct what in his opinion was a misstatement by the member yesterday to the effect that the Minister misled the House in reference to a question which the member had asked him a few days previously.

Mr. Ben: I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Mr. Speaker: There is no debate. I am sorry, I have made an order, there shall be no debate. The member has risen on his point of order, the member has answered it; there is no point of personal privilege at this time.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, would you hear me out?

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, if the member wishes to come back at anything the Minister may say at this time, he may do so in a later address before the House.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, if that is your ruling, then we will have to challenge it, with great regret.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour of the ruling, please say "aye". All those opposed will please say "nay". In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the Speaker's ruling, please rise.

As many as are opposed, please rise.

AYES

Apps
Auld
Bales
Beckett
Boyer
Brown
Brunelle
Carruthers
Carton
Cass
Cecile
Connell
Cowling
Davis
Demers
Downer
Dunlop
Dymond

NAYS

Ben
Braithwaite
Bryden
Bukator
Davison
Freeman
Gaunt
Gibson
Gisborn
Gordon
Lewis
(Scarborough West)
MacDonald
Newman
Nixon
Oliver
Paterson
Racine

AYES

Edwards
Evans
Ewen
Gomme
Grossman
Guindon
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
(Scarborough East)
Johnston
(Parry Sound)
Kerr
Knox
Lawrence
(Russell)
Lawrence
(St. George)
Lewis
(Humber)
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McNeil
Noden
Peck
Pittock
Price
Pritchard
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Roberts
Roberts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Rowntree
Simonett
Spoonner
Stewart
Thrasher
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardrope
Wells
White
Wishart
Yakabuski
Yaremko—64.

NAYS

Reaume
Renwick
Singer
Smith
Sopha
Spence
Taylor
Thompson
Trotter
Whicher
Worton
Young—29.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 64, the "nays" 29.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the Speaker's ruling upheld.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it is my respectful opinion, sir, that you ought not to seek advice about the affairs of

our House from Westminster and we should determine these matters within our own House.

Mr. Speaker: I may say in reply to the member's point of order, it has always been the practice of this House to follow Westminster, as well as our own usages and precedents, and until such time as the House adopts other rules, Mr. Speaker can do nothing other than that.

Would the Minister proceed with his statement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order to correct a statement which was made by the hon. member for Bracondale yesterday in his maiden speech during the Throne debate. I do so because the statement made by him, and to which I refer, implies indirectly, if not directly, that I misinformed this House.

I could have interrupted the hon. member during his speech and, by rising on a point of order, objected to his remarks, pointing out in fact that he was misinforming the House. However, I refrained from doing so because it has been a tradition in this House not to interrupt a member when he is making his maiden speech.

This is a tradition which is probably based on the assumption that in his maiden speech a member does not usually resort to the kind of language which was liberally sprinkled throughout the hon. member's speech.

There were a number of the hon. member's strongly worded remarks to which I take exception and which are totally incorrect. But I shall deal with them at a later date and at a more appropriate time as I do not wish to abuse the privilege I have now to rise on a point of order on his specific statements which imply that I misinformed the House on January 27.

The hon. member in a supplementary question asked, and I quote:

Is the Minister aware that in Guelph reformatory, where the young offenders are sent, the so-called baby dolls are the normal prescribed dress for all inmates in solitary confinement?

I replied, and I quote:

I am not aware of that and I deny it. I denied to this House that all inmates in solitary confinement wear protective clothing or, as the hon. member calls them, "baby dolls." On the day that the hon. member visited Guelph reformatory, there were a total of 15 inmates in solitary confinement—

five in the detention cells and ten in the segregation cells.

I repeat, only the five inmates in detention were wearing the protective clothing.

On the day I rose in this House to answer the question, there were nine inmates in solitary confinement in Guelph—not one was wearing protective clothing.

It is obvious that I in no way misinformed this House.

The hon. member is the confused and the ill-informed one, not I. He does not understand the system or the terminology, confusing solitary confinement, detention and segregation. He apparently does not know the difference. Obviously he did not even appreciate the difference in what—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I will let the Minister complete his statement. I have not heard too much out of order as yet. He is correcting the interpretation as I understand it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, obviously, I am pointing out how the hon. member arrives at his conclusions, which were inaccurate.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I understand that the Minister is trying to correct the misinterpretation the hon. member made in his remarks, and I think perhaps it is in order for the Minister to proceed with that course.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, may we ask that—

Mr. Speaker: No, there shall be no further questions until the Minister has finished. I will call the member to order if I find anything out of order.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He obviously did not even appreciate the difference between what he actually said on the 27th and what he informed this House yesterday he had said on the 27th. In one instance he asked about solitary confinement; in the other, he referred to isolation in "D" wing; and then later said, and I quote:

I was informed by Mr. Sanderson, the superintendent, that everyone in detention in that area did wear the baby dolls.

When the superintendent of Guelph awards a period in solitary confinement, he has two choices. For those who are severely disturbed, he awards protective clothing in the "D" side detention cells, which are furnished

with double doors; for less disturbed inmates, he awards a period of segregation on "B" side without protective clothing.

Inmates may be transferred from one to the other as their attitude warrants. However, this means essentially that those requiring protective clothing are in double-doored detention cells; those requiring solitary confinement, who are less disturbed, are in the "B" side segregation cells. There is a basic difference of which the hon. member should be aware if he is to make any contribution whatsoever on the subject.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member asked whether I was aware that all inmates in solitary confinement wore protective clothing and I denied that such is the case, I was quite correct. The difference, of course, lies in the hon. member's misuse of the terms "detention," "segregation" and "solitary confinement".

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Is the hon. Minister not going to explain the bill, sir?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): I explained the bill on first reading.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am going to wait to hear what the hon. members have to say.

Mr. Speaker: The Minister has the privilege to reply at the end of the debate. If he makes remarks at the beginning of the debate it is then considered that he has spoken on the bill.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, speaking on second reading of this bill, I, sir, think the first principle which I should talk about—because I am sure the hon. Minister of Health is going to bring this up, he brought it up before—is the principle of coercion.

Now, if we recall when he brought in his bill before, he was quite dramatic about bringing a red herring which he referred to as the principle. He spoke about the fact that he hated coercion or compulsion of any form, and I, sir, would hope that he,

sitting next to the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop), would have listened to the words of the hon. member a few days ago when he talked of freedom and the fact that there is not absolute freedom in a society. Indeed, if we follow the approach that you will have no form of coercion, it would mean that you would have to leave society and act like some savage aborigine in a far-off island somewhere up in the Hebrides, which is not inhabited at all; because if you are a member of society—I realize I am being somewhat elementary here but if you are a member of society—

An hon. member: The situation demands it.

Mr. Thompson: The situation does demand it. If you are a member of society you have to accept some law and order within that society or else you are an anarchist. May I say that you are going to have to accept some form of coercion if you are a civilized member of society. You are going to have to accept that we have law and we have order and we have people to maintain that, and you are going to have to play your part within that society.

I say this because the hon. Minister, in this great outburst about being against coercion, tried to throw a red herring about the whole of this bill, and I think that he has tried to blur what freedom really means. You can have freedom from restraint of government, that all government is a necessary evil, and if you have that philosophy you will have to go to this island off the Hebrides. But also you have freedom to do things when you have a collective approach, working together to provide opportunity; and of course we see in a society, an organized society, where there has been an agreement by the members of that society that collectively they are going to create opportunity together for their individual members, and I think of such things as roads. No one individual can build a road.

And I look at my hon. friend across the way there who takes a big interest in Hydro; and with the great complexity of Hydro we know that this has to be a collective responsibility in order that individuals can have greater freedom through having the benefits of Hydro. Being again very obvious, I think of schools.

If we want to give opportunity to be able to choose different kinds of jobs, we have got to set a basic background of education; and we do that collectively as a society. And of course we do it with hospitals. We hear

no great outcry by the hon. Minister when we are asked to contribute to the building of hospitals.

We know that health is important to the people, and the facilities for treating health are important, and we want the best for our people, and we want him to get on with getting active treatment beds throughout this province. So, when he brings in measures which will compel all the citizens to pay for the building of hospitals, we are behind this approach; and the hon. Minister is proud to report on the progress of hospitals being built.

Health has a particular significance to the people; they see it as a collective responsibility. If the hon. Minister was to come in and say, "I am going to help the manufacturers of tricycles and I want you all to contribute to this and we will give grants to it," there would be an outcry—because the need for the manufacture of tricycles is not as great as the necessity for hospitals, which refer to health. It is not sapping free enterprise to be building hospitals to provide health for the people. It is not taking away freedom when you arrange for a hospital so people can get their health back again, in order that they can be more free to be creative and do their work.

Certainly, in training, there is no outcry from doctors and other sources when the government decides that it has got to create greater facilities for the training of doctors. There is no cry that it is socialism at its worst when the doctors, through the OMA, come to the government and ask to be provided with more funds in order to build our schools and help with their research.

Indeed, we noticed just last week there were doctors who were asking government to give them more finances for research; and of course they are very sensible men and they realize that a collective responsibility is not going to be creeping socialism. It is going to mean, if government comes in with grants, that we are going to have better health services.

And so the people of this province have a tradition in giving collectively for hospitals, for medical training, and for medical research. We give through laws; we are compelled to give; and I want to point that out to the hon. Minister of Health. We do not all shudder and cry out and say, "I hate every form of compulsion." I am proud to give my taxes to build medical facilities.

The next thing, sir, is that, having got all these great advances in medicine, in research and hospitals, we now want to see that the

individual members of society, who have to pay to build these facilities, are able to participate in using these facilities. And we have been concerned that there are individuals who may have to contribute by taxes to the facilities, to the benefit, of medicine which we have in this province, yet who are not able to enjoy to the full the services themselves.

And I see, and my party sees, absolutely nothing wrong in having, collectively, an arrangement whereby we arrange the payment of the bills to the individual doctors. We see nothing wrong because we adhere very strongly to the fact that, first of all, the relationship between a doctor and a patient must be confidential. And when we are talking about the payment of bills, of collectively having an arrangement to pay these, we are in no way trying to get between the doctor and the patient.

I was rather amused when I read of the Ontario medical association and the approach they were taking between the doctor and the patient—the approach, it seemed to me, of almost putting Premier Manning in the clinic room or in the waiting room between the doctor and the patient—in the letter that they sent out.

May I say that we are very firm about this. Our only concern is, from the point of view of the payment of bills, to see that the doctor gets his bills paid and the patient is able to pay them. It is a procedure there.

The other concern that we have is that there should not be a compulsion on the part of the doctor to belong to a plan. And may I say to the OMA, that in their approach I would hope that they would not make it compulsory that the doctor cannot belong to a plan either. I think that the doctor should have the choice in this.

Well, sir, having said that, on the principle of coercion which was brought in by the hon. Minister when we discussed this before, I want to say that we ourselves—and I am sure the hon. Minister does now as he thinks it over—recognize that collective responsibility is not coercion. The hon. Minister has said to us that if you have government looking after the bills, where the people are having to pay through taxes in order that they can support a Medicare plan, and you have a government department—he told us, previously in this House—that there would be all kinds of dire results that would take place. He brought forward all this stuff about doctor-patient relationship, and the doctors being overcrowded, and all the other usual approaches.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have to rise on a point of order.

I think that the hon. leader of the Opposition is dreaming. I have no recollection of bringing forward the things he has just stated I brought forward.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is no point of order.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I will get speeches that the hon. Minister made.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He was correcting what he thought was a misstatement.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say this, sir: I notice, as far as people below a certain income are concerned, that the hon. Minister saw that it was quite all right for them to be under a government-sponsored plan, a compulsory plan.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no!

Mr. Thompson: All right, let me say this: The government—for a person on old age pension, or for the welfare person—have only one plan that they would go to, I presume, which is the government-sponsored plan. That amounts to the hon. Minister when he talks to the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), that there is some compulsion when there is no choice in this. This is your basis of compulsion.

My point is that if the hon. Minister—and he says he has not raised this but if there are people who are arguing that a government-sponsored plan had all kinds of dire results, and if they are saying that they like this government plan, they are really demonstrating class distinction, a distinction that they do not give a darn about the health of the people at a certain level of the economy. Because this plan which the government has, which it is introducing, is saying to a number of people, "You are going to be provided for under government-sponsored auspices. Therefore others can go to private insurance companies"—and so on.

In this, I do not think he admits something is terrible for a section of the people and that for others it is not.

May I say, sir, that one of the things in the principles attached to this plan is that we should have the best medical coverage for the people of Ontario. I am not going at great length into our stand—it is known. But I refer again just briefly to the Hall commission concerning the best kind of medical coverage.

Quoting from the Hall commission, which was probably the most comprehensive study, and with all respect to the hon. Minister, I think that was more comprehensive than the Hagey commission. And in the Hall commission, let me quote:

The achievement of the highest possible health standards for all our people must become the primary objective of national policy and a cohesive factor contributing to national unity involving individual and community responsibilities and actions. This objective can best be achieved through a comprehensive universal health service programme for the Canadian people.

And that applies to the people of Ontario as well.

It is not an idealist's dream but a practical programme within Canada's ability, financially and practically. It is what Canadians ought to strive for and expect through their governments. They should not be content with less.

And I would say that we in the Opposition are not going to be content with less, even though the government may try to push less on the people of Ontario.

These are the broad goals which my party has set out for this province, and they are goals which will ensure the highest possible level of physical and mental wellbeing for all persons in Ontario. We believe that our human resources are most precious resources and we must exert every effort now to care for these resources and to use them with respect, foresight and prudence. The annual economic loss to Canada through illness and injury is well over \$1 billion. Health care—and I want to come back to this, the fact that no man is an island unto himself—is a social responsibility. In today's society we are very much interdependent and what afflicts any one group will have an effect on others. We have already accepted the need for community action in the prevention of communicable diseases such as smallpox and typhoid fever and we must also accept the need for community action in providing comprehensive health services.

Now I am certain that the government would accept many of the objectives of my party's plan but the bill before this House demonstrates the government's unwillingness to accept a fundamental principle, a principle which must be accepted in order to achieve the goals which the Hall Royal commission has set for this country. The goal: "To make all the fruits of the health science available to all our residents without hindrance of any kind."

The principle is universality, and the failure of the government to accept this—and I want to quote three main areas of concern to us—will cause an increase in the cost of administering health care in Ontario, an increase that we can ill afford. And also, it is going to leave many who need health services uncovered. It is going to force people to be examined in a manner which is undemocratic and degrading and generally it is going to permit an unfair sharing of the cost of a social responsibility—particularly, this time, for middle income families.

We are handicapped, Mr. Speaker, in a discussion of this bill because we have no idea whatsoever of the intentions of the government in regulating its bill. The hon. Minister of Health has indicated that groups will not be accepted into the government plan. I raise that as a question because I am unsure whether he will stick to this.

Another question which is of vital importance is, does the government intend to encourage individuals to join the plan and to break away from groups? Is the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) going to give an example of leaving the plan he is in and joining the government plan?

Will the government accept payroll deductions as premium payment for fully, partial or unassisted individuals? What about comprehensive within this plan? What does the term psychotherapy mean? Does the government intend to negotiate a contract with doctors, and if so, through what organization? Will it be the OMA, and will the government have to get a special charter in order to do that? Does the government intend to pay doctors directly or to pay individuals?

The people of Ontario deserve to know the answers to these questions and they deserve to know them now. They deserve to know how much of an administrative burden they are going to be carrying under the plan that the government is proposing. This affects costs to the people of Ontario. We have some idea about administrative costs which are based on statements issued by the hon. Minister of Health. The rates set down by the government for a single person are \$60, a family of two \$120, and a family of three or more \$150. I suggest they are going to be subsidized.

If, as the hon. Minister of Health stated, groups will not be accepted, then the rates must be compared with pay-direct plans. We had the experience of PSI. The PSI premium on the pay-direct plan for a family of three or more is \$204, and I understand that PSI is losing money at that rate, that its pay-direct plan is being subsidized by group subscrip-

tion. The reason offered for this is, first, that administrative costs are higher in the pay-direct plan, and second, there is a higher percentage of high-risk rates in the plan.

If, on top of these factors, we add the additional cost of government services, which are more comprehensive than the services paid by the PSI pay-direct plan, then we can only conclude the government premiums will have to be subsidized. I submit that if the government premiums are going to have to be subsidized, we are going to have grave consequences coming from this if we exclude group plans from this subsidized rate.

I say these are some of the dangers I see if we do this, sir.

A large number of high health risks will flock to the government scheme after being turned away by private insurance companies. Employers and employees may both have reason to cause the disintegration of group plans, and the burden of health care costs will become even more inequitably distributed throughout the population of this province.

Families who are earning between \$4,000 and \$5,000 a year not only will be forced to carry their own premiums but will have to pay for the government cost of administration through income tax.

The second criticism I have of the government failure to accept the principle of universality is that many of those who need assistance will not get the coverage. And I think of Alberta. Alberta's experience has demonstrated that a voluntary plan has not achieved universality. Some 15 per cent of the population of that province is still not covered and most of them are the poor residents who need it most. There are other related weaknesses. Younger people and better health risks feel they can bear their own health expenses and they decline to participate in such a plan, increasing the average cost of the coverage to the participants. Since pre-existing conditions are covered in the government's plan—and this would be good if on a universal basis—participation in such a plan may be deferred until benefits are needed. Alternatively, coverage may be discontinued and taken up at a later time.

That is my second objection to the plan. My third objection to the refusal of the government to accept universality is that it does force people to undergo a degrading and undemocratic examination and I will use the words of Chief Justice Hall about this. He refers to the means test and he calls it "a method of examining individuals which is in the opinion of many Canadians contrary to the dignity of man."

The question, apart from the degrading aspects of this, is whether this kind of means test will work. As yet we have had no assurance from the hon. Minister that there are ways of checking the income tax returns of individuals since the federal government will not release this information. And again we look at the administrative problems they had in Alberta. The government of that province has estimated that 2,000 people a year falsified tax statements in order to get government subsidization for medical health insurance.

Now what are the costs? Mr. Justice Hall has estimated that Medicare will cost Ontario about \$200 million. Ottawa estimates it will cost \$238 million and I notice that the hon. Prime Minister estimates it will cost \$280 million.

Last year it was estimated that the government subsidy would cost approximately \$70 million. Perhaps, since on the one hand only 90 per cent of fees will be paid to doctors instead of 100 per cent which was calculated in that first sum, and on the other hand that the subsidy rate has been raised, we can assume that the cost would be about the same. But if, as we fear, there is a steady rise in the percentage costs of administration of the government plan as a result of the mass enrolment of individuals, then I would estimate that the charge on the government could well exceed \$70 million. Add to that direct cost the amount spent by individuals and groups on medical services insurance through private and non-profit carriers, and the economic expense of full Medicare becomes clearer.

We had argued before that if you had just one administrative unit, government-sponsored plan, you could cut between \$30 million and \$40 million off what it is going to cost the taxpayer by this other method. The extra cost is not for medical services, but it is for the administration of medical services. Where there is misery and human suffering through ill health, we cannot afford the extra cost for the administration of services.

I am led to believe, Mr. Speaker, and I would certainly like to get an answer from the hon. Minister of Health on this, that the Ontario hospital services commission has conducted an investigation into the possibility of combining a medical services insurance scheme with the hospital insurance scheme and that the government has been advised that such an undertaking would be feasible. I would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister if he intends to table the report of the

Ontario hospital services commission on combining the two programmes, and if he would table that report in this House.

Certainly, if the government accepts the principle of universal hospital insurance, it would find it a very simple matter to apply the same principle to a related service. Mechanically through computers and administratively, the hospital services commission offers the most efficient and most effective vehicle for implementing an Ontario Medicare plan. Claims against sickness could be processed in the same way as claims against hospitalization. OHSC has already achieved approximately 98 per cent universality. May I say that when we talk of universality, we hope that when the hon. Minister goes up to Ottawa he remembers the concern which we have, he fights for the people of Ontario, and he does not go there and try to chop away at a definition of universality. I would hate to think that behind closed doors he is betraying the trust which we have in him. But, of course, I do not know how he performs up there.

Mr. Singer: And he will not tell us.

Mr. Thompson: May I say this as well. Apart from this examination which has been done in OHSC about combining the medical insurance plan within OHSC, what about the secret mission when you went into that farm land that the hon. Prime Minister hates so much, Saskatchewan? I understand—

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Hate Saskatchewan? Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I really could not let that remark go by. I do not hate Saskatchewan, I do not hate any part of Canada. I think Saskatchewan is a great province.

Mr. Thompson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know quite what—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: There may be some reason why the hon. Prime Minister says this at this time, because I certainly noticed in the last debate that at one point he stood up and said, "I am fed up hearing about Saskatchewan." But for some reason his heart has changed.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: If the hon. member would like to refer to the former government of the province of Saskatchewan, then he might be on target. But when he refers to Saskatchewan as such, I think it is a tremendous, wonderful province, full of good shooting and fishing, potash and oil.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. Prime Minister will have many other occasions when he can speak about his loved Saskatchewan and other parts of our country. I am making a speech right now. There are a number of delegates from there that perhaps he is interested in just talking to about Saskatchewan.

Where is this secret document that could point the practical way for the implementation of a universal medical care scheme? Who were—and I ask the government—who were the Ontario civil servants sent to Saskatchewan in August? I do not know what I am talking about, eh? Sent to Saskatchewan in August of last year to investigate that province's Medicare plan, and where is their report and what is the government doing with it? This government continually endeavours—look at that; it is doing it right now in front of us—to keep from the public eye, a report that would be of benefit to the people of the province.

But I would like to return for a moment to questions I asked earlier in this debate, and that is: Why is the government resisting all public pressure for government-operated Medicare? Who is the government protecting? The hon. Prime Minister talked about the fact there seems a fad in having pickets come before this Legislature and I am sure amongst that fad were a number of people deeply concerned about health. When we debated last year, we had members of the clergy, men of the cloth who did not like to, in many ways move out. I remember it was the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) who was concerned about the sensibilities of these men and that they had to come down to speak on behalf of the people. They remembered the Good Samaritan story and knew that they had to help their brother, and when we had a government entrenched in its position, they thought that adding their weight and responsibility before the Legislature might prick the conscience even of the hon. Minister of Health.

And so from the labour movement, from the churches, from all around this province, the public have told the government what they want. Now we ask, how is the government trying to serve the public? They tell the government what they want. The insurance companies—is the government trying to serve the insurance companies?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): They will tell you what they want.

Mr. Thompson: Have they told the government what they want? Have they had a

greater hearing than many of the public who stood shivering outside this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: They do not stand shivering outside this Legislature. They come into my office.

Mr. Thompson: Is this a point of order? When I speak I need to yield to no one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: The government has accepted full responsibility for providing insurance, and I want to quote this:

—to residents and their dependants without regard to age, physical or mental infirmity, financial means or occupation.

That means, as I mentioned earlier, that the government has decided it will look after all the bad health risks who are going to flock to the government plan and the insurance companies will be in a position to raise their health qualifications and they can take the cream of the crop on their terms, the good risks. In effect they will be left with the 5-BX graduates and the government will be burdened with the costly bad health risks.

And the doctors? The doctors will be pleased. They will be paid only 90 per cent of their fee schedule, but then there are few doctors who really expected the government would proceed with Bill No. 136, which would have given them 100 per cent, and they may even get a little small bonus. We want to get something on that, Mr. Speaker, to see if the doctors are going to be favoured in some other ways. We agree that doctors are men who are giving of themselves, but we want to be clear that when we come to the public funds, there is some answerability beyond this.

And we look forward to hearing a definition of psychotherapy. May I say that I raise this because if the government, by regulation, recognizes the Ontario medical association's recently formulated definition of psychotherapy, there could be an extra fee. The OMA describes psychotherapy as any service rendered by a qualified medical practitioner that relieves the anxiety of the patient, and the charge is \$6. Compare that with an office visit at \$4. Simply by making more expensive use of the term psychotherapy, doctors could increase the cost of medical services insurance by as much as 10 or 15 per cent.

During the 1964-65 fiscal year—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. leader of the Opposition permit me to interrupt? I undertook to go into other bills at five o'clock. If he would care to adjourn the debate, then we will go into the other area.

Mr. Thompson: I am very glad to, Mr. Speaker. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS NOS. 1 AND 2 (continued)

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the two motions respecting hate literature and other matter disparaging to individuals or groups by reason of race, national origin, colour or religion.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity of making a few brief remarks regarding the two resolutions about hate literature that are before this House.

I well realize that there is little argument in principle between the resolutions of the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) and the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop). I would like to mention, though, one or two matters that concern me in the implementing of the principle that we have in mind. There are often greater dangers that can be caused to the freedoms of our people by implementing principles in the wrong way.

Two things did concern me in the resolution of the hon. member for Forest Hill and the first is: He says that everyone should be punished who publishes orally or in writing a statement, tale, news or matter that he knows or he ought to know is likely to cause injury, and so on.

The hon. member for Forest Hill has said that he has had good legal advice in regard to the preparation of this wording, but there is one thing that I do fear as a member in this House, and that is the wording "ought to have known." It could take on a very large connotation if it was ever misused, and if it ever became law at some future date in the hands of an extremist like a Senator McCarthy. I know that the hon. member for Forest Hill does not have anything like that in mind, but this is something that we should keep in our own minds when we go to implement such legislation that is obviously going to involve the hate literature.

Mr. Speaker, we are all embarrassed, we are all ashamed of any individual in this

country who spreads the type of publication that we have seen spread in Canada and in other places, particularly in the United States, and that concerns anti-Semitism for the most part. This has been the one single group that has been centred on, that has been picked on. We should all remember that they may pick on one group today, but we never know when we are going to be the next group that will be picked on.

The one other matter and one other point of the resolution from the hon. member for Forest Hill that I was concerned about, is that he said anyone might be prosecuted if they brought mental harm. Now, about the other things he said I can agree with him, but when you use the term "causing mental harm", I know it has been mentioned in this House before, you use that to carry out a prosecution beyond all bounds of reason.

So, with those two exceptions, I can say that I agree with what the hon. member for Forest Hill has brought before this House, and I know in principle we are in complete accord.

I also bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that it is often very hard to enforce such legislation, because in the free debate we have to be very careful that we do not so hedge ourselves in that we are afraid even to criticize some other group in case we might be disobeying any law or any new law that might be brought in. But one thing such legislation would do, by amending the Criminal Code as we want to do here, is this: It brings to public attention that we are interested in protecting the interests of those people who may belong to some minority; and, as I have often said before, we in this world, the so-called white Christian world, are really a minority in the world as a whole, that we, in trying to look after the interests of a minority, really in the long run have ourselves in mind.

But, even by giving the publicity to such a change in the legislation, we are doing something to interest the general public in the various ethnic groups and the various religious groups that, particularly since World War II, have come to this country of ours. And in the long run it must be admitted, Mr. Speaker, that it is not change in our laws that will bring about better relations between the so-called ethnic groups.

Quite frankly, in Canada and in Ontario, I deplore the use of the word ethnic group, because the truth of it is that we all belong to an ethnic group; but, for matters of personal use and of public use in recent years, ethnic group has come to mean anybody who is not from the Anglo-Saxon or French

groups. Now, this is not the term in the dictionary, it is not the legal term; but I have found, as a matter of usage today, that the ethnic group means someone that is non-Anglo-Saxon or non-French, and I quite frankly deplore its use. I would rather just have a citizen of Canada and be done with all these hyphenated words; but, as long as we have the hyphenated Canadian, and as long as we have minorities, it is most important that we have legislation on our books that will protect them. But it is our attitude that is, I think, even more important and, Mr. Speaker, here is where we fall down badly.

If we look at the list of directors in our leading banks, in our leading financial institutions, in our leading charities, we very seldom come upon a non-Anglo-Saxon, non-French name, and this shows that we as a community are still very provincial, that we have not grown up. The more people that we have of various backgrounds, of various religious backgrounds and racial backgrounds, the better we will come to know them, the better we will come to understand them; and there will be less opportunity for extremists to get in a park and cause a lot of unnecessary trouble by sounding off against one group or another.

So this resolution, or these two resolutions, Mr. Speaker, more than anything else, gives me as a member of this Legislature an opportunity to plead with our government, which has immense power through its influence in giving grants through its various agencies, to see to it that our various boards in government, and through the influence of government I hope, through our various charities and large financial concerns throughout the province, see to it that the people of various backgrounds have far better opportunity than they have had in the past to have an opportunity to sit on company boards and on the large charitable institutions which we have in the province of Ontario.

When you think of the large number of people, particularly in the city of Toronto, in Hamilton, in Sudbury, in Sault Ste. Marie, it is amazing how few of their groups have any representation whatsoever. In some cases it is there but it is very small, and in some cases it is a complete blackout.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a good resolution, both resolutions are good, the intent behind them is excellent, and I would urge this House, as I am sure all the hon. members will, in asking the federal government to amend its Criminal Code to let people of the world, and particularly our own people who come from minorities, know

where we as a Canadian people stand; but also—and I think in the long run this is far more important—that we have a far broader attitude in dealing with people of non-French and non-Anglo-Saxon background, to let them know that it is most important for them, and especially for us, that they are a part of Canada, they are a part of Ontario. And the better that we get to know people of different background than ourselves the more we understand them; and, as the old song goes, "The more we get to know you." There will be far less opportunity and, in the long run, no need at all for legislation where we are concerned about talk that causes hate among various groups in the province of Ontario and the country of Canada. So it is with pleasure that I support these two resolutions.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak very briefly in support of this resolution and I do so not because of any personal experience with the type of abuse with which the resolution is concerned. Rather I rise because I am one of that group in our society which has been the beneficiary of all the rights and privileges and protections which it gives, without dilution or diminution in any degree whatsoever, and I speak of the English-speaking Protestant majority.

The reason I speak today, sir, is for the purpose of reminding the group to which I belong that our freedom from abuse cannot be taken for granted. I speak in part because my father, and many like him, as young English immigrants at the turn of the century, suffered much abuse and discrimination in trying to find a place in the Canadian labour market of those days. And I speak because at this very time we have in Canada men such as the hon. René Levesque of the province of Quebec who, despite his great power and responsibility, preaches the spirit of the very resolution which we are discussing here today.

Within the last few weeks he has been quoted as referring to the Rhodesian-like attitude of Montreal's mainly English-speaking financial community—the picture of a small group of bigoted whites holding a majority of blacks in a grip. He was quoted, on another occasion a few days ago, as referring to the ghetto-like attitude of the mainly English-speaking residents of the town of Mount Royal with their English street signs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe for a moment that Mr. Levesque plans on erecting a guillotine in St. James to behead the barons of finance, nor to lay seige to the enclave on Mount Royal, but I do ask what emotional

string is he trying to pluck when he uses such language? The preamble to the resolution we are discussing refers to statements disparaging to individuals or groups, or tending to provoke feelings of ill-will and hostility between different classes. Mr. Speaker, the minor irritation caused by such remarks as Mr. Levesque's is minuscule when compared to the gross abuses which this resolution is designed to attack. However, I mention Mr. Levesque's remarks because to us they are a little whiff of a problem which, to the Jew and to the Negro, has a great stench.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I normally do not believe that it is appropriate for this Legislature to attempt to mind the business of the Parliament of Canada. I think even less should we attempt to engage in debate with members and Ministers of other legislative assemblies. I really do not think the speaker who preceded me made any significant contribution to the problem we are discussing.

I am quite sure that the gentlemen of St. James street can look after themselves and I do not think we are really concerned about what may be said about them, whether favourable or otherwise. I think there is ground for concern about some of the atrocious, vicious literature that is circulated about groups of people who are in a much less favourable position to look after themselves than the gentlemen of St. James street. It is for that reason that I, myself, am happy, as other hon. members are, to see an exception made to what I think should normally be general rule, that we do not here try to tell the government of Canada what it should do. We leave it to handle its own affairs, while we look after ours.

This situation, however, is so serious, that I think an exception can reasonably be made. Some of the literature that has been circulated in this country with regard to certain identifiable groups, identifiable by race or religion, in my opinion constitutes a gross abuse of the right of freedom of speech, and I agree with other hon. members who have preceded me that some action should be taken to curb that abuse. I will not attempt to repeat the quite eloquent argument that many of the hon. members who have preceded me have already made. I merely want to make two or three supplementary points.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the government, which controls the business of this House by long tradition, that here is a case where we might very well permit private members' resolutions to come

to a vote. If, as I believe is the case, the members of this House are unanimous in supporting the principle of the resolutions now before us, I think we should indicate that by standing in our places and voting in favour. If, on the other hand, we are not entirely unanimous then I think it is only reasonable that that fact should be known, too. If we are going to send advice to the Parliament of Canada I think there should be an indication as to the degree of unanimity—complete as I expect in this case—that stands behind that advice in this House.

If this matter should come to a vote I would like to indicate now, Mr. Speaker, that we will vote in favour of the resolutions; but that in doing so we will, as far as we are concerned, be voting on the principle only.

There are some phases in these resolutions that we view with considerable apprehension. One of them in particular has been mentioned by other speakers, the first part of clause 2 of the resolution of the hon. member for Forest Hill.

Everyone who:

publishes orally or in writing a statement, tale, news or matter that he knows or ought to know is likely to cause injury or mischief to public interest—

will be subject to certain restraints.

I must say that I am most unhappy about that sort of broad wording. I appreciate the fact that the hon. member for Forest Hill has consulted legal advice and has been advised that this is the proper way to state the matter, but I would certainly not vote in favour of an actual bill that had language of that kind in it. It seems to me that it is extremely broad and could be open to interpretations which would restrict the legitimate exercise of free speech.

Therefore I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that if this should come to a vote, and if we are called upon to declare ourselves on this, we in this group will vote for the resolutions—but only in the sense that we are supporting the basic principles contained in them. We do not commit ourselves to the language contained there, and I think that is a fair enough position to take with regard to the resolution. It does not become law in any case, it is really a question of principle that we are discussing and perhaps voting upon.

I would like to make one other point in this connection. If we, either by vote or merely in speeches, indicate in this House that we think the federal government should take certain action in regard to this matter,

it would be the height of hypocrisy on our part if we are not also willing to take whatever action we can within our own jurisdiction.

It used to be an old game in Canada, and still is to a certain degree, for governments and legislative bodies to say that they believe in certain things but they believe somebody else should do something about them. This is always a very safe position. Hon. members can have it both ways. They are in favour of doing something, but they are not ready to do it themselves. This sort of passing the buck has declined somewhat in Canada, and I think that we should bring an end to it. If we are going to give gratuitous advice to the Parliament of Canada, I think we should show our good faith by supplementing our advice by concrete action which we, quite clearly, are constitutionally able to take. If we fail to do that, then I say that everything we have said and everything we may do is nothing but hypocrisy.

I listened with interest to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) the other day, who said that action by this Legislature would simply muddy the water. Well, I would suggest to him that his statement simply muddled the water. Surely we have all of us lived long enough in Canada to know that there are many areas, indeed perhaps most areas, where joint action, at both the federal and provincial level, is required, if a matter is to be dealt with effectively. I believe this is one of those areas. Various speakers have mentioned that it is not easy to legislate effectively against the type of literature that we have been discussing. I believe we should fill every possible loophole to make the dissemination of such literature impossible.

My friend, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) has put before this House two concrete suggestions that I think are worthy of consideration. I believe that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) plans to speak later in this debate. He may have some comments to make about those suggestions, I do not know. But before he makes comments I would like to add my voice in support of the suggestions. They are things that we can do and I think they will help. They will not entirely cure the disease that we are trying to cure but they will help to cure it.

First we should, as we can, amend the laws relating to libel to permit an individual member of a group that has been libelled to bring action. I am not a lawyer, and I do not pretend to be a lawyer, but as I under-

stand the situation under our law at the present time, if an individual is libelled in his capacity as an individual, he can bring action in the courts for damages, but if the entire group to which he belongs is libelled, neither he nor any other member of that group has any recourse to the courts. This seems to me to be a curious anomaly, one that should be remedied and that I believe we have the power to remedy in this House.

The other suggestion made by the hon. member for Riverdale is, I think, ancillary to the first one, and that is that we should bring in laws requiring disclosure of the names and addresses of the publishers of material disseminated in this province, and that it should be unlawful to disseminate any sort of material that does not show the name and address of the publisher. As a matter of fact, I think that is a desirable sort of provision in any case, quite apart from the specific problem we are dealing with. If a person wants to publish and disseminate material then I think he should be prepared to say who he is. I do not believe in this business of anonymous material being sent around any more than I believe in anonymous letters. The person who wants to speak up should have the courage to identify himself, and if he lacks that courage then I say that he has no right to speak up.

So this second provision that the hon. member for Riverdale has suggested is, in my opinion, desirable in itself, quite apart from the ancillary benefit it would have in making more readily enforceable laws under which an individual could bring an action for damages for libel in the courts, if he happens to belong to a group that has been libelled.

Those are the only points that I wanted to stress at this time, Mr. Speaker. As I said, we will support the principle of these resolutions. We trust the government will permit them to be voted upon when this debate reaches its natural conclusion, and we trust that the hon. Attorney General will see fit to bring into this House legislation that we have the constitutional power to deal with, that would help to cure the abuse that is of concern to all of us.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I might say at the outset that I rise to support both resolutions, by the hon. member for Downsview and the hon. member for Forest Hill.

Most of the ground, I think, has been covered in the remarks which have gone before. I would say that I feel as the hon. member who has just spoken has said—in this case we

perhaps should make an exception to what has been our accustomed practice, that we are properly entitled to make representation to the government at Ottawa in a matter of this kind. I think this House should perhaps know that in The Department of the Attorney General over the past two years there have been many, many complaints, many suggestions made that we should prosecute where very vile material, which we call hate literature, has been published, has been distributed, or has come to our attention.

Looking at the law as it now stands and as it has been over the years, and assessing it as best we could and it having been tested in previous cases, it was found that there was no hope of securing a conviction, there was no hope of successful prosecution. These facts, I should inform the hon. members of the House, were brought continuously to the attention of the Minister of Justice.

In looking at one of the early files—this is only one of several that has been built up over a period of something less than two years—I find that in July, 1964, by correspondence we were representing to the Minister of Justice, who was then the hon. Mr. Favreau, that an amendment should be added to the code. Actually we went so far as to suggest an amendment similar in language to that proposed by the national Jewish congress. That amendment, I might say, was not a lengthy one. It is quite similar to the language of the resolution, and it was proposed by the national Jewish congress in these words:

Every person who publishes or circulates or causes to be circulated orally or in writing any matter of statement which is intended or calculated to incite violence or disorder against a group of persons by reason of their particular race, nationality or ethnic origin, colour or religion, shall be guilty of an indictable offence.

We, as I say, urged upon the Minister of Justice an amendment in language similar to that. I think I would agree also with the previous speaker that we should not here today attempt to do more than support the principles of these resolutions, and I do not propose to discuss in detail the language which has been set forth in the resolutions.

I support the principles which they both express. I would, however, say that I think there was some comment on the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Forest Hill. One of the hon. members, perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition, said it was loose language. If he would care to look at section 166 of the Criminal Code he would find that

the language of that section is almost word for word with the language used in the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Forest Hill.

I think the House is aware—and we should be aware—that perhaps as a result of the representations which have been made from all across this country, a study was directed by the government of Canada, and this has been going forward. We have had persons appearing from our province before the committee, giving evidence and expressing views and furnishing such help in the matter of documentation and material as was possible.

That committee, which has been conducting its studies now for, I believe, well over a year, is composed of Dean Maxwell Cohen, of the McGill university law school, who chairs the committee, Dr. Mark McGuigan, associate professor of law at the University of Toronto, and Dr. J. A. Corry, president of Queen's University. I understand that the studies of that committee are about completed and that shortly it will be reporting and making recommendations to the government of Canada. I think our representation will be helpful in this area, too.

I would like to say with respect to the suggestion that we should have provincial legislation in the field of group defamation, that my own opinion, for what it is worth, is that this is rather ineffective. I think this is in the field, and must be in the field, primarily at least, of criminal law, and therefore should be in the Criminal Code, particularly because that is where our criminal law lies and it would have, of course, the virtue of uniformity in all the provinces of this country. Group defamation has been studied and there are some very recent and some very complete studies on this subject. Manitoba has had a law since 1934. Only one case has ever come to the courts in Manitoba, and in that case I believe an injunction was obtained. The great difficulty with the civil action of group defamation, if it seeks damages, is that it must seek to determine what damages there are. To enforce such a law and to make it effective, I do not believe would be feasible because the damages are difficult to assess. The injunction may be considered as a strong remedy, but the business of publication and distribution crops up in other areas and one is having to go forever to the civil court to put down that sort of thing. It makes a very unsatisfactory answer to the type of thing that goes on.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would permit a question?

On this question of damages, would not the awarding of punitive damages have a very salutary effect in some of these cases? It does not necessarily have to be in proven damages, specific damages. Punitive damages, which our courts often award, have a very good effect in some cases.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It could be argued that this might be effective. The experience so far, at least in those areas where the law does provide the action for group defamation, does not seem to be very satisfactory.

I should like to say that there is a strong body of opinion that you cannot effectively legislate against prejudice; and we do have to bear in mind that there is a very fine line, actually, between the great freedom of speech and the freedom of expression in writing that we prize and the thing that we are speaking of here, which verges on vituperation, hate—and, in one of the resolutions referred to, urging genocide and that sort of thing. You might think there is a very vast difference, but the line is fine. The difference is hard to define and, in putting down a certain freedom, you endanger the freedoms we have tried to maintain.

I think that there is a field here where legislation should be enacted. We have urged it. These resolutions have urged it. I think it is possible to define that line and to enact it into legislation. But I would say this further: I believe the best answer, Mr. Speaker, that we can give to the type of vile and hateful and disgusting material which we find occasionally in our midst, is the attitude which I think it itself creates, that these people are fanatical, that they are madmen in a sense, and that they only degrade themselves and not those whom they abuse.

In our society, and in our House, we have members of the races here abused. They take their part with great credit in our public affairs and in all our society across our land. This is a very great and effective answer. I believe that the publication of this type of hate literature really, in a sense, degrades those who publish it, and that our people look at it and say, "It has little effect on us." I do not think it will be successful.

But that does not detract for a moment from my full support of these resolutions, which say, Let us make representation, so that we have legislation to make this criminal and to punish it and to put it down.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence to say to you, sir, that amid the spirit of unanimity that pervades the

House by way of apostatizing the very vile innuendoes and slanders that have been communicated abroad in our community and our society—which all of us deplore with every sinew of our body, as well as recognizing that they are offensive to our reason and our commonsense—amid that spirit of universality of feeling among the hon. members of this House, I would not—speaking for myself and indeed, I may say, speaking for others of my own group—feel it meet and just that the resolutions should carry without someone expressing some reservations about their effect; and that, sir, with your indulgence, I intend to do.

It is rather germane to note that, as recently as last night, the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Pearson) said in this very city to a large and important gathering, that one of the solutions for the success, or one of the things that will promote the success of our Confederation, will be each respective level of government in this Confederation dealing only with those matters which concern it. He probably had in mind the government of Ontario, if he was thinking of governments that transgress the federal sphere of jurisdiction.

In that regard, sir, the reference to the Criminal Code in these resolutions reminds one that the criminal law of Canada is the exclusive preserve of the Parliament of Canada, and any legislation which will declare to be illegal any form of behaviour and conduct among Canadians from coast to coast is the preserve of the Parliament at Ottawa. Quite a different situation from the United States of America, which prefers to leave to the several 50 states jurisdiction in that field of legislation proscribing behaviour. Therefore, sir, there is one reservation about the resolution: whether it is within our province to presume to suggest to the legislators at Ottawa what steps they should take in the revision of the Criminal Code.

They are 265 people, led on all sides of the House by men of initiative and intelligence and ability. One would assume they are aware of social problems; indeed, if one reads the papers but cursorily, one is assured that they are aware of the problem with which this House now seeks to concern itself. Vastly different, of course, from the resolution we had last year, moved by my hon. friend from Wellington South (Mr. Worton) concerning divorce, which he again has put on the order paper. Vastly different, for we know that the Parliament of Canada will legislate in the realm of divorce any way that the government of this province wants it to legislate. Presumably, if the executive coun-

cil of this government said to the government at Ottawa, "We want divorce to be as easy as possible in Ontario, everybody should be married four or five times," the Parliament of Canada would hasten to enact legislation to bring that about; because they have always taken the attitude that in the realm of marriage and divorce whatever a particular province wants then that province can have. I leave off that by saying that the divorce Act, which governs the dissolution of marriage currently, is called The Divorce Act (Ontario) 1930. That is a vastly different proposition.

On the other hand, one cannot easily summon to mind, or one would have to strain to recall any other field, in which one has ever heard that publicly—which is one that is ever heard publicly, I emphasize that—in a time when we are governed by secret conference. One has never heard publicly that The Department of the Attorney General of Ontario, or the government of Ontario in the last 20 or 25 years, has ever made any representations to the government at Ottawa to change the Criminal Code.

One does not recall that they ever did that, failure to do so being cognizant of the very tortuous manipulations in the field of securities which have led to great harm. I am not trying to be contentious. The Criminal Code should have been amended a long time ago to bring within its ambit the clever manipulator in securities who has done untold harm to people, and yet the Criminal Code has not been amended at our instance. Now we get into an area where we presume to make suggestions. I say that by way of contrast.

The reservation I make is to say to the hon. Attorney General, in deference to the opinion he has himself, that we go far, we establish a precedent, by indulging ourselves in this—

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I was wondering if the hon. member might permit an inquiry?

Mr. Sopha: Go ahead.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the hon. member has forgotten the government of Canada has sought on more than one occasion to get the Attorneys General of the provinces in conference to discuss amendments to the code, that these suggestions have been made and that one of the conferences was very recent and many amendments to the code were discussed. A considerable amount of publicity was given to those matters following the conference. My point is that our participation has been invited.

Mr. Sopha: I can think of many areas in the Criminal Code where the officials within the province who are charged with the administration of justice are cognizant of wrongs—matters that ought to be amended, that might be revised—and I have failed to note much initiative on their part that they have made representations to have them amended. The hon. Attorney General knows better than I what goes on at these conferences.

The second reservation, sir, is that of the two resolutions, I beg leave to protest—and I mean no discourtesy to the hon. member for Forest Hill—that upon a careful examination, that of the hon. member for Downsview is the better of them. I could have no quarrel with the statement such as my hon. friend from Downsview makes in his, that he would make it an offence to advocate or promote genocide. I would heartily support any law in any form that would deprive people who promote genocide of their civil rights, and would jail or imprison them, and in a day when capital punishment is being debated I would not have many qualms about giving some of them their own just deserts. The world suffered much in this century through two great conflagrations from those—one can hardly think of an epithet to describe them adequately.

I do have difficulty in supporting, sir, this statement in the resolution of my hon. friend from Forest Hill—his paragraph 1:

Everyone who publishes or circulates or causes to be published or circulated orally or in writing any matter intended or calculated to incite violence or provoke disorder against any class of persons or against any person as a member of any class in Canada is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to punishment.

One can say in contemplating that that we have come a long way from the thoughts of the great philosopher Locke who was writing at the time of the American Revolution and the French Revolution. Locke, in his philosophy, said it was meet and proper for peoples as a whole—the inhabitants of a geographical area—if sufficiently provoked to put down the tyrants by violence. They had the right to rebel; they had the right to use violence. He said:

We come to a point in our society where the people can tolerate tyranny no longer; they have the right to rise up, put tyranny and despotism down by force.

Supposing, for example, the executive council of Canada sequenced to itself the military;

it got control of the armed forces, and it threatened to use the military to maintain itself in power, it threatened to set up a military dictatorship under the military's hegemony and aegis and put the rest of us in chains. It is a class. We would have the right to rise up against them and actively promote revolution. I do not know how the American people, in view of their development—and I have watched the progress of these resolutions in the state of New York, and so perhaps have other hon. members—could adopt that one of my hon. friend from Forest Hill. It is a pretty far-reaching statement.

For those who think in terms of civil liberties it is proper and just that someone should say here, and I do attempt to say it within the limits of my capacities, that there is a danger when we interfere with opinion. I prefer to think—I have always thought, at least in the last quarter of a century—that if some person or some group promotes foolish and unsupportable and unsubstantiated utterance, then common sense puts it down, the common sense of those who hear it. They apostatize it themselves, they eschew it, they avoid it, they put the name on it for what it is—nonsense—and it dies out.

One of the worths of living in our society, I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, one of the great privileges that comes to us, is that within our democracy, which is the culmination of 1,000 years of struggle, we can even let people be foolish. We can tolerate them. There is room for them in the spectrum of opinion. And I have this caution, too, not in regard to promotion of hate against people for their origin or for their religious beliefs, but in regard to many social problems, many that were thought foolish 50 or 100 years ago are now commonplace.

To give the hon. members an example, just recently I noted that a half a century ago the great Oliver Wendell Holmes wrote a dissenting opinion with his brethren on the Supreme Court of the United States, the majority of whom upheld the decision to declare unconstitutional a statute backed by a sovereign state that would have prohibited the employment of children under 12 years of age. The majority said that statute was unconstitutional, that it would destroy the fabric of free initiative within the community to prohibit employers from employing children under 12. Oliver Wendell Holmes dissented. He wrote a vigorous dissent, and his dissents were never lengthy, and he would have enabled that sovereign legislature to pass the statute, but he was beaten down by

the majority of his brethren. Now we look back a half a century later and we wonder how could the majority of that court, the highest court in the United States, ever entertain the thought that it was wrong to prohibit employment of children under 12 years of age.

Such is the process of change in a democracy. Our thinking changes. And the beauty of it is that among reasonable men, among men of goodwill and understanding and common sense the truth very nearly always triumphs—very nearly always. We put aside that which is insupportable, that which is the product of the diseased mind. These people who promote this hate literature—this fellow Stanley and others of his ilk; though I notice even he has reformed—even he has seen the error of his ways, according to a recent news report.

But these people have been put into limbo—they are put outside the society in a democracy. Remember, who will forget—every one in this House lived in the age of McCarthy—how everyone recoiled in horror at the tyranny which that man provoked within the United States. Everyone was in fear; everyone in this country that thought about it was in fear that that might seep across the border and we might be subject to the same kind of things that he was promoting in the United States.

I merely repeat that goodwill, understanding, and common sense, always win out; for in the final analysis what happened to McCarthy was that his own colleagues, in a sovereign legislature like ours, suddenly one day sat down and said, "Men of dignity do not conduct themselves the way you conduct yourself. We cannot tolerate you." And a Mormon from Utah, a God-fearing man, a decent man, a man of breadth of mind and understanding of the relations of man to man, was the one who gave voice, articulated the sense of the Senate of the United States, who said, "McCarthy, you are not fit to be among us." Common sense always prevails.

We must guard against in any way limiting the free speech of the individual. It was hard fought and hard won, and human history is the record of tyranny imposed upon people by those who thought they knew it all. That is as good a view of history as Toynbee's explanation, or Springhurst's, or any of the other great philosophers of history.

German history is a record of tyranny. When a single group thought that they had all knowledge they imposed their will upon the great mass of mankind. In that regard

a great benefit was conferred upon me by my hon. friend from St. David (Mr. Price), who acquainted me with the works of Robert Ingersoll, who died two years before this century began. Clarence Darrow was perhaps the greatest lawyer of this century on this continent. Darrow's philosophy, and his great love of his fellow man, is traced to Colonel Ingersoll who wrote these things in the last century. Ingersoll said the only value worth living for is liberty. The only value worth living for is liberty. The only goal of human endeavour is happiness. There can be no happiness without liberty.

We must be careful, Mr. Speaker, in what we do to limit the freedom of individuals. I venture to predict I will support this resolution, but I do so with reservations, and calling attention to the dangerous ground upon which we tread. It may be that out in the province, among those whom we represent here, that there will be some who will be glad that somebody on the floor of the House said these things; that if, in other words, we decide in this House that we are going to make progress by taking steps to limit the liberty of those who would promote violence upon classes of individuals, or would heap ridicule and contempt upon them, if that is their social goal, then we ought to tread carefully to ensure in the final analysis that in effecting that goal and eradicating the vice, which we would seek to do, we do not in so doing destroy something that is precious.

Those are my reservations and I hope, in saying them, I have not infringed upon the common sense or the comprehension, of any hon. member of the House.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I move adjournment of the debate.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I really wanted to make one comment. In view of the really unusual nature of these resolutions, and this whole debate, I would be quite prepared to ask if this matter could be brought to a vote. I suffer somewhat the same reservations as my hon. friend from Sudbury in some regard, and I find myself in agreement with my hon. friend from Woodbine in regard to some of the particular wording of these resolutions, but I do not think that is really the point we are after in this discussion. I think we are trying to indicate a basic attitude that we have, and I think what we are trying to do is to go on record as being unalterably opposed to this type of activity.

As far as the federal government is concerned, and its drafting of whatever amendment it may choose to draft, it will have at its beck and call many experts; it has many experts studying this question at the present time. At a federal-provincial conference in 1964, I asked for this matter to be placed on the agenda. Once again this was simply to bring it to the attention of the federal government, and the people of our country, that we do have very strong feelings in this regard. It is against that background that I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that a vote be taken on these two resolutions.

Resolutions carried.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Tomorrow we will resume the debate of Bill No. 6.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, February 4, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Friday, February 4, 1966

Labour Relations Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gisborn, first reading	221
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Young, first reading	221
Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bryden, first reading	221
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading (continued)	223
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to	245
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	245

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1966

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE LABOUR RELATIONS ACT

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, section 89 of The Labour Relations Act provides that a municipal council by simple by-law may remove its employees from the provisions and procedures of The Labour Relations Act. The amendment repeals the Act so that the municipal employees would therefore be entitled to the same procedures and provisions as other organized employees.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend the Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM ACT

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Municipal Employees Retirement System Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), notice of which has been given him.

In light of the fact that part of Sunnydale township was annexed to Wasaga Beach on January 1, 1966 without provision for representation on the Wasaga Beach council, what plans are being made to assure such representation?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, part of Sunnydale township was annexed to the village of Wasaga Beach effective January 1, 1966. The decision of the Ontario municipal board was given after a lengthy hearing of all evidence presented to the board. It was a written decision of the board.

Now this decision of the board dealt with the matter of annexation only, and the many matters that are incidental to the annexation are dealt with in detail in the formal order of the board, which I anticipate will be issued in the not-too-distant future.

I would refer to section 14 of The Municipal Act, the particular subsection is 10-g, and I would read that for the benefit of the hon. member. The Act now states and I quote:

The municipal board may by any order made pursuant to an application under this section or by subsequent order or orders make all such provisions for the composition of councils and local boards, the fixing of days for nominations either before or subsequent to the day on which the annexation or amalgamation becomes effective, the appointment of returning officers, the holding of elections, the qualifications of candidates and electors, the preparation of first voters lists and assessment rolls, the fixing of days for first meetings of councils and local boards, and for such other matters as it may deem necessary to provide for the effective administration of the enlarged or amalgamated municipality or of any local board thereof.

That is the section of the Act. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, this gives the municipal board very complete powers in regard to elections and representations and the general administration of the enlarged municipality.

At the present time, the Ontario municipal board is waiting for the solicitors for the

municipalities to bring in a draft order, at which time the question of representation and all of the other matters incidental to the annexation will be settled, to ensure that the people in the annexed area are given proper representation.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The annexation was as of January 1.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, that does not matter. This is the regular policy of the Ontario municipal board, and I have had some correspondence with residents of the area in question and I have so advised them. As soon as the solicitors for the municipalities involved take the next step, the municipal board will issue its formal order in this connection.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question?

Is the hon. Minister aware that the solicitors will not act for that annexed area because they say it is no longer part of Sunnydale township, and therefore the whole thing—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I am not aware of that, and if any solicitor is doing that I suggest to you that the municipality better get themselves another solicitor. What else can we do?

Mr. Speaker: Will the member complete his other question?

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), notice of which has been given him.

Will the hon. Attorney General assure the House that all persons having any knowledge of the circumstances leading to and surrounding the death of former Guelph reformatory inmate, Anatol Chemenko, on December 5, 1965 will be called as witnesses at the inquest which has been adjourned until March 4 in Kitchener?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, it is unnecessary to ask such a question. It is our policy to always, at all inquests, call all persons having relevant knowledge of the facts and I assure this House that there will be no exception in this case.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Except when they forget.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a further question? Is the hon. Attorney General aware whether or not any of the inmates, the present inmates, might be released before

the 4th, and will steps be taken to ensure that they might be there?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware as to the dates when inmates of this institution, various inmates, may be released. If they are witnesses, this would place no restriction on their release. Certainly I am sure the hon. member would not expect that they be held as inmates of the institution. I would think, and certainly be certain, that if they are released as any other citizen they can be subpoenaed and brought forward as a witness to the incident.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General.

What steps is the government taking to see the public is being guaranteed maximum security by financial institutions, operating under a provincial charter, who at the present are giving up to 6¼ per cent interest on guaranteed certificates, along with substantial gifts on the buying of each certificate, or on the opening of a new account?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the hon. member refers to trust companies—he says financial institutions. If it should be a trust company, as I would assume the question refers to such corporation, I would advise the hon. member that trust companies come within the provisions of The Loan and Trust Corporations Act. That Act provides for inspection and examination by the registrar appointed under the Act, and such examinations go forward continuously from time to time.

Perhaps I might say this: I think the hon. member is aware of the forecast of the legislation to come into this House, amendments to The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, which will provide additional controls and examination of this type of institution.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. In the opinion of the hon. Attorney General, would the government come to the rescue of any trust company operating under a provincial charter, as it did with British Mortgage, providing it became involved in financial difficulties?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: That is a rather broad and somewhat hypothetical question. In the long histories of trust companies none has ever failed. The question was addressed to the matter of guaranteed certificates. No one has ever lost money under such a certificate in the conduct of trust company business in this province.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Of the 6,000 medical doctors licensed to practise in Ontario in the last 15 years, how many were from India?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, once again I am sorry I cannot answer that question as this information is in possession of the college. They will give it to me as soon as they can prepare it, but I point out again that they have a very limited staff, and staff only geared to carry on the normal operations. Therefore, it does take them a little time to get the answers to these questions dug out.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, with your indulgence and the indulgence of all hon. members of this House, I should like to make known a very pleasant personal circumstance.

All hon. members are aware of the practice and custom of the Provincial Secretary to issue scrolls of congratulations on outstanding occasions the bulk of which revolve on the occasion of 50th and 60th wedding anniversaries.

The one that I hold in my hand is a rather unique one. First of all it is signed by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) personally and for this the recipients will I am sure be very appreciative; but the unique factor of this certificate is that perhaps for the first time in the history of the province the scroll will bear the signature of the Provincial Secretary one John Yaremko and the presentation will be made tomorrow night to his parents Mr. and Mrs. George Yaremko on the occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Fifth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

(Continued)

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I think I had left off on the debate where we had been talking about the need for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to be more frank, both in this Legislature and to the people of

Ontario. And I suggest that for some reason, whether it is apprehension about his plans, whether a distrust or a contempt for the Legislature and the public, he is being extremely secretive about the whole negotiation of medical insurance.

We do not know where the government stands. He is not even authorized to say. We have asked in the Legislature, "Where do you stand? Where do you stand on universality? Where do you stand on portability and comprehensive aspects on a province-operated plan?"

And the hon. Minister goes up to Ottawa silently, like someone creeping up there in the dark. He goes behind closed doors, and we do not know if he is fighting for the people of Ontario or what he is doing in there. And he comes back again, and says to the press when he steps out, "Well, we want to get some more clarification." And he comes back to this House and insults this House.

He insults this House when he is asked, "What do you object to, if anything, on the broad qualifications of the federal plan?" and his answer is, "I can only say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole matter is under discussion with the federal authorities."

Really what he is saying is, "Let us keep this thing under wraps; do not bring it before the public. Do not let us say where the government stands. Do not tell the people what we believe should be done about medical insurance." And even in the procedure of this bill, sir, I notice the hon. Minister does not stand up and introduce this bill to us—stand up on this second reading and tell us where he stands. Oh, no! He sits very coily, almost as if he is ashamed of the bill, almost as if it has been a bad birth in some way; he just sits there, not wanting to have real responsibility for it, jotting down bits of notes here and there and scribbling them.

Why did he not introduce it, if he was proud of it, with a full burst? Why did not even the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) introduce it? He has not said a word in connection with where he stands and yet he wants us to debate. He has given no flesh to the bill, described nothing really about it—as last year, when we found nothing about his idea of premiums and so on. Well, sir, I say this is an insult to the Legislature.

I had been talking, I think, about the fact of the Ontario hospital services commission, and I had noticed one of the fundamental points that a former premier had in connection with insurance—insurance to cover

hospital services for the people of Ontario. In order to be able to have this on a sound basis, Mr. Frost had decided that he was going to get groups in on the Ontario hospital services commission. I was not in the Legislature at the time this was discussed but in reading *Hansard*, I realized that he had stressed the point that he needed groups in.

Why did he need groups in, Mr. Speaker? Well, it is obvious that if you have the groups in you are going to get the healthy, who are going to share with the individuals who may be rejected as bad risks. This is why he wanted the groups in. This is why the Ontario hospital services commission has been able to be a success. And yet, in the medical insurance approach of the hon. Minister, we do not know if he wants to bring groups in or not. But if he does not, and if he looks at other insurance procedures, for example, PSI, who opened the door wide to individuals, he will realize—and I want to re-emphasize this, I have said it before—that the government-operated scheme is going to attract and take the bad risks, and leave the cream of good risks for the profit-making insurance companies.

Let me say, regarding the PSI, that it opened its doors for individuals, for the public enrolment plan. PSI's final report in 1964 had this to say, after they had done this, and I quote:

It has been a year of important decisions, especially regarding the subscription rates, because during the first six months of 1964 there has been \$1.8 million more paid out for medical care than received from subscription income.

I will follow up on this later, referring to the very succinct point that the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) made in connection with poor risks being covered. I hope he will be here to listen to that, because I thought he got right to the heart of the thing.

An hon. member: He is here.

Mr. Thompson: May I say, sir, that last year there were some who felt that we were just concentrating on doctors and physicians and patients in that relationship, and that we did not see the broader picture of health coverage. And of course we saw this. We had argued, for example, that Bill No. 136—we had argued first of all when it was introduced last year, that it was administratively inadequate and, even if it were rewritten to eliminate the bureaucratic never-never land it embodies now, it would still be inadequate. And we said it does not go anywhere; it does

not lead to dental and optical care for children; it does not embody any preventive medicine, it speaks vaguely about the general check-up which the medical profession emphasizes as being so important. It ignores well-baby care—this is a point I am quoting from my own remarks last year.

It is silent on such matters as mental health, home nursing, chiropractic care and other therapeutic measures that are all part of the health services spectrum. It ignores the whole field of prescription drugs and makes no provision for the inadequacies of medical and health services available in different parts of the province. It is silent on the subject of medical and health care research. It makes no provision for the incredibly rapidly changing technology of health care. It says nothing about the kind of paramedical personnel who can do so much to support available resources of fully professional health care workers—the dwindling resources and the need for new resources.

We argued as well, sir, and I want to bring this to the attention of the hon. member for Forest Hill, in the Throne speech we outlined that there had to be a phased-in programme. We recognized that and we outlined what we thought were the important things in that phased-in programme. I turn to *Hansard* just to re-emphasize that and I quote from my own speech in the Throne speech last year:

There are priorities of course in this. There are priorities for the whole health care programme and we are proposing for health care that it is unrealistic to suggest that the full plan could be instituted at once. Therefore it is essential that priorities be assigned to the phasing in of the different aspects of the programme.

Then I outlined what I considered were the important areas to be phased in. One of the things that causes some confusion is that I suspect there will be another red herring produced on the part of the government. I notice the first approach was made by the hon. member for London South (Mr. White) in which he is suggesting that a shortage of doctors exists because, he says, of the Ontario medical association.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I did not say quite that.

Mr. Thompson: Let me quote the reaction of Dr. Glen Sawyer, general secretary of the Ontario medical association.

Mr. White: Well, that is quite different.

Mr. Thompson: Well, after all, he seemed to be an injured party in the thing. He was

sorry the Conservative Party was so poorly informed. He said the OMA has nothing to do with licensing or training of doctors. This is what Dr. Sawyer said: "It comes down to the question of the government failing to provide the facilities for training doctors."

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: No, sir, he did not clarify it as the federal government. I know that is the type of buck passing that is often tried by this government. He was referring to the Ontario government whip. I had my differences with the OMA; but at least I am realistic about them, I am not blaming them for the lack of facilities.

Mr. White: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, at no time did I say the OMA was responsible. What I attempted to do was to demonstrate that the several levels of government and the university administrations were not likely to be responsible because of the unique situation in the medical profession, and I said that I had come to the tentative conclusion that the profession itself was in some way responsible. I did not mention the OMA at all.

Mr. Thompson: I accept the statement of the hon. member. I would say that perhaps one of the reasons I am sometimes confused on the question of the shortage of doctors is that we hear from certain hon. members on the other side that really the government has been doing a tremendous job and that there is not a shortage of doctors.

We hear from the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris). I read his speech last night, actually in the early hours of the morning. I want to tell him I enjoyed the speech. He described how there has been \$114 million put in by the government, this wise government that looks ahead and sees the need for doctors and for dentists, and he said that there was a new school started at McMaster, an expansion of the University of Toronto, health science and dentistry at Queen's University; and then he went on to point out that \$30 million was spent for nurses' training.

Now, sir, after he has been saying that the government has done great things in order that there would not be a shortage of doctors, I must say that he was not bashful at all about saying it was the government that is responsible for the training of doctors. May I say to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) he had not any hesitancy to say that it was the provincial government that is responsible for the training of doctors. He did not blur the picture and say it might be some-

thing to do with the federal picture. No, sir, he said it was the provincial government.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): I did not use any such words at all.

Mr. Thompson: Then, sir, we find that the hon. member for London South is suggesting that really it has nothing to do with the government. I do not want to say it was OMA that is responsible, but he is saying there is a shortage, that everything is not rosy and he is complaining that it is someone other than government that has a responsibility for this.

In all this confusion I wanted to look for facts and figures. I am inclined, Mr. Speaker, sometimes to be a little suspicious that government members may embellish, and if I could use again the word "embroider," figures and facts. I decided I would have a closer look at the situation.

I looked at statements by the hon. Minister of Health, for example, that man who is so sound on his facts, who comes from Ottawa saying \$14, and then very quickly says that it was \$17. However, I look to him for the figures. I find that there are two Dr. Dymonds. I do not want to say Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde, but I say there are two Dr. Dymonds. One is the Minister of Health and the other is the Ontario Medicare negotiator at Ottawa.

Now the Dr. Dymond who is the Minister of Health is apparently very proud. The Dr. Dymond who is the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, is very proud of the doctor population in this province. He told us last year, and I want to quote this, "Ontario, with one doctor to 776 population, has one of the highest doctor population ratios on the continent."

"This is bettered only by five nations in the world," he thundered.

But the other Dr. Dymond, the one who sneaks up to Ottawa and talks in the hidden conference rooms up there, he is worried. He is worried about the ability of the doctor population of the province to provide medical services for all the people of Ontario through Medicare.

An hon. member: Will the real Dr. Dymond please stand up.

Mr. Thompson: I do not like to use medical terms, sir, but is this a problem of schizophrenia? The hon. Minister himself can answer that.

I am happy that the Dr. Dymond in Ottawa is showing some concern, because

the Dr. Dymond who is the Minister of Health has not demonstrated much concern over the past several years.

Let us look at the facts. Since 1959 there has been a steady and a sizeable decline in the number of graduates from foreign medical schools registering with the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario. Since 1957 there has been more than a 50 per cent decline in the number of graduates from the United Kingdom, Australia, New Zealand and South Africa registering here. Since 1961 there has been a sudden drop in the number of graduates from American colleges and in 1964 not one American medical school graduate registered in Ontario.

In 1964 there were 412 new registrations in the province; and erasures in the same year, that is due to deaths, retirements, for due cause, were 366. This left a net gain in the doctor population of Ontario for the year 1964 of only 46. Now calculating on the basis of the hon. Minister's boastful doctor population ratio of one doctor to every 776 population—the 1964 registrants would handle 35,696.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is pretty good arithmetic for the doctor.

Mr. Thompson: What is alarming for the province of Ontario, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the population is increasing; and simple arithmetic tells that the doctor population ratio in Ontario is worsening. My office writes to the college of physicians and surgeons—and I wish the good hon. Minister of Health, who is on the board, and the government who provides the charter, would be writing a bit more to the college of physicians and surgeons, and be a little more up to date on statistics. But we have written to them for statistics on registration erasures from earlier years and one of my concerns is that the college of physicians and surgeons, or the government, or someone, should be having a far closer look at the number of doctors who are practising, who are graduating, so we can get real facts concerning the need of doctors, and the need of new training facilities in this province.

When we asked the college of physicians and surgeons for statistics or registration or erasures from earlier years, we were informed, and I quote:

The college has not maintained figures on erasures and net gains or losses for the years previous to 1964. To obtain detailed information in this regard would be a rather costly procedure.

I say it is going to be very costly to us if we do not get some facts concerning this situation.

My concern is matched again, and I am allied here with the Ontario medical association. In a letter dated December 31, of 1965, the association said:

It is urgently necessary to determine the effect of doctor-patient ratio for patient care in Ontario. These figures are required to reinforce our request for the expansion of medical schools, to discover fields of medicine that are not being adequately manned, and in order to indicate to newcomers the areas where the need is greatest.

I put the neglect of medical training right square where it belongs, right in the government's hands. I put the ignorance of doctor-patient figures right where it belongs, right in the government's hands. And you may be wanting to use this to blind the people, in connection with what the true facts are, by the fact that you have ignored giving proper training facilities in order that we can have more doctors. You may try to use this as an excuse in order to hold back the implementation of a universal comprehensive Medicare plan in this province.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, it will not wash on the people of Ontario.

Let me say that there is another answer to this, just a partial answer; and that, of course, arises from the questions which we have been raising in the House in connection with the college of physicians and surgeons' approach to the acceptance of foreign doctors. I would say that there are 150 doctors in Ontario who have been denied the opportunity to write college entrance examinations. Many of them hold diplomas from medical schools which have been recognized in the college in the past, and some were contemporary colleagues of foreign doctors now practising in this province. And it seems to me it is an awfully confused standard that has been raised.

In answer, the hon. Minister tersely, when he is asked does he not think this looks a little peculiar, gives only the answer "No". I think that is an abdication of his authority. It is an indication of his lack of concern with the shortage of doctors, if there is a shortage of doctors, that he is not going to the college of physicians and surgeons to tell them. "Let us have a clarification of the kind of rules you have for the acceptance of men and women who hold doctors' degrees; let us have a clarification concerning this. What are the rules in order that you can practise?"

They tell me that the schools which may be barred can change from day to day. I know it will create an outcry on the part of the hon. Minister if we read that some of the doctors have decided that the University of Edinburgh no longer has the standard that is required. But he is not going to be moved when you talk of colleges in other countries. He is not asking, "Let us have a close examination."

Some of these men have taught at the University of Edinburgh; some of them are recognized in the United States and can practise. In six months they could be accepted, and yet we hear moaning on the part of the government whip here that we have a shortage of doctors; and for these doctors who are here, we have got a very blurred answer on the part of the college of physicians and surgeons as to why they can practise in other provinces but not in Ontario. And why, at one point, will they accept undergraduate schools and, at another point say, "No, we won't accept them"?

There is a very clear reason for this, and a principle. One of the principles in this is to get adequate medical services for the people of Ontario. And this a good time to talk about the inadequacy of the hon. Minister's statement regarding the doctor shortage in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister told the House a few days ago that 6,000 men and women were granted licences for practice in this province over the past 15 years. And of this number he said about 2,000 had received their education outside the province. Now, this is an impressive figure but it hides the real story. The hon. Minister had admitted that the college of physicians and surgeons will not accept any medical graduates from these countries—and I want to quote some of these countries—this is their recent list; I have not seen today's bulletin, they may include some others today—but this is a recent list: the countries of Central America, Communist China, Republic of China, Egypt, India, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Korea, the Philippines, Pakistan, Syria and Turkey. Now the hon. Minister said that in the past two years the college has accepted graduates from the British Isles—I am glad to see this in—the Republic of Ireland, Haiti, Jamaica, United States and most European countries.

The hon. Minister was asked if, in his opinion, there were no universities in India and the other countries that are excluded that had good medical schools. And I would think, when we have got a shortage of doctors and we have men who are specialists, who

are over here and want to practise here, that the hon. Minister would have said to his colleagues at the Ontario medical association, "Look at the cost that it takes to get doctors; look at the need we have for doctors. Now, you are saying that there are no universities in India or in Iran or Pakistan that are up to qualifications. What are the grounds for it? How have you looked into this?" And he would have come into this House with an assurance that there are no good universities in these countries.

The hon. Minister, when he was asked this—he was asked if there were, in his opinion, no universities in India and the other countries in the list that have good pre-medical schools, and what was the kind of reply he gave? The reply was, "really, in essence, I do not know. I have never undertaken a study of their standards."

The interesting point—and this is the concern for us—to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, is that he is meant to be the guardian of the health of the people of this province, and he is meant to be taking every advantage of getting the most capable people. Insuring standards, yes, but being sure that standards are not being used sometimes just to bluff people and prevent them coming in. You have to have clarification that the standards which are used are not just there to keep people out; they are grounds for standards.

In short, the interesting thing is, Mr. Speaker, that the college of physicians and surgeons, has not made a real study of the universities and medical schools in India, for example. They sent off, I think it was, 40 letters; I may be inaccurate in the number that they sent off to these universities but they sent off a bunch of letters to them and they got so many replies—very small, six replies, a very small proportion of replies—and then their study goes like this: I understand that every now and then someone goes on a safari or something away out into the country, and has some coffee with some of these universities, and comes back and says that they are not up to standard. They want to know the proportion of doctors to patients.

In the United States it is even admitted there are problems in setting up necessary standards, of knowing the standards of countries throughout the world. In Britain they have done this, and they have set an approach to it. And yet we hear this encrusted, entrenched group, the college of physicians and surgeons, saying, with very limited resources, "We know what the standards are throughout the world and we will decide we will throw out Central America, Communist

China"—it almost looks to me as if it were on a political basis as well as on a racial basis.

May I say that that can be concluded because you are not going over to the college of physicians and surgeons and asking them, "Give me clarification about what you are doing," because you are having to be pushed by vehement doctors to go over and get answers from them.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): The hon. leader of the Opposition must not start—

Mr. Thompson: Well, I think I will. I think I will have to take action.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: To push being an intensive job on the part of the Opposition over the years. To push you to recognize that we need hospital beds. To push you to recognize that we need doctors. To push you to recognize your responsibility as Minister of Health. It takes an awful lot of pushing.

An hon. member: It sure does.

Mr. Thompson: In other words, the hon. Minister of Health is not talking from first-hand experience of the standards that are barring doctors. The hon. Minister of Health does not know—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: How does the hon. leader of the Opposition know?

Mr. Thompson: Because he does not give us answers. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the real criticism of this hon. Minister. When it comes to health he seems to be struck mute, and we want answers.

The hon. Minister was asked by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) what students in the past two years have been accepted by the college from Jamaica and Haiti. The hon. Minister of Health should be on top of this subject; he had to take the question as notice, even though he had had prior notice of the question, and even though this question has been before the people of this province for the past eight months, and when he finally did give the answer he was not sure but he thought one student had been admitted in the past two years from Jamaica.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There was no talk about it; I stated unequivocally that one student had

been admitted from Haiti and that the Jamaican—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Will the Minister complete his point of order?

An hon. member: He is finished. He stated unequivocally that one student had been admitted.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I stated unequivocally that one student had been admitted from Haiti and that we did not have any record of the country of origin of the others since they were graduates of the University of London, England, and as such were admitted. It would seem to me that this points up quite clearly that the colour of a man's skin, his political beliefs, his origin or anything else has nothing to do with his admission.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, may I say that as I understand it he did not say that one had been admitted from Haiti; he said that one had been admitted from Jamaica.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I stated one from Haiti.

Mr. Speaker: We have the word of the Minister stating unequivocally that he did mention Haiti.

Mr. Thompson: I think anyway, sir, that we are glad to hear that he said one from Haiti. But let me say it is significant that Ontario is in the minority when it comes to bringing in doctors from other countries, very much in the minority. Six provinces in Canada give foreign doctors a chance to prove themselves by writing an exam and these provinces accept the qualifications set down by the august medical body in Great Britain. There is a great irony in this situation.

At one time in the not-very-distant past the college did accept doctors, and I am re-emphasizing this point because to me it shows the shifting standards from day-to-day. At one time the college did accept doctors from these countries which it now bars, and the hon. Minister admits this. Many of the people went to undergraduate schools at the same time, or even before, people who are coming to our country now asking for admittance. Many of those people are practising, and practising in very prominent positions, throughout Ontario and the hon. Minister would never say that they are doing a first-class job for the people of this province in health services.

So that the reasoning, in demonstration, is shown to be completely invalid. Here are these men at the college of physicians and surgeons saying: "Look, we have decided that these schools, these undergraduate schools are not adequate; a man therefore should not be allowed to practise here because he will not be adequate in undergraduate training."

Yet we can look today at doctors who are practising, holding prominent positions, and they went right through these undergraduate schools. The same schools. In some cases in the same year. Does that sound logical to the hon. members as a reason for barring other doctors?

The tragedy of this is—and the hon. Minister know this—that many of the foreign doctors who are being barred are highly qualified. I may even suggest, sir, without any inference that I do not consider that the hon. Minister has not got first-class medical qualifications—I would be glad to have him treat me for some physical illness at some point if I had it—but I would say that some of these doctors he is barring, some of these doctors are more highly qualified and have spent more time in research. They are so highly qualified that our hospitals allow them to treat patients in emergency wards and in some cases they are teaching students. Many of them have good specialist degrees.

Let me point this out to the hon. Minister. This is something he should recognize about these men we are barring. Some of them are from the college of physicians and surgeons in Scotland, a land dear to the hon. Minister of Health. Others have passed exams set by the educational council for foreign students in the United States, a very responsible body. They can go down to the United States and practise. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. Minister, that is just what he is doing. He is making it attractive for these men to go to the United States. It boils down to this—and I want to re-emphasize this—the hon. Minister, the representative of the public on the college, is not protecting the public interest. He is mute on the matters of the college that affect the public.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, I would like your ruling on just what this speech has to do with the principle of this Bill No. 6 that is before us.

Mr. Speaker: I may say that the principles stated within the bill are quite wide. There are three principles, I believe the Minister stated yesterday, and as they cover the field of medical insurance it does leave an opportunity for the sort of wide-ranging remarks that

are being made. I have endeavoured to treat the remarks of the members in the debate so far as having this wider latitude, and unless I find that they go too far afield I thought it best to allow them to proceed in this manner.

Mr. Wells: A full discussion on the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario is allowed under—

Mr. Speaker: Yes. What the leader of the Opposition is trying to do is to bring in the need of medical doctors in order to look after medical insurance.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that you are getting the point very clearly that we do need more medical doctors.

May I now turn to the hon. member for Scarborough North? One of the reasons I think he may feel uncomfortable about this newly amended bill, sir, is because he is one of those fellows who, when the government brings in anything says: "My party right or wrong."

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I think the leader of the Opposition should proceed with the principle.

Mr. Thompson: I say one of the principles is that it draws some enthusiasm from Conservative members and I quote the hon. member for Scarborough North when this bill was brought in, this previous bill, he said, Mr. Speaker: "In my enthusiasm for this bill," that is the previous bill I may add, "I am merely trying to show that this is one of the group of bills that stamps this government with its true term, Progressive-Conservative."

I would like to talk about some other inconsistencies. The principle I am taking now, sir, is the principle of inconsistency, a word that was bandied about when we discussed Bill No. 136 in the last session of the Legislature. When the hon. Minister of Health introduced the bill so enthusiastically, I think the hon. member for Scarborough North was impressed. It was contagious enthusiasm. He thought: "My party right or wrong." But I agree that might be off the bill a little bit to go back and he does not want me to.

When the hon. Minister of Health introduced the bill, he took five pages of *Hansard* to do so. I am interested that Professor Schindler has written up the abuse the hon. Minister did to Parliament by throwing in everything, bolts and nuts and your own weird philosophy about how you looked at benefits and you were transfixed and so on.

That is abuse of the Legislature. This is what he said as well, and I quote:

Another and logical step forward in a progressive programme.

That is your quote.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. leader of the Opposition like my opinion of Schindler?

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister does not need to tell me. Schindler was against auto-crats, so I know how he stands with him.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Thompson: But apparently he had second thoughts and, Mr. Speaker, I want to quote again.

Mr. Speaker: Order! May I ask the leader of the Opposition to get back to the bill?

Mr. Thompson: Yes. I realize when I quote the hon. Minister on the bill I may be off the bill a bit. With your indulgence, sir, I will quote the hon. Minister again and you can judge if he was off or not. He said:

Another and logical step forward in a progressive programme.

When he introduced it to the Legislature, and I admit that is a little bit off this bill to call it a progressive programme and you were quite right to call me to order, Mr. Speaker, but apparently even the—

Mr. Speaker: I was calling the leader of the Opposition to order about his remarks with reference to Mr. Schindler.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I am sorry. But apparently the hon. Minister has had second thoughts about the progressive approach of this bill, because the principle of the bill has been radically changed; and perhaps his first step in Bill No. 136 was not as logical as he first thought.

The hon. member for Beaches is not here. I was going to pay him another compliment for his foresight, because he said in the House, in connection with the other bill, and I quote:

No one on this side of the House would say that this is the last word in health care.

How right he was. Bill No. 136 was not. The government is having another try this year and they may take another shot next year.

Now the usually quick-witted—and I want to come to him, I notice he patiently sat here

waiting for me to refer to him again—the usually quick-witted hon. member for Forest Hill picked out what he thought was the key provision of the bill that was introduced last year. Let me quote:

This legislation provides for the pooling of bad risks under the Medical Carriers Incorporated provisions and enables the private carriers to cope with the problems of bad risks.

Well, that was not quite the way it was. We found there was no real pooling. Bad risks—and that means, in chief, people who are ill—would have to pay the maximum premium and others would get a lower premium. And the government found, during the long hot summer, that its whole system of standard contracts was unworkable, something the Opposition had tried to tell the hon. Minister for three weeks during the session.

My favourite, though, is the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling). He likes insurance salesmen. In fact he told the House, and I want to quote:

I think they do a great job in this province. In this great contribution they provide jobs, provide income tax, they pay their way. Just because they happen to be enthusiastic about the product they are selling that is no reason to deride them or their product.

Apparently insurance salesmen, however, were not too enthusiastic about the hon. Minister of Health's standard contract.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): You should know.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I did know. That is why I was surprised at you expressing this enthusiasm.

Mr. Cowling: There it compliments you.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. member for High Park expressed passing interest in the Hall report, and may I put that as a compliment on the part of the hon. member for High Park because, sir, this comprehensive report is the most intensive study done across Canada. He was unusual in that he was one member from the Conservative ranks who even paid passing interest in it. We are hoping they will pay a great deal more interest to it. The hon. member for High Park paid passing interest to the Hall report but he was dubious, and I want to quote. He said:

After all, the federal government may some day institute a universal medical plan on the basis of the Hall report.

And, using his quotes, he said:

Boy, oh, boy, Mr. Speaker, if we waited for something like that in Ottawa we would all have long white whiskers in this House.

Well, where are your white whiskers, hon. member for High Park?

The hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) displayed little faith in his speech. He said, and I quote:

The programme which is now before us is as far as the government felt they could go unless federal financing was forthcoming.

Well, when I was asked where is the Ottawa plan, I said that we know that the Ottawa plan will develop if this province will stay where it stands.

The hon. member for Oshawa went further in talking about comprehensive Medicare. He said he did not think this province would ever have such a programme, and I quote:

—until the federal government presents a co-operative financial programme to assist in financing such a plan.

Well, Ottawa has offered a co-operative programme, even though the senior Conservative hon. members are never quite together on what their approach will be to the programme.

But we are still waiting to see, for example, who the hon. member for Oshawa is going to blame next. This programme that Ottawa is offering, of universality, of comprehension, of portability, it is offering to assist financially. Where does the hon. Minister of Health stand in connection with this?

The hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), a man who shows rare good sense on a number of occasions, said and I quote:

I have come to the conclusion that no thinking person, no reasonable person, would try to foist upon the people of Ontario some kind of scheme that would not work.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the government now admits that they tried to do. And I expect the hon. member for Eglinton, in his usual sensible and logical way, will realize that he now will have to brand his government as being insane, not thinking, and unreasonable.

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Downer), a man who, I understand, has his ups and downs in other arenas that he goes into—and I note the hearty laugh from my colleagues, so I suggest he has probably had his downs—the hon. member for Dufferin-

Simcoe was in great form in the second reading of Bill No. 136 last year. In that way that he does, it always reminds me of the Senate chambers, sir, in a way I will quote you; he said:

Are we prepared to take one step at a time and thus avoid costly errors in a field where costly errors can mean millions in dollars and open the way to we know not what?

And then he added a lovely thought, which only he can do. He said:

The hon. Minister of Health is giving us a light so that we can go forward.

The hon. Minister of Health—the light that failed.

The hon. member for Dufferin-Simcoe warned us, in those stern tones that he can produce. He said government regulations can only provide average care for the average patient in average communities under an average range of circumstances. I wonder what he thinks, now that the government is offering Medicare insurance to all comers. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Health will adopt the hon. member's slogan in his advertising campaign: average care. He will be putting through that campaign, he will be saying, "Average care for average patients and average communities under average circumstances." And this will bring a real rush of customers.

The hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski), the sage of the Ottawa valley, hit the nail on the head when he said, "The Minister of Health, his associates and advisers, have put a tremendous amount of thought into the legislation before us now."

Unfortunately for this province that is probably true—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would say to the leader of the Opposition that I think perhaps he is discussing last year's bill a little more than this year's bill. In his remarks, I do not mind him referring occasionally to last year's bill but I think he should concentrate a little more on the bill before the House.

Mr. Thompson: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do think it is important that the House should know how the hon. members have stood. After all, they spoke last year; this was on discussion of principle and I assume that the hon. Minister is going to tell us the principle has not changed that much, or perhaps he will say he has had a retreat.

Mr. Speaker: Bill No. 6 is before the House now.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. I think the hon. Minister will tell us, sir. I realize he has been rather mute and silent about this bill but I imagine he will tell us he really has not beat a retreat from Moscow in this bill and there is not that much change.

An hon. member: Ridiculous!

Mr. Thompson: It is ridiculous. The principles—he is a man of principles, sir, that is what I am trying to get at. If he says that he stood for the bill last year he is not going to change his principles this year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond. On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it me or is it the bill?

Mr. Thompson: Let me say, sir, that speaking of principles I would like to switch to another Conservative, and this is on the issue of principles.

The former premier, the Hon. Leslie M. Frost, introduced The Hospital Services Commission Act in 1957. This is part of a principle, the hon. Minister saying that the hospital services commission is not compulsory, and going into a strange attitude about how he abhors compulsion. Yet with 15 or more employees, it seems to me, firms had to join the hospital services commission. I do not know how he can clarify in his mind that that is not compulsion.

It was quite clear to the premier of the province, the Hon. Leslie Frost. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) read the discussion that took place between hon. Mr. Frost and the hon. leader of the new party (Mr. MacDonald). I would like to read that again, it applies very much to the principle. The former premier said at one point:

But perhaps in moving the second reading of this bill—

this is on the Ontario hospital services commission:

—I can make some comments from just a little different angle. I move to do this because I have received comments of varying points of view.

One of the points of view I received from some people is the fact that this type of legislation goes too far, that it is involving the government and the people in commitments in what might be termed business which goes beyond the realm of government.

And in this *Hansard* debate the hon. leader of the new party calls out "Socialism," and Mr. Frost replied:

I may say I have always been open to new ideas and I hope I will always remain the same.

And then Mr. Frost said:

I think I have been practical in that way. I have always been practical in regard to these matters. I do not profess to being a reactionary. I profess being a member of the most progressive of all parties.

And he brings a little of other aspects into it. But then he said:

You must remember that The Hospital Services Commission Act wound up with 60 per cent of the people being enrolled because they had to join.

Let that sear into the mind of the hon. Minister of Health: "Had to join, had to join, had to join."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am getting it.

Mr. Thompson: I think the hon. Minister is getting it, slowly; I hope so.

What was Mr. Frost's reason for this? It was simply because he did not want private insurance to get the cream of the crop and leave the government and the taxpayer with the bad risks.

Times have changed. I admired Mr. Frost for standing against the pressures of the insurance companies. I wish this government had the same quality today. Things have changed. The present government does not know where it is going. It is the height of inconsistency.

Since I am talking about principles I would like to illustrate this, Mr. Speaker, with a few quotes from the hon. Minister of Health during the last session. In his remarks—and this was on principle so I think I am quite entitled to say that—in his remarks on second reading the hon. Minister starts off with a bang. He is quoting as he introduces the bill. In order that we would have clarification about this bill he says:

This is not Medicare. We have never pretended it was Medicare.

First of all, I do not know what Medicare is. I take it that Medicare is a complex of two words, "medical" and "care". No government—I have said in this House many times—no government can provide medical care because no government is capable of practising medicine.

At best, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is playing with words.

This is the man this government sends to Ottawa to negotiate a national scheme. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, no wonder in his own words in the *Toronto Daily Star*, he said that the government has not given him power to make an agreement when he does not even know what Medicare is.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister should be as worried as I am about what kind of a programme we are going to end up with.

Now the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, got pretty tough when he was talking about private insurance companies and I want to quote him when he talked on the principle of the bill last year.

We have told them, for instance, that they must provide a standard contract for all the people, that they must not cancel it—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, the bill before the House makes no reference to private insurance carriers whatsoever. I fail absolutely, therefore, to see where the hon. leader of the Opposition is now speaking to the principle of this bill before the House.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I stand on this: There is a bill with amendments before the House. When we talked of principle last year these are the remarks which the hon. Minister of Health made, and unless he is going to tell me that he has changed his principle I feel that I am quite entitled to continue talking on this. He says:

We have told them, for instance, that they must provide a standard contract for all the people, that they must not cancel it, that they must guarantee to renew it, that they must not sell at more than a government-approved maximum premium; and all these things they must do on pain of losing their licence.

That is pretty tough talk on the part of the hon. Minister of Health to the insurance companies.

Then the House adjourned. The summer came, and the tough talking Minister sat down with the insurers. They did not like what he proposed and the hon. Minister backed down, Mr. Speaker, completely and utterly. He told them, in effect, the government and the taxpayer will take the poor risks, you fellows can have all the good risks and the hospital group plans. He used this shoddy escape to patch together his already compromising medical insurance scheme.

He was frank, at one point when he talked on principle in the bill that he did not have the answers which the House needed to properly evaluate his scheme, and I quote what he said:

I make no apology for that, that I do not have the answers; and if I study it for

60 more years I do not expect to have all the answers.

Well, Ottawa cannot wait for 60 years and Ontario cannot wait for 60 years. Anyway, I do not expect all the answers. A few days ago I asked the hon. Minister a simple question. I asked him what funds did he want from Ottawa for a government-run scheme? Which of Ottawa's four points could he not accept? And the hon. Minister could not or would not answer. Perhaps this summer dealing with the insurance companies has been too much for him. He chastized my colleague, the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), who remarked he wants to do away with all the choices that are now existent and introduce only a single government plan.

Let me ask the hon. Minister on this point of principle: Under his scheme what choice is there for a family with a low income? What choice does a family with a low income have if it wants to get a subsidy? Indeed, what choice does a family with a low income have if it wants to get an individual contract at \$150?

Some people have said the philosophy of the government is that we will say you can have good health; but similarly, there are others who will say you can have a Cadillac if you want it. You are free to have a Cadillac; the problem is can you afford to have them? Can you afford to have good health? The question is still in my mind that, even with your \$150, there are going to be people who will find it hard, for financial reasons, to get the benefit which they should have in health.

Now the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker, has talked and talked and talked about compulsion; and, of course, I find this ironical on a point of principle. The hon. Minister sits in that government and he says he is not going to force people to do anything to join the plan; and yet standing, or sitting, right over there, there is a man who thunders out, "They are going to integrate or else." Or else bring in retroactive legislation if they do not!

How does the hon. Minister mix with him? On a point of principle it seems to me there is confusion and contradiction on the part of the government. He refuses, sir, the hon. Minister of Health, to recognize that there is compulsion. For example, my hon. friend from Bruce (Mr. Whicher) tells me that there is compulsion in the hog marketing board. Ontario hospital insurance certainly has it; education and numerous other areas. And, of course, there is an area of compulsion in having to pay taxes for these.

Now, sir, I want to come to the nub, to the nub of my remarks in this.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Takes two hours to get there!

An hon. member: What a nub that is!

Mr. Thompson: Well, let me go to the hon. Minister again. The hon. Minister has said, sir, when he was talking on principle on this last year, and I want to quote—I want to be accurate about what he said: “I say to you, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Last year, sir, I was not speaking on the bill that is before the House today. What I was talking on last year was passed by this House, sir. This bill before us now proposes amendments to that bill.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister of Health saying that there is a complete change of principle in this bill from the one last year? Because if there is a change of principle, and there is no similarity then, sir, admit it. And if there is similarity, and if there is the same principle, surely I can quote the hon. Minister's remarks on that principle.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. leader of the Opposition had read the bill before him, he would be able to discern the principle because it is written in language so simple “that a wayfaring man, even though he be a fool, may not err therein.”

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, let me say this: As I understand it, these are amendments to the bill and I am talking on the bill in principle.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps we are getting into too much debate back and forth across the floor of the House when only the person speaking should be debating the bill. But I must also counsel the member now speaking to the bill that I think perhaps he should confine his remarks more to the bill before the House, and compare the three basic principles therein to comparable principles in last year's bill. I do not mind him comparing one bill with the other, but he should limit his remarks about other things that were in the bill last year and which are not in this bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, Bill No. 6 is an amendment to last year's bill.

Mr. Speaker: Yes, I understand that.

Mr. Singer: It is not that the hon. Minister of Health suggests a complete negation of it. He has not repealed last year's bill. By having amendments he brings the whole package back before the House.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, on a fundamental parliamentary principle. The act of amending a bill does not necessarily open up the whole bill to complete debate.

Mr. Singer: That is nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is absolute fact, sir; and I ask the Speaker for a ruling on this matter.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member who is now speaking to the bill to try to confine his remarks more to the comparison of the principles within this bill with those in last year's bill. I do not mind members going back and forth when talking about the same principles but whenever they move into a lot of other things I think perhaps we should draw the line a little closer.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate this, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure that when the hon. Minister was talking last year, on the principle of the bill which he now wants to amend, he was, as I said before when I referred to nub—I mean nub—when he speaks he refers to the nub of the problem, and for that reason, sir, I would like to quote some of his remarks of last year, and he said:

I say to you, sir, the more government takes away from people the more likely they are to become enslaved. In the history of society—

Mr. Speaker: What has this got to do with it?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, the principle, as I understand it, that the hon. Minister was discussing, was compulsion. He was showing the great danger of compulsion and he made this rather—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The word compulsion is not mentioned in this amendment before the House.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister mentioned it in principle last year. And this is what he said, sir, when he talked of principle last year:

In the history of society all great nations, all the great efforts of the past—

I agree with you, sir; you let him speak last year on this, sir, so I assume that I can requote what he said:

All the great efforts of the past, as I read history, failed for two reasons. They depended too much upon government. They became enslaved. They became soft and faded into oblivion.

If this, Mr. Speaker, is to give true freedom to the individual, if the government is to look after him as far as health care is concerned providing he is capable of looking after himself, then why not look after him so far as his food, his clothing and shelter and all the necessities, the basic necessities, of everyday living are concerned?

Now the key words from point of principle are that the hon. Minister last year has said:

If government is to look after him as far as health is concerned, providing he is capable of looking after himself—

And if that happens the hon. Minister of Health will see the decline and fall of the Roman empire taking place in Ontario; and yet, sir, that is exactly what he is doing in these changes.

He is allowing anyone to buy a medical care insurance programme from the government, regardless of income. The government is looking after the health of the people, and how can the hon. Minister remain in his position when he goes into this great mournful, doleful prediction of what will happen if he moves into it? I do not think he is moving in half far enough on this; but I am saying that he is moving slowly, he is being dragged into the 20th century in connection with a concept of health care.

The hon. Minister, again on this aspect of compulsion, said: "I am not afraid of it." He said, "I just detest the word." You remember, Mr. Speaker, when he stood up that night and almost exploded when he said it. He said, "I hate the word."

Anyone who has been taught "Scots wae hae wi' Wallace bled"—and you will have to excuse the way I say it—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Thompson: But he hates the idea of compulsion. Of course we have compulsion in this society; I have gone into that. We have compulsion in this medical care bill that the hon. Minister is bringing in, as I described; and he is really ranting when he brings up that red herring.

The hon. Minister of Health has said at another point: "This programme need not

cause any hardship. There is nothing about the programme that may be developed. Indeed," he said, "the opposite is the case." And yet, sir, Ottawa has devised a programme, a far superior programme, and has promised to pay half the cost, but the hon. Minister is now finding obstructions. He sees mysterious, integrating, union pension plans. He will not tell us in the House what the obstructions are, but he whimpers it up in Ottawa in the street there, or somewhere. He does not come in here and tell us where he stands and what the difficulties are. He hides that.

He sees a shortage of doctors and hospitals and, I re-emphasize, who is to blame for that? Who is to blame? And yet, for years, he has been crowing about how magnificent the government's programme in this field is. And he is suddenly worried about priorities, and we have been pushing him on hospital beds. I can remember four years ago, at a night debate, where he was saying the words, "hospital beds". Now he is worrying about priorities, and the principle of giving adequate service to the people of Ontario. It is a façade. The hon. Minister cannot bring himself to accept Ottawa's plan and the province is suffering because of an indecisive Minister and a reactionary Prime Minister.

Let me say it is the Canada pension plan all over again. It is the hospital insurance commission all over again. Mr. Drew held back hospital services for the people of Canada for years; and, similarly, this government, when we get a great social reform, starts raising red herrings about the need for doctors and everything else. The hon. Prime Minister flip-flopped around the place on The Canada Pension Act and the hon. Minister is quibbling around on this, like a frightened nervous child, about Medicare. And I want to talk about figures.

The hon. Prime Minister told us last year, I am sorry, the hon. Minister of Health told us last year that actuarial studies said people who received assistance and bought their policies from the government would be involved in the premium rate of \$72 for an individual, \$144 for a couple, and \$180 for a family. Now he is charging less, and he has not said how this will happen. Costs are confusing. We noted last year that the Hall commission figures indicated a total cost for a government-run universal comprehensive Medicare plan at more than \$200 million. Now the hon. Prime Minister is saying that it is going to cost \$280 million. It has been reported that Ottawa will pay on the basis of \$238 million. I should note that the hon. leader of the New

Democratic Party had said that he could bring in a plan; I admit it was in 1961 but I think he said that it would cost \$165 million.

The problem that we have here is that the government has access to getting the figures. We do not. We want to know what the plan is going to cost. We want the hon. Minister to tell us about premiums and other things that flesh out a plan—not sit in silence, trying to keep everything dark. Last year, he blandly told us, and I quote from the hon. Minister:

We changed our well-baby care provision because the pediatricians were at odds with me on it. I bowed to their superior knowledge which this is their field. We came to the decision about our psychotherapy provisions after discussing with representatives of the Ontario psychiatric association and we are assured that they are good provisions. And now limitations which were prescribed by the regulations for psychotherapy and well-baby care have been removed.

Well, who is he bowing to? I think the change that we want is a progressive change.

The hon. Minister moved a little bit progressively with well-baby care, with cutting off the waiting period from the point of view of pregnancy, but why did he make such a hash of it the first time around? The hon. Prime Minister got involved last year on second reading of Bill No. 136. He told us the bill had two principles, and he made it sound as though the principles were carved in stone. One principle was, he said, and I quote:

That insurance carriers make available a standard contract to all the people of Ontario without regard to their state of health, age or any other consideration.

And it was not the hon. Minister alone who was going to get tough with the insurance agencies. In the House, here, we heard that the hon. Prime Minister was going to get tough, too. He lectures us for bringing up the fact that there are insurance offices in his home town. Too childish, he said. But where is the hon. Prime Minister's great principle today? Gone. He told us, and I quote:

I can only assure him that the thinking and the considering was done before this bill was brought into the House.

Well, what is he going to say this year, when we have to amend the mess which he has brought up at this time? He chided us, and I quote the hon. Prime Minister:

I can only suggest that as yet we have not seen the leadership from Ottawa.

This was his excuse. We have not seen leadership from Ottawa. Well, now he has seen leadership, and what is he doing about it? The hon. Prime Minister talked about statesmanship last year when there was no concrete federal proposal on the bargaining table, and he said and I quote:

I would agree that Ontario plays a very important part in the national scene as far as an overall national programme is concerned.

Well, what are his actions, when a national programme is proposed? He gives a speech in Montreal. It is odd how the new wave in that province affects the hon. Prime Minister of this province, and he used the wrong figures — figures his Minister of Health had been told were out of date—and he leaves the impression with some that they will have to pay \$182 million more.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): The only figures that have ever been announced.

Mr. Thompson: He will have to pay—he left the impression that \$182 million more will have to be paid for Medicare than they are paying now. He neglected, Mr. Speaker, to say that our people are already spending millions for medical care. And later he apologized. He was only using Medicare as an example, he said. As a national statesman, he did not set much of an example.

Then, last year, Mr. Speaker, we got down to discussing the principles of Bill No. 136 in detail, and the socialist party and ourselves proposed 21 amendments. The amendments were about equally distributed between the two parties, and in some cases they were combined efforts. Now I appreciate that we stood together, the socialists and ourselves; we stood together on this point of view and I think the bill today shows what we achieved. The sections of the bill today that you are bringing in were either suggested or proposed by either one of the parties. And what were the hon. Minister of Health's reactions at that time? I think it illustrates what kind of a Minister of Health we have.

The hon. member for Sudbury and the hon. member for Woodbine had introduced a joint amendment effecting waiting period. What did the hon. Minister say when he was asked specifically about pregnancies? This, and I quote:

In studying the matter, sir, we found that it is customary in all insurance contracts to state either a waiting period of ten months, nine months, eight months in the case of pregnancy.

And it is quite readily understandable when the hon. Minister said that the insurance principle is not in determining when pregnancy occurs, nor is the insurance principle concerned in the matter of providing the care. The insurance principle, and I notice this great emphasis on insurance principle, is only in making provision for prepayment of this care. And if insurance principle is going to obtain, and if premiums are to be kept to a realistic level at all, then certain safeguards must be built into all the contracts and one of them has relationship to pregnancy.

Now the hon. Minister reduces premiums and removes the special waiting period for maternity benefits under the standard contract. And it is a worthwhile change. But it raises the question, Mr. Speaker: Did the hon. Minister know what he was talking about last year? What of this great love of insurance principle?

He is the Minister of Health, not the Minister of insurance companies; and when we talk of pregnancy and of mothers, his reply is constantly not emphasizing the health principle, but emphasizing the insurance principle. We are glad to see he has backed down on that one.

Another point I pointed out, and I quote:

No increase in fees at any time will be enforced until approved by the medical services insurance council.

And the hon. member for Woodbine added the rider that doctors should be paid 90 per cent instead of 100 per cent of the fee schedule.

What was the hon. Minister's reaction to that, sir? The hon. Minister's reaction is really in two parts. Let me quote:

I submit to you that every self-employed person, whether he or she is a professional person or in the designated trades as I believe it is called, whether in business or commerce, or any of the service areas, has a right—

this is the hon. Minister saying this:

—to set whatever rate he likes upon his services.

And then, in another part, he said:

Has the OMA requested 100 per cent of the fee? I would say "No." They never asked for it at all. What I would point out to my hon. friend from Bruce is that only PSI, so far as I know among the carriers of Ontario today, has an agreement with a group of doctors known as participating doctors who have agreed to

accept 90 per cent of the scheduled fees. We did this deliberately, this fact of the percentage of the fees. We did it deliberately to get the thing rolling.

Well, I would make these points: He did this to get the plan rolling; that was at 100 per cent. This was his reason, to get it rolling. And I would take it then, if that was his argument last year and if it still has any validity, if he comes now down to 90 per cent, I take it the new plan will not get rolling—or else his argument last year was just utterly facetious.

Second, he will let the doctors set their own fee schedule, obviously, and he will not have an agreement to stop extra billing. I have heard nothing from him on that. Anyone who thinks everyone will only have to pay 90 per cent of the present OMA schedule will be sadly mistaken, possibly, if he does not put more clarification in this. And the hon. Minister's figure of \$150 per large family will then become misleading at the very least.

Last year, the hon. Minister had done nothing. It is obvious he has changed the bill a good deal. Has he had a change of heart, Mr. Speaker; has he had a change of heart? The man who said he was against any form of compulsion therefore seemed to correlate "universal" with "compulsion." The man who said that, who tried to shift and twist and wheedle around Ontario hospital services commission. Keeping a blind eye to it and saying it was not really compulsion for 15 or more.

The man who can sit comfortably in that government, with his remark about being against compulsion, can sit comfortably when we hear another clarion call as though an army is going to come down about pension plans and bring in retroactive legislation and force people to comply about their security measures! The man who can do that must, to me, be a man who needs a lot of study. It is for these reasons, sir, that I think it behooves the hon. Minister to get up on his feet and tell us where he stands.

He has hidden as though he was some shivering, apprehensive little child, as though the job is too big for him. He has hidden away, when he is demanded by the public to get up and tell us does he agree with the federal plan or does he not? I think he has a duty to perform in that, and if he does not want to perform it, then I suggest he resign and let someone else take over.

It is because of this sir, that I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver—and I may say in moving this that I am moving to a large

extent the same motion that I did last year, because with us the principle still holds firm. We do not have to waffle or change. I have put several things in and I have explained them. For example, in my remarks on the Speech from the Throne, sir, I have explained that we were emphasizing phasing-in.

It was unfortunate the hon. member for Forest Hill had not read that speech, because he suggested we had no emphasis about phasing-in. We talked about drugs and the need for helping with prescribed drugs. This is one of the phasing-in programmes. In order to emphasize that, in case people had missed it, these are in our resolution.

And therefore, sir, I move, seconded by Mr. Oliver that the motion be amended by striking out all of the words after the word "that" and the following be substituted therefor:

This bill be referred to the standing committee on health and welfare at which representatives of farmers, trade unions, the business community, the medical profession and the public should be invited with instructions to make recommendations to the government and the House in accordance with the recommendations of the Royal commission on health services chaired by the hon. Mr. Justice Emmett Hall, in order that the bill should provide a health charter for the citizens of Ontario and without limiting the generality of the foregoing the bill shall include and be based upon the following principles:

1. A comprehensive government operated universal health care programme.
2. The patient shall have the right to be treated by a doctor of his choice.
3. The doctors shall be paid on a fee for services basis and shall be free to practice within or without the plan.
4. There shall be no means test.
5. Mental illness shall be treated on the same basis as other illnesses.
6. Dental and optical services for children up to 18 years of age shall be included.
7. Other ancillary medical and health care services such as home nursing or orthopaedic appliances, chiropractic services, and payment of a part of the cost of prescribed drugs shall be phased into the programme as independent health services in order that the programme shall be fully comprehensive by 1971.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much that you have interpreted the rules rather broadly for a free-wheeling debate here. I hope that I

can succeed in dealing more centrally with the principle of this bill, rather than wandering around on the periphery of it in the fashion that the hon. leader of the Opposition has done.

In the course of his near two hours I think one would have to concede that he has at least alluded to, if not made, most of the points that should be made in opposing second reading of this bill. Unfortunately, having made them he has so buried them in irrelevancies that our problem is to rescue them so that we can get them pointed sharply at the government once again.

The hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) says I have a job on my hands, and he is quite right. They are buried so deep in the irrelevancies that I have got a real job on my hands. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, during previous years in debating this issue we have put a great deal of solid substance, in terms of facts and relevant considerations with regard to Medicare, and I am very glad that we have done so, because without it the hon. leader of the Opposition would be almost as mute as the hon. Minister of Health. His research staff has fine-tooth-combed all of our speeches and he has regurgitated most of them here once again this morning.

Now, if I may deal with one of the points that was made and see if I cannot help to rescue it a bit and sharpen it and point it in the direction in which it should be directed; and that is the argument the hon. leader of the Opposition dealt with, away, way back in the first three minutes of his speech, namely, the question of compulsion. He said compulsion is not necessarily a denial of freedom.

If you have a higher objective that society has come to the conclusion should be met, then it is not a denial of freedom if you say to the people that everybody will be compelled to share in the achievement of that objective. These are not his words—I would not like to thrust them into his mouth—but this is my interpretation of that case. Obviously, it is valid.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to you that it is relatively academic. The much more valid contention in dealing with the claptrap that we have had from this government on the question of compulsion is to get right down to the spurious presentation of it that the hon. Minister started out with last year, and he repeats this year. I trust I can quote, Mr. Speaker. This is the hon. Minister when he said:

I fully anticipate that there will be argument that everyone should be compelled to come under our standard plan—

that standard plan is now discarded:

—and that this is the only equitable and workable way in which complete and adequate medical services coverage can be attained. This really boils down to a different basic philosophy. Some believe that governments should regiment the people, deciding what is best for them and imposing that decision upon them by compulsion. Others—and we subscribe to this—believe that the same objective can be attained without compulsion.

Having made that statement, Mr. Speaker, in inimitable fashion this hon. Minister goes on to contradict it:

We believe we have proven this in our experience with hospital insurance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this hon. Minister knows—everybody in this province knows—that that is the case. The simple fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the voluntary principle in hospital insurance and in this bill is sheer hypocrisy. There is a misstatement of fact and the hon. Minister, with a shocking lack of intellectual integrity, gets up and repeats it as a misstatement of fact. This hon. Minister knows that the previous Prime Minister of this province said hospital insurance would be introduced into this province only by saying to 60 per cent of the people, who were in employee groups of 15 or more, that their employer must enrol them in the plan.

Now when, Mr. Speaker, is the party on that side going to at least get enough respect for intellectual integrity that they will quit this claptrap of saying it is voluntary? They have been peddling it on the hustings for years and they are peddling it still.

But, Mr. Speaker, what makes it even worse is that they did not even have the courage to do the same thing in this plan. This is a reversal of what they did in hospital insurance. In hospital insurance they established a viable administrative unit that would have low administrative costs, by saying that 60 per cent of the people who were in the group plan will be included in the public plan right from the word "Go." What has this government done? This government has said, from the word "Go", that the 60 per cent of the people who are in group plans will be excluded. This will be left as the gravy for the private insurance companies to claim; and the bits and pieces, the odds and sods, the high risks this government is going to collect together, may, after some years, be worked into a viable administrative unit.

What makes it even worse, Mr. Speaker,

is this: In addition to a fundamentally different approach, they have imposed a gross injustice on the very people who are entitled, under another section of this Act, to get assistance.

For example, a person who happens to be in a group, and whose income is less than \$500 taxable, or \$1,000 for a couple, or \$1,300 for a family—and, Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of civil servants who get that kind of income from the government—yet, Mr. Speaker, these people are not going to have an opportunity to get the subsidy. They now have been handed over, enslaved if you will, to the London Life. They used to be with PSI, but this government last year, in effect, euchred and manoeuvred the civil service association into a position whereby coverage for the whole of the civil servants in this province had to be handed over to London Life. And thousands, indeed there may well be tens of thousands—I do not know what the up-to-date figure is after some modest increases in civil servant salaries in the past year—I do not know what the up-to-date figure is of those earning under \$3,000, or \$3,500, or \$3,800—in other words, those who are entitled to a subsidy—but because they happen to be in a group they are going to be denied the opportunity to get that subsidy, and this will be true of many other groups across the province.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, this proposition that we have something here that is not compulsion is just sheer unadulterated rot; and I trust that some time soon the hon. Minister of Health—and I repeat it once again—will have the intellectual integrity to face the facts, instead of peddling that kind of—

Mr. Bryden: Deliberate deception.

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Now I want to get down to a basic point, Mr. Speaker, in considering the principle of any bill or any amending bill for the establishing of medical insurance. In considering the principle of this bill, let us go back and review why it is that governments have gotten into this field. Why have events forced them to get into the field of medical insurance? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the reasons are beyond dispute. The costs through private carriers became too high, and, therefore, too many people were not covered. That is the simple reason as to why events have forced governments to get into this field. Society as a whole—and today all political parties at least pay lip service, whether they genuinely believe it or not, to

the proposition that this kind of exploitation of ill health should not be tolerated and, therefore, something has got to be done about it.

Mr. Speaker, if that is the reason why governments have moved into this field, I suggest to you that the only justification and purpose for their intervention is to bring the premiums down to a level that will be within the reach of all families within the province, so that we can make certain that there will be universal coverage, that there will be nobody in this province who is going to find that he cannot cope with the kind of doctor bills he will have if ill health ever strikes his family. On this basis, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the government's bill of last year was a fraud, and it was widely described as such across this province. And what is more, Mr. Speaker, without serious modifications the amending bill that is before the House is still a fraud.

The hon. leader of the Opposition at one point, for example, said that the principle of this bill is radically changed. I do not think the principle of the bill is radically changed. The underlying principle of this bill is fundamentally the same as it was a year ago; and what is that principle, Mr. Speaker? I acknowledge that the government has done something by way of making medical insurance coverage for a few of the most unfortunate in the province—those in lower income groups and those who are in receipt of categorical assistance—but these benefits have been wrung out of this government only through the most intensive kind of battling.

These improvements, Mr. Speaker—this is the point, this is the underlying point in principle—have been only incidental to the basic objective of this government, and that objective is that the provision of medical insurance in the province of Ontario is going to be left under the domination of the insurance companies and the medical association. In fact, Mr. Speaker, we can go even further than that. One can say that this bill, this government's legislation, was shaped in co-operation with and designed primarily for the protection of two vested interests in the insurance field.

In case the hon. members may have forgotten, just let me go back briefly to review this by way of documentation. I put on the record in this House last year the minutes of a confidential meeting which was the first meeting at which the framework of this government's Medicare legislation was shaped. And what was that meeting, Mr. Speaker? That meeting was a meeting called by the

hon. Minister of Health in November of 1962 down in the Westbury hotel, where he laid out the principles—and they are essentially the same principles that we have before us here still—and said to this meeting, "You go ahead and work out the kind of legislation that will achieve this objective."

And who was at the meeting, Mr. Speaker? Was it representatives of the people of the province of Ontario? Was it farmers or labour or business, or any other group there represented as a group? No. The only people who were at the meeting were 24 doctors and 11 representatives of insurance companies. And they came forth with, in effect, a draft bill, the details of what this government could put into effect. And, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 163, the bill that this government passed before the last provincial election, the bill that the hon. Prime Minister went across the province saying, "Done, done" on Medicare, was shaped by the insurance companies and the medical association and other related vested interests in the Westbury hotel and related meetings.

Then what did they do, Mr. Speaker? The government, by way of stalling to do more study, set up a Hagey commission, a commission on which everybody on that commission, with one exception, was committed to private Medicare. In other words, they so shaped the operations of the committee that they could get nothing other than what they themselves wanted in terms of their private Medicare bill. And the Hagey committee took some two years to study the situation. They came back, Mr. Speaker, with nothing other than minor revisions of the details of what were in the secret report of November, 1962. It was a sheer waste of time and tens of thousands of dollars.

Then the government mulled through this and came up with Bill No. 136. In other words, Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 163, Bill No. 136, the bills that came down in 1963 and 1965, were shaped by the medical association and the insurance companies almost exclusively; and the representatives of the great mass of people in the province of Ontario, all of those organizations which represent great numbers of them and are authorized spokesmen for them, simply did not have an opportunity to share in any meaningful way in its formulation. They came and presented briefs to the Hagey commission, but most of the briefs were ignored because the framework of the legislation had already been established.

Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is that this government has followed through on

precisely the same kind of approach all this past fall. The hon. Minister of Health is not the Minister of Health, he is a water boy running messages from Queen's Park to the OMA and the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario and to the insurance companies and not much more. That is what has been going on during this past fall.

There were two features of the bill last spring that even this government recognized were intolerable. One was the proposition of a differential in standard coverage which was going to result in the people whose need was greatest, the aged and the ill, having to pay the largest premiums for the standard coverage and the premiums could be graded down for others. Even, as I said the other day, even the *Toronto Telegram* found that this was intolerable and said so, though they had been supporting the whole proposition up until then.

Second, as far as the medical association was concerned, the OMA had stuck to its guns on its demand of a 100 per cent payment on its schedule of fees. This government had obediently gone along with it. But a great battle was put up in this House by the Opposition parties and the government recognized that something must be done about it, so last fall, Mr. Speaker, the government took the initiative to reshape the bill.

And who did they bring into their consultations? Did they bring in the churches which were in favour of public Medicare? Did they bring in the farm organizations which speak for the hundreds of thousands of farmers in this province? Did they bring in, for example, the social workers and their organizations, who had made representations? Did they bring in, for example, the labour movement in support of this?

No, Mr. Speaker, none of them. These people speak on behalf of the people who are going to benefit and who need Medicare. The only people they brought in were, once again, the insurance companies and the medical association.

Now I am not objecting to the government bringing in the insurance companies and the medical association if it were a broad consultation; but this government's legislation was shaped by the vested interests, and even after last spring this government went back to have it reshaped once again by the vested interests in the field. So that this is a piece of legislation, to the extent that this government thinks it can get away with it, to meet the demands of the medical association and to meet, even more important, the demands of the insurance companies.

I was interested, for example, that the OMA after having many meetings with this government throughout the past fall, starting with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health back in September and with many civil servants in the intervening months, concluded with another meeting with the hon. Prime Minister in early January of this year. How were all of these meetings initiated, Mr. Speaker? Well, here is the letter that went out from the OMA when they called their council together for a meeting on January 5 or 7, if I recall correctly. The third paragraph:

Subsequently, the government of Ontario gave notice to us that they propose to amend certain features of Bill No. 136 before it was proclaimed. Since then the board of directors and the executive committee had several meetings with different representatives of the government.

Now what right, Mr. Speaker, what right has this government, in this closed sort of fashion, to deal only with the doctors in the establishment of a scheme when the doctors, as they say in this letter of invitation, are committed to keeping a private Medicare rather than the kind of public Medicare plan that events are driving you to? Yet that is what was done.

I have a quotation here, for example, from an article written by Peter Thurling which has a very intriguing little paragraph in it, only two weeks ago in the *Toronto Telegram*, on January 22.

Only two weeks ago Dr. Gordon Mylks, president of the OMA, said that doctors had met at least 12 times in private with the government.

Then get this, Mr. Speaker: "And they had a gentlemen's agreement with the Prime Minister not to say anything." What sort of a hugger-mugger game is this?

Mr. Bryden: It is nice to be on the in group.

Mr. MacDonald: Exactly! They sit down and they talk with the medical association and then they, in effect, commit the medical association to keep their mouths shut so they will not let anybody in the province know that this is going on.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: That is only the reporter's view.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the reporter's view? This is Dr. Mylks' view.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member just quoted Mr. Thurling.

Mr. MacDonald: I quoted Mr. Thurling who in turn was quoting Dr. Mylks who happens at the moment to be the president of the OMA.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: On how many steps down the chain can the hon. member rely?

Mr. MacDonald: Is the hon. Minister denying that what I say is correct?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am saying it is not evidence.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the hon. Minister denying it is correct? Is he denying that the government did not, in effect, say to the medical association that they should keep quiet and not publish any news with regard to these discussions?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am just saying what the hon. member said in his argument.

Mr. MacDonald: What the hon. Minister is saying is an irrelevancy. What I am saying is that what the government did was to close the OMA's mouths so that the public would not know that the private discussions were going on. So let us not go off into extraneous points.

Mr. Speaker, I am the last person in the world to underestimate the role of doctors in medical insurance. Obviously, you have to have doctors if you are going to provide medical care to people. There is nothing new about that at all. But I trust some time that the little water boy for the OMA, who happens to sit in this House as Minister of Health, will recognize that the OMA is dominated by medical politicians who increasingly have not even got the confidence of the doctors of the province of Ontario. As a matter of fact, I was fascinated, Mr. Speaker, to read this morning an article from Ottawa with regard to a meeting yesterday of the academy of medicine in that city—where a resolution was introduced by an Ontario doctor, Dr. Sam Mirsky. Just let me read two or three paragraphs here so that I will not break it up and the hon. Minister will think it is out of context.

"The letter dated January 17th was suggested by"—this was the letter that went out from the OMA to the various people of the province of Ontario, urging the doctors that they should brainwash their patients into opposition against this plan; a fantastic concept of the ethics of a high profession. I wish Duncan McPherson had done a cartoon. It would have been a wonderful opportunity for a cartoon of a person on the operating table or in the doctor's office and the doctor with

some instrument in his hand saying, "Now, you are going to oppose the government's legislation, aren't you?" This is, in effect, the kind of thing they were doing.

Well, what is the action now? This is what was done by these medical politicians who presume to speak on behalf of the rest of the doctors. "I do not know anything more abominable for our profession to do," Dr. Sam Mirsky told the academy meeting as he proposed a motion criticizing the content of the draft letter. The newspaper report continues:

Steps should be taken in the future to avoid such an embarrassing situation.

The medical profession was asked by the provincial association to "engage our patients in political discussion"; and he did not think it was "a dignified way for the medical profession to behave."

We may as a group want to enforce ideas, but to indulge in politics and send letters to patients is a pretty cheap way. It smells of the lobbying you hear of in other countries," said Dr. Mirsky.

Now lest anybody think that Dr. Sam Mirsky was not speaking for the doctors who were attending the academy of medicine, only three of about 65 doctors attending the meeting, voted against the motion criticizing the OMA letter.

Now my point, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. The OMA is becoming a discredited organization in its tactics—even among the doctors. I venture the prediction that at the January 7 meeting, that was held this year, the rank-and-file members of the council of the doctors in the province of Ontario did not authorize this kind of thing. This is the kind of dictatorial move that is taken at the executive board level, or the publicity committee level, within the OMA. It is not representative of the doctors in the province of Ontario.

Let us face that fact. Let the hon. Minister of Health recognize the fact that if you want to find out what should be done in medicine you get out and talk to some of the rank-and-file doctors instead of getting the brainwashed views from the leaders of some of the medical associations.

Out in the province of Saskatchewan, when this battle was on, one would have concluded that the overwhelming majority of the people in the province of Saskatchewan were opposed to it, at least the overwhelming majority of the doctors. Now we discover, for example, that 72 per cent of the doctors in Saskatchewan are supporters of the plan.

For example, Mr. Speaker, instead of the hon. Minister going over in a sort of a

slavish, sycophantic fashion with regard to the Ontario medical association, why does the hon. Minister not sit down with the Ontario medical association or the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario and do something about grasping the problems that need to be solved if we are going to get health services to the people of this province? For example, instead of the hon. Minister getting up here, as an honorary member of the college of physicians and surgeons of Ontario and confessing his ignorance—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I object to that. I am not an honorary member. I am by law a member of the college.

Mr. MacDonald: Fine, I accept it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot practise my profession—

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, it makes my point all the stronger, and I am glad to have the hon. Minister underline it. If he is a legal member, why does he not stand up on his feet and accept the responsibility for protecting the interests of the people of the province of Ontario?

We have known for a long time that there is a shortage of doctors. We have known for a long time that the college of physicians and surgeons is excluding doctors, and the case is getting stronger and stronger that it is done on something other than strictly qualifications. It is typical of the hon. Minister's kind of neglect of important issues that when we ask questions in this House, he as a member, has not even satisfied himself as to what the facts are.

He has now had six or eight questions with respect to the position of foreign doctors and on each one of them he has to say to us, "I will get the answer from the college of physicians and surgeons." As a member of it, why has he not already got the answer?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Speaker, in the name of sweet reasonableness at least, how in the wide world can one person keep in his mind all of the answers to all of the unpredictable questions that my hon. friend and his socialist group are liable to put?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister sits on the council. He must have participated in discussions with regard to this.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid that now we are getting into a field that really does not come within the ambit of the discussion today. We are getting into a question-and-

answer debate on the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons. Now I would rather the member come back to his original thoughts with regard to the principles of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, we have covered this issue, and it has been pointed out many times that you cannot have medical insurance unless you have got doctors; and it is idle for the government to come in here with something that will be even more of a fraud if we do not get more doctors so that we can implement it. So things that are as close to the issue as the proposition of why the hon. Minister has not faced up to the limitations that are being put on our doctor supply in the province at the moment, I suggest to you, is completely relevant to the principle of this bill.

I will not digress at any great length, but what I am saying is that the hon. Minister has been abrogating his responsibilities. He has been sitting on the council and he has been hearing these discussions, presumably, and he has not had enough initiative to find out what exactly the picture is—so that having sat on it and having gotten the details, he would have them at his fingertips, to answer our questions.

This is not a new issue. This is an issue that has been written about in the press for six or eight months, for a year, for a year and a half. How long does an issue have to be dealt with before this Minister becomes aware of the fact that it is his responsibility to get some information in connection with it?

Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to one or two fundamental aspects of this question of providing medical insurance. They have to do with the question of costs, and the arguments that have been used that it cannot be dealt with because the costs are prohibitive. This is an argument that has been repeated down through the years—"We have to go slow," or "It is going to cost too much," or "The province or the nation cannot sustain it." And I want to say, Mr. Speaker, once again, that in my view the government has been giving figures for per capita costs that are ridiculously high.

The Hall commission report, for example, fixes national averages for the year 1966 at \$24.91. Yet the Robarts government is coming up with a figure of \$40. Now I concede that the \$24.91 is a national average, and maybe the Ontario figure may be \$26, \$28, or \$30. But the proposition that it is \$40

is ridiculous. And, Mr. Speaker, just let me show you how ridiculous it is at \$40 per capita. There are 6.5 million people in the province of Ontario who are eligible for coverage—approximately 6.5 million—I think the latest figures on our population are closer to 6.75 million. That would mean a total bill of \$260 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, since there are 5,500 doctors in Ontario, this would work out at a gross income of \$47,200, or a net income of \$31,500, for every single doctor in the province of Ontario—because the rule of thumb used in the profession is that one third of gross income can be deducted for expenses, and that gives net income.

The latest figures indicate that the average net income for doctors in the province of Ontario is in the range of \$19,000. So what, in effect, the hon. Minister of Health is saying, what, in effect, this government is saying, if it is going to cost \$40 per capita, is that the net income of doctors overnight inevitably is going to increase by some \$12,000. Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous. It would not be tolerable if it did happen, and it is not going to happen because the figure is exaggerated.

However, Mr. Speaker, just let me show you how ridiculous are the calculations of the government. For the moment I am going to accept their figure of \$40. I invite the House for a moment to follow some calculations that may be a little difficult to grasp in a single hearing, but I think I can get the message across.

The total cost in the province of Ontario for 6.5 million people at \$40 is \$260 million. The latest figure out of Ottawa, as a national average of costs on which Ottawa presumably are willing to pay 50 per cent, is now \$34. Where this comes from, I do not know, but let us accept it. That means that the province of Ontario will get \$17 per capita subsidy; and that, for 6.5 million people will be \$110 million; this would leave, to be raised in the province of Ontario, \$150 million. But, Mr. Speaker, the government estimates, in its present proposals, that it will be spending, out of the Treasury, \$70 million to cover the categorical assistance and the low income groups—all the partially subsidized groups. So if what has to be raised in the province of Ontario is \$150 million, and the government is proposing on its plan to put in \$70 million of public funds, that means that the amount that needs to be raised from all of the rest of the people of the province of Ontario, to have complete comprehensive coverage of a subsidy from Ottawa, is only \$80 million.

And what is \$80 million if you break it down into premiums? Well, Mr. Speaker, I invite hon. members of the House to follow these figures. I think they are relatively simple. There are 6.5 million people in the province of Ontario. But one million of them, the government has indicated, are not paying any income tax and therefore are going to have their premiums paid for completely by the government. That means 5.5 million people to bear the cost. Now among those 5.5 million people, there are 816,000 who are single persons, there are 335,000 who are couples, and there are 925,000 who are family units. Accepting this government's policy that the premium should be in the ratio of 1 to 2 to 2½ for a single person, a couple, and a family—for example the premiums are \$60, \$120 and \$150 under the present plan—accepting that ratio, Mr. Speaker, I did some calculations and discovered that if you had a premium of \$20 for the single person, \$40 for a couple, and \$50 for a family, they would raise \$77.1 million, just a little under the \$80 million required.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, if this government will now become part of the federal proposal, and take the subsidy of \$17 per capita from Ottawa all they have got to do is raise another \$80 million, which is a premium of \$20 for a single person, \$40 for a couple, and \$50 for a family, and they can have complete coverage for everybody in the province of Ontario.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): More socialism.

Mr. MacDonald: This is not socialism. This is plain good business sense.

Mr. Dunlop: Is there not a difference?

Mr. MacDonald: No, there is no difference between socialism and this; but there is a difference between what this government is trying to do and good common business sense.

An hon. member: Better watch that fellow.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, yesterday—or the day before yesterday—when the hon. member for London South was speaking, he came up with an inimitable pronunciation of an old word that I am always intrigued by, the word “potpourri”; he described it as a “pot pourri”. I accept his pronunciation of it because I think it has very appropriate overtones for reference in this particular case. I want to suggest that what the government is bringing to us here today is a “pot pourri,” to be sure. On the one hand, in principle, it

it a mish-mash of private Medicare, public Medicare, and mixed-up Medicare in between.

Mr. Bryden: Really mixed up.

Mr. MacDonald: That is its principle. When you get to the administration, the inefficient costs of private insurance are going to be carried on, for example, among the 60 per cent of our people who are out in private coverage. Just let me digress here for a moment, because it is interesting to note that if 60 per cent of our people in the province of Ontario—55 to 60 per cent of our people in the province of Ontario—are covered in group plans which have been handed over completely to the private insurance company, if there are one million people who are wholly subsidized—that is another 15 per cent—if there are 800,000 people who are partially subsidized as proposed by the government—that is another 12 per cent—that means then that there is going to remain 13 to 18 per cent who are not covered at all, or who will be on a direct-pay, individual kind of coverage.

In short, what we have got in the administration then, Mr. Speaker, is this: We are

going to have a highly inefficient and costly kind of administration. For 60 per cent of the people who are under group coverage with the private insurance companies we have administrative costs which the Hall commission documents as being high—28 per cent of every premium dollar. But you can reduce this to four or five or six per cent by a province-wide public plan.

I think I can conclude this in a few moments if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker. On second thoughts, since I have this amendment to deal with I move adjournment of the debate, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House; on Monday we will continue with the debate on Bill No. 6.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, February 7, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Monday, February 7, 1966

Grand River conservation authority, bill to establish, Mr. Simonett, first reading	249
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	254
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued	257
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Renwick, agreed to	275
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	275

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome, as guests in the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from Danforth technical school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

Of the corporation of the township of North York, praying that an Act may pass permitting it to require owners of certain lands to enter into an agreement re conditions relating to development of the land.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South), that this House now adjourn to discuss—

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition must wait for his motion until after the routine proceedings of the day, that is after the questions are made; then he would present his motion. These are another type of motion.

Introduction of bills.

GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to establish the Grand River conservation authority.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the amalgamation of the Grand Valley conservation authority and the Grand River conservation commission.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Assuming that the bill passes the Legislature, does he contemplate a date by which this amalgamation would take place?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes. There will be a temporary amalgamation for three years and it will be reviewed at that time; then it will be set up as a separate authority.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), notice of which has been given.

In view of The United States Department of Agriculture's action in cancelling the registration of insecticides alderin and dielderin, has the hon. Minister contacted the food and drug administration in Ottawa with a view to taking similar action?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I can only assume that the hon. member is referring to a news release that was in Saturday's *Toronto Globe and Mail*. I, too, read that article this morning with some concern. We were in touch with The Department of Agriculture at Ottawa and I would like to read this statement, if I might, Mr. Speaker.

The food and drug administration of Canada does not register insecticides but is concerned with the tolerances of amounts of pesticides in products. Registration of pesticides is carried out under The Pest Control Products Act, administered by The Canada Department of Agriculture. We have been in touch however, as I indicated already, with both the food and drug directorate at Ottawa and The Canada Department of Agriculture relative to the recent announcement that was contained in this press release by The Department of Agriculture in the United States. We have received an official reply to our inquiry from The Canada Department of Agriculture and it reads as follows:

The United States Department of Agriculture has not cancelled all registrations on alderin and dieldrin. On January 28

The United States Department of Agriculture sent out notices cancelling the registration on certain uses of alderin and dielderin, principally on forage crops to be used in animal feeding. This brought the accepted uses in the United States basically in line with accepted uses in Canada under The Pest Control Products Act, the Canadian restrictions on the uses of alderin and dielderin on forage crops having been made known to the trade on August 30, 1965.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? As a matter of interest, what the hon. Minister is saying then is that the tolerance level in Canada is now much the same as the tolerance level in the United States in terms of usage. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member would agree it is just the other way around. We established the tolerance usage here in Canada—I should not say “we”, in Canada The Department of Agriculture made the rule on the use of these two insecticides and The United States Department of Agriculture has now brought its standards in line with our regulations, as announced on January 28. There could have been some misunderstanding here, I believe, in that they are not totally barred. If one reads the press release carefully, it almost looks to be a contradiction, even in the press release. It looks as though it was a blanket application and yet it really is not; it is only on specific crops that the reference is made to not being able to use it.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), in three parts.

Will the hon. Attorney General appear personally in the supreme court of Ontario tomorrow when the *Oshawa Times* attempts to obtain an order prohibiting all picketing by the members of the newspaper guild and other supporting unions and directing the reading of The Riot Act?

If so, will the hon. Attorney General oppose this application?

If not, what steps will the hon. Attorney General take to prevent an outbreak of violence?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Riverdale, the Attorney General will not appear personally in this matter, but The Department of the Attorney General will in

any event be represented by senior counsel on the application tomorrow before the supreme court of Ontario.

The hon. member for Riverdale is no doubt now aware that the action to which he has referred is between Canadian Newspapers Limited as plaintiff and five named individuals as defendants. It is a civil action between the parties, in which the Crown would ordinarily have no status.

However, in this proceeding, which is part of the action, an order is being sought to direct the activities of the sheriff of the county of Ontario and the Ontario provincial police force. We will appear through counsel on their behalf, although they are not parties to the litigation. We will state our position to the court at the hearing at which time all the facts of the matter will be before us.

The outbreak of violence to which the hon. member refers in the latter part of his question presumes that some persons will take the law into their own hands. I have a great confidence in the common sense of our citizens, in the rank and file of the labour unions and in the leaders of labour and management, who are responsible men.

Every responsible citizen has a duty to see that the law is respected, observed and maintained. Our whole society, our civilization, our way of life, is based upon the rule of law and respect for the law. We are proud of the reputation which our courts and judges have established and maintained for fairness and impartiality throughout our history as a nation.

Any person who defies the law, every person who says it is to be disregarded, flouted, disobeyed and set at naught, everyone who by word or deed seeks to bring about disrespect for the judgment of the courts of the land is seeking, whether he knows it or not, whether he realizes it or not, to destroy the society under which he lives and by which his own rights as a citizen of that society are maintained and guaranteed. He can only be described as an enemy of the state, and in the end result he is his own worst enemy for if one law can be defied by force because one group does not like it, then no law is safe. If one decision of our courts can be torn up and disregarded by one group of persons, then the whole of our law and all the decisions of our courts are brought into disrepute and the end is anarchy.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: When that day arrives, those who have first lifted their hands against the law are the first to suffer when their rights

and their freedoms are no longer protected under the rule of law.

Surely this is the lesson which history teaches. Therefore, it behooves every man for his own security, for the future of his children and the reputation of his nation, to see that the law is respected and obeyed. A man or woman who does not understand that is foolish. Those who know it to be true and still persist in efforts to destroy the maintenance of law and order are enemies of society.

Above all, it is the duty of the state to see that law and order are maintained and that law is upheld. No government worthy of the name can do otherwise and it has the right to expect the support of every citizen since it acts in the interest of all.

All of the rights which labour has won down through the years are enshrined in our law, buttressed and secured by the courts and by the rule of law. No responsible labour leader, no member of any political party, would wish to see that security weakened by counselling that the law be disregarded. The whole edifice of our labour relations Acts is built upon the foundation of law and they who, like Samson, would use their strength to pull away the pillars of the house, should first pause to think of the awful consequences, that they may bring the whole structure down to destroy themselves along with it.

We may not like a particular law; we may honestly believe it should be altered by every lawful means, and such means are always in the hands of the people. But no one has a right to set himself up above the law and he who does must face all the consequences of his unlawful action.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Attorney General permit a supplementary question?

If the hon. Attorney General has no status in the court tomorrow other than to represent the sheriff and the Ontario provincial police, who will represent the public interest in that court hearing tomorrow morning, to prevent a continued abuse of the process of the court by the *Oshawa Times*?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member says an abuse of the court, I take immediate issue with him.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South: That is what the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) said.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I take immediate issue with him because the court cannot be abused. To say that the court is being abused is to

imply that the court is either not impartial or wrongly informed and that those who are appearing before it are giving false information to the court upon which to get its decision.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): That has happened.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Both parties—all parties—will be represented before the court. For the hon. member to say that the court can be abused is to imply that he has no faith in the impartiality or in the wisdom of the court. I think it ill behoves the hon. member, a member of the legal profession, to stand up and make such an implication in this House or anywhere else in the land.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. Attorney General—

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps the supplementary question has been asked and that a satisfactory answer has been given and I would not like to see the question develop into a debate.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I had not really finished answering the question.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, he has not even started answering the question. All we have heard so far is a lecture.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The Department of the Attorney General will be represented. The Attorney General will be represented by senior counsel. I do not propose, as I stated in the answer to the original question, to say what the answer will be at this moment, but hon. members may rest assured that it will be fully explained and publicly made apparent in the court rooms of this land.

I would remind the hon. member that while I am aware that the Attorney General in Great Britain does appear personally, as he does in some other areas of the Commonwealth, the Attorney General in those jurisdictions is not an elected person, he is appointed. He is not a political person. I am, by force of my election to this House, such and a member of this government; and no matter how the Attorney General in this House might wish to remain clear of political influence the public is bound to gain the impression, if he appears in court, that he appears speaking not only on behalf of the government, but there is bound to be the implication and the imputation that he speaks with a political bias.

I think it is important—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Minister from St. Patrick's (Mr. Roberts) did it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think it is important, and most important, that the high civil servants, the high law officers of the Crown, be there and represent the Attorney General, but that they be free to act as such and that the Attorney General personally do not take part in hearings which may have a political implication.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Hire a downtown lawyer tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: There will be no downtown lawyer.

Mr. Sopha: We are glad to hear that.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: We are making progress.

Mr. Nixon: I have a question of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis). Have the regents of the colleges of applied arts and technology arranged to meet formally with representatives of all the municipalities in Ontario that have applied for a college before making location decisions; and, second, does the report of the meeting of the board of regents last week call for the opening of the first colleges in 1966?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, the council completed their meetings late on Friday and their initial report to me has not been presented as yet. As soon as I have this information I will make it available to the hon. members of the House.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, might I take that to mean the report would be tabled *in toto*?

Hon. Mr. Davis: No, it does not mean that, Mr. Speaker. It means that I shall provide the information. The council, as the hon. member knows, is an advisory body to the department and to the Minister. I shall provide information relating to the questions that the hon. member has asked just as soon as I have the information.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given: Would the hon. Minister inform this House whether the Ontario hospital services commission was asked to study unified and combined billing procedures for hospital and medical services? What were the findings of the study? Are the findings in the form of

a report to the Minister? If so, does the hon. Minister intend to table the report in this House during the current session?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is "no", the OHSC was not asked to conduct the study which the hon. leader of the Opposition mentions.

The organization and methods section of government carried out a study to determine the best organizational pattern for medical services insurance and during this study the organization and methods section discussed with OHSC the feasibility of certain common procedures. The present pattern of organization is the one which was recommended not only by the organization and methods section but by outside consultants as the best for our purposes. This also answers the second section of the question from the hon. member.

The third section: The Ontario hospital services commission did not submit a report and therefore the answer to the last part of the question is since there is no report it cannot be tabled.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker: I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts), notice of which has been given: Did the Prime Minister and/or the hon. Minister of Health meet with representatives of insurance companies last week? If so, what was the purpose of the meeting? What recommendations respecting medical services insurance were presented to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health by the insurance company representatives at the meeting; what specific complaint did the insurance company representatives raise in connection with the proposed medical service insurance rates introduced in this House by the hon. Minister of Health?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health and I met on Wednesday last with several members of the board of directors of the Canadian health insurance association, which is an association of insurance companies dealing in health insurance. As to the purpose of the meeting, I can only say it was arranged at the request of the association itself and I would say perhaps there were certain questions they wished to put before us because of the effect of what the government might be doing will have on their business.

In regard to the two latter parts of the hon. leader of the Opposition's question, I can only say that in the course of the year I entertain quite a few delegations in my office

and certainly in many cases I do not think they would be particularly pleased if whatever we happened to be discussing were made public. However, I am able to tell the hon. leader of the Opposition, in answer to these two parts, they made no recommendations respecting medical services insurance and they made no specific complaints in connection with the proposed rates.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education, copy of which has been submitted to him: Are the postgraduate fellowships provided by the Ontario government made available to universities on a quota basis for postgraduate students enrolled or seeking to enrol in that university? If so, what is the quota for the various universities in Ontario; and, if not, on what basis are these postgraduate fellowships made available?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, the province of Ontario graduate fellowships in amounts of up to \$2,000 per student have been provided now for three years. The number of awards has increased from 782 in 1963-64 to 1,149 in 1964-65 and to 1,572 in 1965-66; and we estimate that it will be approximately 2,000 in 1966-67. The number of awards at each institution is based on a quota system and the quota at each university is based on the proportion that the actual graduate enrollment of the preceding year in the eligible disciplines, as reported by the individual institutions, bears to the total provincial graduate enrolment in all these disciplines. The allocations in these could vary by one or two, but the allotments for 1966-67 will be approximately as follows: Carleton, 87; University of Guelph, 16; McMaster, 164; University of Ottawa, 176; Queen's University, 174; University of Toronto, 810; Trent University, 3; University of Waterloo, 174; Waterloo Lutheran, 10; University of Western Ontario, 240; University of Windsor, 60; and York University, 35.

Now these could, subject to the information we get from universities, vary slightly from institution to institution.

I might also add, Mr. Speaker, just as a note of interest, that we have increased the total amount that can be available for those proceeding to their Ph.D. from \$4,500 to \$6,000, so that a student is now able to receive \$6,000 when he is going for the doctor of philosophy degree level.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), in two parts.

What is the diet of severely disturbed inmates placed in detention while in detention; and what is the difference, if any, between that diet and the diet of inmates punished by solitary confinement while in solitary confinement?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in answer to part one of the question, what is the diet of severely disturbed inmates placed in detention, while in detention?—An inmate in detention may be placed on either regular diet or special diet, the decision being made by the superintendent.

Special diet is comprised of meat loaf, bread and tea. This special diet has been evaluated by our administrator of food services, Mrs. I. Beal, who is a graduate dietician. It contains all the protein, carbohydrates and vitamins which are required for adequate nutrition. As a matter of fact, it is nutritionally far superior to that which is recommended by the Canadian council on nutrition. Its ingredients for a one-day serving are two ounces of powdered milk or eight ounces of whole milk; three and a half ounces of grated potatoes; three and a half ounces of finely chopped carrot; one ounce of tomato juice or puree; three and a half ounces of finely chopped cabbage; four ounces of ground beef; two ounces of shortening; one ounce of white or whole-wheat flour; one half ounce of salt; one tablespoon of chopped onion; one egg; five ounces of cooked beans.

Insofar as part two of the question is concerned—what is the difference, if any, between that diet and the diet of inmates punished by solitary confinement, while in solitary confinement?—I am afraid I must say that here again I find confusion in the terminology, which I attempted to clarify in the House last Friday when I dealt with detention, segregation and solitary confinement. I pointed out at that time that there are two forms of solitary confinement—detention and segregation. It would appear to me that in part two of the question, the hon. member must be referring to segregation.

In all cases of segregation, as in detention, the decision regarding regular or special diet is made by the superintendent.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a supplementary question?

Does the special diet to which the hon. Minister refers have some special attributes which assist an emotionally disturbed person or a person with suicidal tendencies to overcome those propensities?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, obviously this is a question which really does not apply to the original question. If the hon. member wants a scientific answer to this question by one of our psychiatrists or psychologists, I would be pleased to get it for him. I would merely point out that we are one of the few jurisdictions, if not the only jurisdiction in Canada, which has replaced what was for years a bread-and-water diet and which is in existence in practically every other institution in Canada, including the federal, with this special loaf.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the liquor control board of Ontario, ending March 31, 1965.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). He is not in his seat. Do you wish me to ask it?

Mr. Speaker: So that the Minister may take it as notice.

Mr. Young: The question is: Would the hon. Minister inform the House if tradesmen are now being laid off with the statement that it is contrary to the policy of the department to retain employees who are beyond the age of retirement when these men will not be eligible for pensions for one, two or three years?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Worton that this House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance in relation to a grave matter of civil disobedience and disrespect for the law in relation to the strike now in progress of employees of the Oshawa *Times*.

Mr. Speaker, if I could substantiate with you why I am making this motion—

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has submitted his motion to me for approval, and after making his motion, I have to render a verdict which he and the members of the House can either find acceptable or challenge.

Mr. Thompson: Surely, sir, you would want to hear my reasons for making the motion?

Mr. Speaker: No, that is not the regular practice for following motions on adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance.

Mr. Thompson: I think it is very hard, sir, for you to decide whether the motion should

be accepted unless you hear the reasons on this.

Mr. Speaker: Order! For the benefit of the House, I would like for a moment to review the rule for the leader of the Opposition, which is in our book on parliamentary procedure in Ontario, by Mr. Lewis, on page 39.

A member who desires to place before the House a matter which he regards as a definite matter of urgent public importance, may move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing it. Such a motion must be made after the daily routine of business has been disposed of and before the orders of the day are read, and a notice in writing of the matter the member proposes to discuss must be supplied to the Speaker. If the Speaker decides that the matter is of sufficient importance to justify the move, the member then moves adjournment of the House and on this motion can discuss for a period of ten minutes only the subject he is interested in. Then any other members may also discuss the motion for ten minutes.

I would like also to finish another paragraph on this rule which I think is quite relevant and important.

A motion for adjournment under this rule must be restricted to a single, specific matter of recent occurrence, and having been discussed cannot again be brought up during the same session. The Speaker may decline to receive a motion for adjournment under this head, if in his opinion the subject proposed to be discussed is not definite, urgent or of public importance, if it is a subject which could be discussed at an early date in the debate on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, or the debate on the Budget, or some other business relating to it that may come before the House.

In view of that rule and also in view of another aspect which I am going to mention to the House in my ruling on this motion, I have come to the decision that the motion be not allowed at this time.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask you, sir, surely with your impartiality you would want to hear the reasons why I am making this motion before you pass judgment? It looks as though you have prejudged the issue before I have presented the motion.

Mr. Speaker: No, I have not. The leader of the Opposition is misinterpreting the rule.

I am not prejudging what he is about to say in discussing the motion. I am simply making the ruling on the motion for adjournment and am not prejudging what the member might want to say regarding the motion.

Mr. Thompson: I am not going to speak regarding the motion, Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Speaker: I have to deal with the subject-matter of the motion as the leader of the Opposition has submitted it to me and then give my ruling on it, and that has been the regular practice in this House over the years.

Mr. Sopha: Surely you should hear the hon. leader of the Opposition briefly, sir, before ruling.

Mr. Speaker: I may say that I had some difficulty in coming to a decision in this particular matter because the subject-matter of the motion does appear to be urgent, to be of public importance and perhaps definite. However, when I realized that there is an application pending before the court pertaining to this whole matter which was asked today by the member for Riverdale, I realized that the matter then was obviously *sub judice*—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I do want to point out also that as soon as the matter is out of the hands of the court it can be adequately dealt with in the Throne debate, which is proceeding at present, or in the Budget debate, which is about to begin within a few days. I would also remind members—and I think this is important—that if they debated it today for only ten minutes, which is very restrictive, it would prohibit them from discussing it again in this session in a debate for a no-time-limit reply.

I think that should be ample reason for the members to realize that it would be better not to discuss it at this time. But I have no alternative but to deny acceptance of the motion at this time because there is an application now before the court. If I am going to follow former rulings and practices that have come before this House, I have no alternative but to make that ruling.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, and for the purposes of the record, sir—

Mr. Speaker: Would the member state his point of order?

Mr. Sopha: Would you tell us, for the purposes of the record, why your ruling did

not apply to the hon. Attorney General who made a five-page statement on this precise matter?

Mr. Speaker: The Attorney General, as I understand it, was answering a question by the member for Riverdale which is entirely a separate matter. There was no motion before the House. He was answering a question, and a supplementary question. I take that as being entirely different to the motion, which is now before the House.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, this was a question approved by you? Surely, if you are going to give the hon. Attorney General the right to speak on this when it is before the courts, I fail to see why the leader of the Opposition cannot have the same consideration.

Mr. Speaker: The leader of the Opposition has had a motion to adjourn the House to debate this subject, which is a totally different thing to the question being asked of the Attorney General.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, your arguments are not impressing me; because it is *sub judice* you say.

Mr. Speaker: I have made my ruling, and if the members of the House do not care to accept it they have the opportunity to challenge it.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, can you tell me where in the rules it says that the motion that is put to you cannot be argued, either prior to or immediately after you make your ruling? I am not suggesting that the substantive part that will follow later can be argued now; I am asking that when you are asked for a ruling, and when you are about to give it, why is there not an opportunity given to those members who make the motion to present arguments as to why the motion should be granted? I fail to find any ruling on that, sir.

Mr. Speaker: I have never found it the practice of this House to debate the motion, because in debating the reason for having the motion you are debating the motion. In my time, in this House, the Speaker has always rendered a ruling whether he accepts the motion or not; and if I had telephoned the member, which has been the practice in the past, before the House sits at three o'clock, that I did not accept his motion, then he could not even rise and make the motion.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: I would also like to refer the House to the *sub judice* rule, which is also in our book on rules and parliamentary practice on page 29—

Mr. Thompson: Are you speaking to the hon. Attorney General?

Mr. Speaker: Order! It says:

A member, in addressing the House, should always bear in mind that certain matters are not to be alluded to in his speech and one of these is matters awaiting a judicial decision.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, why did you not rule the hon. Attorney General out of order, then?

Mr. Speaker: Does the leader of the Opposition challenge the ruling?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I do.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I raise on a point of order before you put the question—

Mr. Speaker: There are no more points of order. Call in the members.

Mr. MacDonald: I cannot explain the position of the party vis-à-vis your decision before we vote?

Mr. Speaker: No. The Speaker's ruling is not debatable and I made a ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not debating it.

Mr. Speaker: Well, the Speaker's ruling has been given and the leader of the Opposition has challenged the ruling so I have no alternative but to take a vote.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the Speaker's ruling will please say "aye." As many as are opposed, will please say "nay." In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Those in favour of the Speaker's ruling will please rise.

As many as are opposed will please rise.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the members to desist from talking while the clerk and assistant clerk are taking the vote.

AYES

NAYS

Allan
Bales
Brunelle

Ben
Braithwaite
Bukator

AYES

NAYS

Bryden
Carruthers
Carton
Cass
Cecile
Cowling
Davis
Davison
Demers
Dunlop
Dymond
Edwards
Freeman
Gisborn
Grossman
Hamilton
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Johnston
(Carleton)
Kerr
Knox
Lawrence
(St. George)
Lewis
(Scarborough West)
MacDonald
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McKeough
McNeil
Noden
Olde
Peck
Pittock
Price
Pritchard
Randall
Reilly
Renwick
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rowntree
Simonett
Spooner
Stewart
Walker
Wardrope
Wells
Wishart
Yakabuski
Yaremko
Young—57.

Farquhar
Gaunt
Gordon
Newman
Nixon
Sargent
Singer
Smith
Sopha
Spence
Thompson
Trotter
Whicher
Worton—17.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 57, the "nays" are 17.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the Speaker's ruling upheld.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I am very pleased to announce that another agreement to build a modern detention centre has been reached. As hon. members are aware, during the past few months two previous agreements have been signed. The first one was with the counties of Hastings, Frontenac, Lennox and Addington, and Prince Edward, and the second with the united counties of Durham and Northumberland; Peterborough and Victoria.

The present agreement was reached between the city of Hamilton and the county of Wentworth. This will replace the 90-year-old jail, on Barton street in Hamilton, with an up-to-date detention centre. The proposal put forward by these authorities has been accepted by this government as one which qualifies for the 50 per cent capital grant by the province towards the construction of a regional detention centre. The date of the signing of the agreement will be announced shortly.

In announcing this latest agreement, I wish to pay tribute to the people in these communities for the great leadership they have provided and the informed interest they have shown in this area of corrections. I would like to commend the efforts of the special jail committee, appointed by the Hamilton council on the recommendation of their mayor, which was set up in June of 1964 to consider the advantages of a modern detention centre. This committee was composed of five citizens and three council members. They met with representatives of Wentworth county and The Department of Reform Institutions, and the recommendations were later submitted to the Hamilton council.

I also wish at this time to pay tribute to the leadership of Mayor Victor Copps of Hamilton, Warden Lorne Freeman, and the reeve of East Flamborough, Kenneth Harper, both of Wentworth county. They have, throughout all our discussions, shown the greatest consideration and co-operation.

In drawing up their plans for the replacement of the jail, the representatives of Hamilton and Wentworth have consulted with us at all stages and they will construct a detention centre with the assistance and expert advice of our regional detention centre planning committee, in keeping with this government's progressive programme of replacing the old local jails with modern institutions more capable of carrying out the best pre-

cepts of rehabilitation in correctional institutions.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a question regarding the comments?

Mr. Speaker: It is not customary during a ministerial statement, but if the Minister cares to answer a question I shall allow it.

Mr. Gisborn: I assure you, sir, it is short. There is quite an omission in the statement. Could he tell us if they have decided on a location for the building?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, at this stage of the agreement, it has been the policy to avoid the discussion of locations, although I am sure that the authorities concerned have pretty well established where it is going to be. They have not so advised us. We have an idea, as I say, that they do have one in mind, but I am not at liberty at this time, Mr. Speaker, to advise the hon. members as to whether this is definite or not.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

(continued)

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, when the debate concluded on Friday I was in the process of elaborating on an argument, and was about to consider the question of the amendment that is before the House.

I would like today to briefly recapitulate the main points that I was presenting to the House and then proceed to the amendment. I will do so by a listing of these points.

First, from the outset the government Medicare legislation has been shaped by, and designed to serve primarily, the interests of the medical association and the insurance companies. The present amending bill is once again shaped in accordance with the dictates of these vested interests at the expense of providing the most efficient and inexpensive coverage for all the people of Ontario. The government has bowed to the public outcry against paying 100 per cent to the OMA schedule of fees, but the bill has gone far to compensate for this so-called "cut" by the

assurance that the government payment for all medical welfare cases will be on the full 90 per cent, instead of pro-rating at approximately 30 per cent as has been the case in the past.

Furthermore, the government has not done anything to get an assurance from the OMA that extra billing will not take place. Similarly, Mr. Speaker, the government has bowed to the refusal of the insurance companies to provide coverage for the aged and ill at something other than the highest premiums on standard contracts. Instead the government has generously assumed full responsibility for providing a standard contract, thereby leaving the insurance companies with the low risk coverage while accepting all the highest coverage themselves.

Second, the estimate of the government of an overall \$40 per capita cost is ridiculously exaggerated. If this estimate is valid it would mean an overnight increase in income for Ontario's 5,500 doctors to just beyond \$47,000 gross or \$31,000 net as compared with the latest income tax statistics which reveal the incomes of doctors already as the top among professions in the range of \$19,000.

Third, even with the exaggerated figure of the government accepted as valid for purposes of calculation, these calculations indicate that, with the current offer of financial assistance from Ottawa, it would be possible to provide complete coverage for everybody in Ontario at lower premium rates than now being offered to the most heavily subsidized groups under what has become dubbed "Robartscare". The estimate of the government of \$260 million total cost, that is 6.5 million people at \$40 per capital, would be met by \$110 million subsidy from Ottawa, that is 50 per cent of the national average of \$34—a figure now emerging more and more from Ottawa.

Of the remaining \$150 million that would have to be raised in the province, the government is proposing to spend from the public Treasury some \$70 million, so that there would be only \$80 million to be raised in premiums. That can be covered by a premium of \$20 for a single person, \$40 for a couple and \$50 for a family as compared with the government figures of \$61, \$120 and \$150 on their standard contracts or under the subsidized proposals \$30 for a single person and \$60 for a couple or a family.

Mr. Speaker, these calculations simply reveal the indescribable pot pourri that "Robartscare" is. In principle it is a monstrosity; partly private, partly public and

partly a mishmash of both. The result is high administrative costs throughout the whole plan. For example, the 55 to 60 per cent of our people under group coverage are left wholly at the mercy of the private carriers. Even the low income groups caught in the group coverage as a condition of employment will be denied a subsidy to which they are otherwise entitled.

In striking contrast to what we did when setting up hospital insurance, all of this group will be left to the private carriers instead of being brought in to provide the basis for a viable, efficient administrative unit. In short, more than half of our people will be left to carry the burden of the high administrative costs of private insurance, which represents about 28 cents on every premium dollar.

For the 1.8 million people who are going to be covered by this government, representing 27 per cent of our population for whom premiums will be wholly or partially subsidized, again there will be unnecessarily high administrative costs in the government plan. How high, it is impossible to predict at this point.

Finally, there will be some 13 to 18 per cent of our people left to individual coverage either from the private carriers or from the government standard contract, a figure which indicates just how difficult it is going to be for Ontario to meet the qualification of universality in order to get the federal subsidy.

In summary then, Mr. Speaker, what this House is being asked to consider and accept is a plan shaped primarily to meet the interests of the insurance companies and the OMA and the mythology which each of these vested interests perpetuates for their own benefit. The government proposes to impose upon us a hodge-podge of a plan in which administrative costs will be high across the board, and premiums will be three or four times what they need to be under a comprehensive universal plan operated through a government agency with the federal grants now under consideration. It is incredible that this government should be such a slavish minion to the vested interests in the field, at the expense of both the medical needs and the pocketbooks of the people of the province of Ontario.

We in the New Democratic Party will fight this fraud, this poor substitute for the real thing—and that is a dictionary definition for a fraud—not only because it is poor in itself, but equally important, Mr. Speaker, because if this government were to give the kind of leadership the present situation demands the real thing is now within our grasp.

Events at Ottawa have forced the Liberal government, after nearly 50 years of procrastination, to the threshold of action. I acknowledge, as this government has contended, that Ottawa is still waffling. The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) pleads, for example, that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) should not, in the secret conferences at Ottawa, whittle away at the universality principle. I wish I were confident only this government were whittling away at it. The Liberals at Ottawa are already talking in terms of whittling it down to 90 per cent for qualification on the federal grant. In short, the danger arises from both provincial Tories and federal Liberals, neither of whom have had any firm conviction on this issue, as experience down through the years has proven.

But instead of welcoming Ottawa's waffling in order to justify its own half-baked plan, this government should now be taking the kind of lead which would give not only the people of Ontario but all of Canada a first-class Medicare plan along the lines mapped out by the Hall commission report.

What is the situation at the moment, Mr. Speaker? Following the federal-provincial conference of Health Ministers last week three provinces—Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan—have accepted the federal proposals. The premier of B.C. has indicated that minor changes needed in their plan in order to qualify for federal grants will be made. The Quebec plan conforms with all the federal requirements, it only remains to work with the fiscal equivalent.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the indecision of Ontario stands to date as the main roadblock to this nation finally being able to achieve this major piece of social legislation, which has eluded us for generations. Ontario is the one province that can put an end to Ottawa's waffling. With a firm commitment in principle from Ontario the overwhelming majority of the Canadian people would be in on the federal plan and the federal government could waffle no longer.

That is what this government should be doing. That is what we in the New Democratic Party plead that this government do. Forget their outmoded ideologies; quit paying lip service to the mythology of the OMA and the insurance companies; give the leadership which events demand of them in the interests of the people of Ontario, and beyond Ontario to the people of this whole nation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with the hope that the government can be persuaded to this, I turn

to the Liberal amendment. Perhaps I do not need to remind the House, Mr. Speaker, but we have had some confusion regarding procedure on second reading, so just let me pause for a moment to discuss it.

An amendment on second reading is of a very special type. It strikes out all the words after "that" in the motion, "that the bill be now read for a second time," and substitutes words which are designed to defeat the motion. But when you put the question, Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your ruling last year, which was approved by this House and is to be found on page 4424 of *Hansard* for June 21, 1965, it will be put in the traditional form which you have restored to this House, namely: Shall the words proposed to be struck out stand as part of the bill? Or more simply, shall the bill be now read a second time?

We, Mr. Speaker, shall vote "no" because we are opposed to second reading of this bill. If that motion is defeated, then all the words after "that" will not stand as part of the motion, they will in effect have been struck out and the Liberal amendment offers a substitute wording which will then come before this House. When, and if, it does, Mr. Speaker, we shall oppose the Liberal amendment and I want to give my reasons.

Basically what the Liberal amendment calls for is further study, that the matter be referred to a standing committee in order that still another opportunity will be given to a wide range of community organizations to present their views. But as the hon. leader of the Opposition has already reminded this House, this has already been done, not only before the Hagey committee, but before the Hall commission, which has provided us with the detailed stages of implementing full medical insurance. After 50 years of government procrastination, Mr. Speaker, the last thing in the world we need is further study of medical insurance. This issue has already been studied to death. We do not need any more study.

Programme for action has already been mapped out by the Hall commission. All we need is a government with the conviction to move, particularly now that it is possible to move with the federal proposals, to achieve this. Obviously our chief requirement is to have an official Opposition that does not confuse the issue with proposals for retreat to more study. I cannot help but wonder whether the kind of amendment that has been presented to this House was not even suggested by the federal Liberals in order to justify their continued waffling.

But, Mr. Speaker, the amendment introduces a second confusion on the tactical level. Certainly all those who accept the Hall commission's blueprint for full medical insurance—covering eventually drugs and dental and optical needs, as well as other ancillary medical and health care needs, such as home nursing, orthopaedic services, chiropractic services, and so on—are not opposed to these items in principle. But, Mr. Speaker, surely the only practical way of achieving that ultimate goal is to take one step at a time. The first step is to establish universal coverage for doctors' bills and that step can be taken now. A study which takes us back for still more wallowing around, in consideration of later steps that are years ahead, can only divert attention from the immediate step and postpone the achievement of progress that is now within our grasp. It would be difficult, Mr. Speaker, to conceive of an amendment that is more tactically inept than the one which the Liberals have put forward.

What this Legislature needs now is an opportunity to force this government to take that first step without any more delay. This amendment gets them off the hook, so that we will be stuck with this government's highly unsatisfactory proposals. It is a perfect example of how the Liberals bungle their job of official Opposition, and through their ineptitude, leave this province to suffer, without any relief, the inadequacies of Tory legislation.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal amendment is put to the House, we shall vote against it. We shall do so in the hope that a majority of the House will clear the Liberal amendment out of the way and make it possible for an amendment that meets the immediate need. I hereby give notice, if this opportunity arises, that I shall move an amendment which offers this substitute wording:

That this House believes that the needs of the people of Ontario cannot be adequately met by mere tinkering with The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, and proposes as alternative that the Act be replaced by legislation:

(a) establishing a universal, comprehensive medical services insurance plan under public administration which will qualify for federal assistance under the announced policy of the federal government, and

(b) containing such additional interim provisions as may be deemed necessary to provide protection for lower income groups pending the coming into force of a joint federal-provincial plan.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that such an amendment will provide—

An hon. member: Why does the hon. member not move a sub-amendment?

Mr. MacDonald: One cannot under the rules of the House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is why the whole thing is just an essay in fancy. Notice, we cannot even vote on it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, we may not be able to vote on the Liberals'. Why does the hon. member not get to know the rules of the House?

Mr. Singer: He is going to make the first vote with us—

Mr. MacDonald: Such an amendment will provide an opportunity for a clear-cut vote, calling for Ontario's immediate commitment for participation in the federal plan now under consideration, and at the same time providing the necessary interim steps to assure coverage for lower income groups pending the commencement of a joint federal-provincial plan on July 1, 1967, Canada's 100th birthday.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, during the past few days, in the debate on second reading of the bill before us, we have been treated to something of a display of verbal fireworks. It was introduced in remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition by what might be regarded as the fuse. It was rather long and it sputtered a bit. We then came across the full pyrotechnic spectacle in the remarks of the hon. leader of the ND Party and like pyrotechnic spectacles, it really introduced nothing of substance and left nothing behind it, except a certain after-image in tired eyes, in this case tired ears.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders why the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the ND Party have opposed the government's bill so vociferously, so vigorously and in some instances, so vituperously. I imagine it is because they are afraid that a plan which does not conform to their preconceived views of a universal compulsory Medicare programme is going to succeed—a plan which is not the star to which they have attached their particular political wagons. I think their fear of the success of the government plan is very well founded. It is popular, it meets the needs of those most in need—the aged, the infirm and those with low incomes—and it will be seen by the majority of the

people of this province as appropriate to the circumstances of this time.

I think the hon. leader of the Opposition and the hon. leader of the ND Party are not cruel men and they are not cynical men. Yet I submit that it is a cruel delusion to suggest to the people of Ontario that simply implementing a plan of universal compulsory Medicare will provide for the distribution of medical services of a high standard to all the people. I am sure they are not cynical and have not based their opposition on some attempts to gain more votes in the future; indeed, I think they are sincere in all that they have said and I fear only that they are out of touch with the realities of the situation and of the day.

Mr. Speaker, what are these realities? Indeed, they themselves have mentioned some. The first is that almost 85 per cent of the people of Ontario already are covered with some form of medical service insurance. The second reality is that the plan before us will meet the needs of the aged and the infirm and persons of low income, who no doubt form a substantial proportion of that 15 per cent who are still without coverage. Thirdly, there is the reality of cost.

I believe that the \$50 million to \$60 million which the government's proposal will cost in a year is quite justified, indeed, essential. But I believe the \$252 million a year which I estimate that a universal compulsory plan would cost is not justified at this point of time; the plan which would require the Treasury of Ontario to furnish \$133 million and which, under the present but rather obscure offer from the government of Canada, would require that government to furnish a further \$119 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some fun with figures. The leader of the ND Party had some fun with figures on Friday but I fear that the answers that he achieved were in error, at least I cannot achieve the same answers. Speaking in Montreal some weeks ago our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) estimated that a universal compulsory plan would cost \$280 million a year, assuming for the purposes of easy calculation that the population of Ontario is seven million—it is, actually, according to the latest DBS statistic, 6,832,000—and that the per capita cost of medical services insurance would be \$40. That estimate of \$40 per capita was based on the assumption that the presently uninsured group would use medical services at the same rate as the presently insured group and that 100 per cent of the doctor's bill would be covered.

Under the present proposal to meet 90 per

cent of the doctor's fee the per capita cost will be reduced to \$36. Well, then; if we multiply \$36 by seven million, we reach an estimated cost of \$252 million. In these kinds of projections and estimates the fact that that is \$8 million less than the estimates used by the hon. leader of the ND Party is really not of very great significance. What is of significance, Mr. Speaker, I think, are the following calculations.

In an effort to suggest that the government's mathematics were unsound and that the government cared more for the welfare of the doctors than the welfare of the people, the hon. leader of the ND Party went through calculations purporting to show the average gross income of doctors under the government plan would be some \$47,000 a year, yielding a net income of some \$32,000, being two-thirds of the gross. These figures he contrasted with the most recent average income of doctors as found in Dominion bureau of statistics' taxation statistics, being some \$19,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone through these calculations over the week-end and I find this: There are 9,691 doctors on the rolls of the college of physicians and surgeons. Not all of these doctors are in practice. I am told that PSI has 6,500 participating doctors; and, on the basis of very considerable experience, PSI believes that 85 per cent of the practising doctors in Ontario are among their participants. Thus we can estimate quite firmly that there are about 7,600 practising doctors in Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we divide that into \$252 million we find that the average gross income of doctors would be \$34,500, yielding an average net income of about \$23,000, again two-thirds of the gross.

Had I used 6.5 million as the population of Ontario, as the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party did, instead of seven million, of course, that would have yielded a still lower figure.

Nevertheless, the estimated average net income of some \$23,000 is not greatly out of line with the Dominion bureau of statistics' figure of some \$19,000, particularly when you remember that the DBS figures are performance several years out of date, and it would be several years before there was total participation in any scheme of medical services insurance.

More particularly, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that this calculation indicates quite clearly that the government is not proposing, as the hon. leader of the ND Party would suggest, some new and special bonanza for doctors. The government's interest is in the welfare of

the people of this province. It does suggest to me, however, Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the ND Party is perhaps not always as careful as he might be in selecting the data which he uses for his calculations upon which he bases his conclusions.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the Opposition argues that, as almost 85 per cent of the people of the province already have medical services insurance, the costs are already being met and it would make little difference if the whole plan were to be transferred from the private to the public sector. As an exercise in pure economic theory, I could agree with him. But as a measure to be taken by responsible government, I simply cannot agree with him. I am sure he would not suggest that all that need be done is to request individuals and employers henceforward to pay their premiums to the Provincial Treasurer of Ontario. I am sure he would realize that to transfer medical services insurance from the private to the public sector would require the imposition of new taxation. I am afraid he would not perhaps recognize that there are at this time other objects of public expenditure of greater immediate importance when reaching budgetary decisions, and when determining the imposition of new taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I believe that the \$50 million or \$60 million that the government plan would probably cost is an entirely justifiable expenditure by this government, and to be voted by this Legislature at this point in time. I do not regard the \$252 million that a total scheme would cost can be justified at this point of time.

Let me cite in the health field alone certain matters which I believe have a higher priority in expenditure, and I mention first the field of medical education. I am told that the capital costs alone for the medical schools in this province in the next seven years will be some \$300 million.

I have no idea what the operating costs will be. I have no idea what the capital and operating costs will be for the education of nurses and pharmacists and other health workers. But I am quite certain that they will be enormous and they will have to be met. So far as specific programmes in the health field are concerned, I believe that a scheme which would provide nursing home care for those persons who no longer require to be treated in hospital but who, for one reason or another, can no longer be treated at home, has a higher priority than universal, compulsory Medicare. There are other examples that can be found, such as, I think, better

access to capital funds for hospitals, but I will not pursue this field.

The hon. leader of the Opposition would probably suggest that, in the fullness of time, the government of Canada will provide the necessary funds and that it need not be a great worry to this province. Well, certainly for 50 years the party that now enjoys power in Ottawa has shown some interest in medical services insurance; and certainly, since some few weeks before the last federal general election was called, they made noises which were quite indicative of impending action such as perhaps next year; perhaps the year after; perhaps some time.

That government will probably achieve, this year, a surplus on the national accounts basis and will have to consider how such surpluses are to be distributed in the best interests of this country and its people. Indeed, the Canada economic council believes that, if the goals it has set are achieved, there can well be a very substantial surplus at Ottawa, on a national accounts basis, by 1970. But in placing Medicare at the top of its list of political priorities, I believe the government of Canada has misjudged what it must best do to meet the needs of the people in a growing Canada. Perhaps they will make an offer so attractive in the Medicare field that this government, and no other governments, could turn it down. But I am sure this government would like to be sure that the government of Canada has considered the priorities, and considered them with great care and insight—and on the basis of a real study of the needs of the people, the provincial governments and the municipal governments.

Speaking at what the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) described last week as a great gathering in Toronto, the Rt. hon. Prime Minister of Canada said that he really had no wish to see the government of Canada interfere with the provinces but he did not want to give up the government of Canada's rights to help them with the things they needed to do. Perhaps he believes that Medicare has the highest priority.

Certainly someone told me, after the July Dominion-provincial conference last summer, that the definition of co-operative federalism might be put thus; that the Prime Minister of Canada says we don't care what the provinces want to talk about, we want to talk about Medicare. In any event, I would cite, as higher priorities than universal compulsory Medicare, some of these things: Aid to higher education; a well-balanced drive for medical manpower, of which we are going to

be desperately short in the mid-1970's unless the drive is launched today, as every doctor who is going to graduate in 1971 is already in medical school; a plan for manpower development; greater abatements of taxation to the provinces to meet their needs and that of their creature municipalities; and selective reduction of certain taxes. These are reasons why we should not simply look to Ottawa for sufficient funds to finance a total Medicare programme but we should also look to them for a planned use of the national accounts surplus which they may well develop.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the amendment before us will be defeated; but I would hope indeed that all hon. members of the House, even those sitting opposite, will in fact vote for second reading of this bill as a responsible measure fitting into a programme of development of both health services and the potential manpower and other essential services of this province in a truly responsible fashion.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, when I heard the hon. member for Forest Hill speaking on this bill, I rather gathered from his remarks that he felt that government moneys could be spent on more important things than going all out for a complete comprehensive health scheme in Ontario and Canada. That, I gather, is his opinion; and I want to say to this House, Mr. Speaker, through you, that I completely disagree with him.

Mr. Dunlop: You surprise me terribly.

Mr. Trotter: There is nothing more important than the health of our people. It is our greatest resource. It is up to us to see that our people are healthy and, if they are in ill health, to restore them to good health as quickly and as inexpensively as possible. And there is only one way to do it, and that is to have a comprehensive universal health scheme. Anything less is just not good enough. It is obvious through the years that I have had the opportunity to discuss this principle in this House that the present Tory administration has no desire whatsoever to bring it about.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister of Health was once speaking in regard to this principle, at a time when he was running for the leadership of the Tory party, he let the young Progressive-Conservatives know that he wanted nothing to do with such a scheme. Then, before the last election, we went through all the time and expense of discussing Bill No. 163 which, at that time, was obvi-

ously a phony bill, and meant for an election on a phony campaign. When the election was over, and we came and discussed and went through the whole routine of Bill No. 136, it was obvious that it also was a phony bill that the government had no intention of putting into effect. We told them at that time that they obviously were just putting on a show to literally bring about a fraud.

That term has been used on many occasions on this side of the House in referring to the legislation as in Bill No. 136. I remember how shocked the government benches were when the hon. leader of the Opposition last year called it a fraud. But that is what it is. And now that we have Bill No. 6, which is a supposed amendment of Bill No. 136, all we have left of last year's bill is five sections—sections 7, 22, 23, 26 and 27. In other words, the whole bill is completely changed and it is a ridiculous way to bring before this House a chopped-up piece of legislation such as we have before us today.

The hon. member for Forest Hill, Mr. Speaker, has said that this bill as we now have it before us will bring medical services to all of the people. He said that about 85 per cent of the people are covered. Now I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it will no more bring medical services to all of the people than did the previous Tory legislation we have had. It is true the Tories are slowly beating a retreat. They have had to concede a bit at a time and if we were to burn all their speeches that they have made in the past few years, including your speeches, Mr. Deputy Speaker, it would make the biggest bonfire since the English warned of the coming of the Spanish Armada. Bit by bit they have retreated on the principle of medical insurance and we on this side of the House will not be happy, will not be satisfied, until they are in complete and absolute retreat.

It stands to reason, Mr. Speaker, by the logic of events, because of the demands and needs of our people, that we are going to need a comprehensive universal scheme. All this present bill does is subsidize the insurance companies, and yet if a worker with a family wants to be subsidized, he literally has to take a pauper's oath. This is an insult to the dignity of our people. To say that once a family man is making \$3,600 he no more needs a subsidy for his insurance bill is nonsense. Even the social planning council of Toronto in 1964 said that the minimum income for a family of four was \$4,319. That is about \$83 per week and yet that family is not quite \$1,000 over the minimum that is set by this government.

It is obvious that we are not helping the people who need it most, and that is the great number of people who over the years have managed to pay their bills, but who today, with the high cost of living and with the high cost of drugs, are simply not going to get the services they require unless they take a pauper's oath.

Let us bear in mind that it is not only the premium of \$150 that they will have to pay under this legislation for medical services, but they still have the hospital premiums, they still have the dentist bills, they still have drug bills, and so we are not beginning to meet the needs that are definitely required.

The hon. member for Forest Hill said 85 per cent of our people are covered. Certainly on a national scale the Hall report said that about 41 per cent of our people across Canada are being ignored. There are approximately 8.2 million people who are not receiving adequate insurance. It is true there are people who have insurance but that insurance does not adequately cover them.

For example, about four years ago, a survey was carried on in the city of Hamilton as to how much of the medical bills of an individual are paid, even though insured. They found in Hamilton by far the best was PSI, but even PSI only paid 58.7 per cent of the doctors' bills. The Travellers' Insurance Company was the worst in Hamilton; it paid 30 per cent. In other words, a lot of people are supposedly insured but when they come to collect on their policy they find they do not get nearly the adequate insurance they are supposed to have.

To say that we are adequately insured is wrong; to say it is available is ridiculous. It is available—and this is said many times, Mr. Speaker, in this House by many people—it is available if you have the money. Bear in mind that a good many thousands of our people simply do not have the money.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, when this government will ever come to the realization that its duty and its first obligation is to the people of the province of Ontario, not to the insurance companies or to the doctors. Far too much attention has been paid to that strongest of all lobbies, the insurance companies, and that extremely strong lobby, and good friend of the hon. Minister of Health, the Ontario medical association.

Just for a moment, let us take a look at what another doctor says—Lord Cairns, who in 1963 was the president of the Royal college of physicians and surgeons in Great Britain. He was one of their top doctors.

This is what he said of the medical insurance scheme in Great Britain:

Patient and doctor have been served well by Britain's health plan. The plan has fostered better treatment, hospitals and research.

To interject here, Mr. Speaker, I think that is very important to emphasize. So many of the doctors of the Ontario medical association ask: "How are you going to supply the doctors?" and "How are you going to treat them all?" Yet Lord Cairns said such a plan in Great Britain fostered treatment, hospitals and research. And Lord Cairns goes on:

As to relations between doctors and patients, the British medical association set up a committee that took a lot of evidence over three or four years and had a poll in the newspapers. The committee did not think the relations between doctors and patients had materially altered and I agree.

One effect of the national health service was to improve medical services so more doctors were needed than ever before and there are more doctors practising now than ever.

I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a proper scheme where the sick person did not have to worry about bills, it would make for a far better atmosphere for better doctor-patient relations. The doctor knows that the patient need not worry about the bills. I rather suspect that many a patient might have recovered except that he died worrying about how he was going to pay for the operation or for the hospitalization before we had a scheme. This is true. You find that more illnesses—some Tory over here mentioned "nonsense"—are probably caused by worry or brought on by worry than anything else, and this is the one way to clean up that worry that many patients are bound to have.

I daresay, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Health knows that probably better than any other hon. member in this House. This is why it is hard for me to understand that he can persist in trying to fight a theory in government, and a theory in good health, that is bound to come, and that is the universal comprehensive care within the means of all. How is it, Mr. Speaker, that a relatively poor province like the province of Saskatchewan can charge a family \$24 per year for medical coverage and yet we talk about \$150? Obviously it is because of Tory thinking, of an unwillingness to bring about the legislation that is needed.

Mr. Speaker, over the years we have talked and argued about these schemes and we are

making very little progress. It is true that the welfare patients are covered but they were covered in the first place. It is true that the government is now going to take over the high risk, what the hon. Minister of Health has called the high-risk patients, and indeed we are so very kind to the insurance companies to do this.

He tells us that he is giving the people freedom of choice, that they do not need to join the scheme if they do not want to. Well, it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the old and the sick are going to join, and the taxpayer is going to pay, but the healthy man, the fellow who is 21, will obviously stay out. Then, if he becomes ill, he will enroll when the first enrolment period comes up. In any theory of insurance you make your money on those who are well, and you lose it on those who are sick; but if you welcome only the sick you are obviously going to have a tremendous loss.

Even PSI recently—approximately a year ago—carried out a pilot programme up in Owen Sound on drugs, making it voluntary so you could join if you liked or not; and they lost a tremendous amount of money and they had to cut it off.

When British Columbia introduced its hospital plan it originally followed the principle of making things voluntary; and it found what should have been obvious, that the sick joined and the healthy stayed out. So it was not too long before British Columbia, in order to avoid losing dollar after dollar, had to make the plan compulsory. Whether you call it universal or you call it compulsory, it is obvious that it has got to cover all of our people eventually.

To keep the people covered by group insurance out of this system is unfair and foolish. It means that somebody who is in a group may be paying taxes for a better scheme than he is in; and yet he cannot join unless he pays the group premium and unless he pays the premium for the government scheme. This is a ridiculous set-up and again it is something that is kept on simply, I say, for the main reason of pleasing the insurance companies.

We know, in the history of health insurance, that insurance companies make relatively little money out of health insurance programmes. What they mainly want health insurance for is to get their feet in the door to sell other policies. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, the insurance companies, as far as this government is concerned, have not only got their feet in the door, they are living with the government over there; as a result

the government have a policy that always favours the insurance companies. Despite the hue and cry and the demand for improvements in medical insurance, this government has been entirely and completely loyal to that particularly strong lobby; indeed, the insurance companies may be well pleased with the present administration we have here in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to belabour this point any longer but I must again re-emphasize that over the years this government has not treated the people of this province, or this Legislature, fairly. We have had to go through a series of debates of bills that were obviously never going to be properly implemented; nor is it fair to say that the federal government is not going to bring about the medical insurance that they are now promising.

It is obvious it is coming because the people of Canada are demanding it. No government can stay in power, or attain power, unless it serves the people of Ontario or of Canada by bringing about this necessary legislation. The province of Ontario has a tremendous opportunity, if need be, to embarrass the federal government, to urge it to do something; but all they are doing, literally, is delaying the day when all Canada has the much-needed legislation of health protection.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of sadness that I see once again the principle of the old Bill No. 136, repeated in Bill No. 6, before this House. My hon. leader covered very well the principles as advocated in the amendment, and I have made reference to them, as I have spoken here to you today. And I again emphasize that, in the logic of events, it is obvious that it is coming; and it is obvious that it is necessary for us to have an overall health scheme for the people of our province. And I would urge the government to bring that day about in the immediate future.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview) Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate today, and I am sorry that the hon. member for Forest Hill is not in his seat at the moment because he wanted certain answers. He wanted to know why we oppose this bill so vigorously and I think that part of my function is to tell him.

One of the reasons, of course, is that we believe that this bill is one which makes for gross inefficiency, and I want to elaborate on that. We oppose it because we believe that the government across this House has not yet been able to hear the voice of the people of

Ontario. The insurance companies and the doctors have been talking so loudly that this government has not been able to hear the people.

In two surveys which I took in my riding over two years, and in other surveys which have been taken at various times and in various places, we know that over three-quarters of the people of this province do want a universal, low-cost Medicare plan. And those people are today looking to this Legislature, asking why this high-cost voluntary plan is being foisted upon them once more—because this plan is only a refinement of Bill No. 136. It is no improvement as far as the people are concerned but it is an improvement as far as the insurance companies are concerned. This, I think, our people are realizing more and more.

I call this plan grossly inefficient, because of the system of multiple carriers it has set up first of all. The multiple carriers will be advertising on newspapers, radio, television; they will have a sales staff. The private companies will be going after the young and the healthy and their families for coverage, pointing out to them the fancy packages they have, where the medical insurance is tied in with life insurance, just as our civil servants had it tied in last year—tied in with other kinds of benefits so it would be impossible for them to separate the medical coverage from the other bits of the package. So that kind of pressure is going to be on, and that kind of salesmanship is going to add to the total cost of the whole plan.

Then, of course, there is the other matter which is inevitably going to figure large here. The profits of the private insurance companies must be paid. They are not going to operate this plan without profits; a factor which does not intrude into a publicly operated plan which can be run at cost for the people. All of this adds up, as I said, to gross inefficiency—where, according to the Hall commission report, 28 cents out of each premium dollar is going for administration costs. The experience in Saskatchewan, as this House has heard time after time, is that a public plan can be administered for about six per cent or less. And if a difference between 28 per cent and six per cent, Mr. Speaker, does not spell gross inefficiency, I do not know what does.

Then, of course, the government plan is going to be costly because it is going to set up new machinery. In this House last year, and again this year, on this side of the House, we have stressed the fact that the Ontario hospital services commission is

due now. It has the names of our people, our families, on filing cards. It would be a simple matter to add the tab to the card showing that this person is covered by medical insurance under a public plan. It would need more people, certainly, to administer it, but it does not need the duplication of effort that is going into the kind of a plan which is now proposed.

This proposed plan, Mr. Speaker, constitutes a betrayal of the people of Ontario because of this gross inefficiency; and because, secondly, it is going to cut the people off from the \$17, or whatever the subsidy might be, from the federal Treasury. I detected, in the speech of the hon. member for Forest Hill, something which made me sit up and wonder. He talked about priorities and then he talked about what might happen if we were tough bargainers, if we might get better terms from Ottawa. So I would like to ask the hon. member, and perhaps the hon. Minister in his absence, if in fact this Legislature is being used as a bargaining tool against the federal government? If it is, then this is not the role of a sovereign Legislature of this kind, to become a bargaining tool in a fight between two levels of government. Certainly we expect the hon. Minister to bargain, and to bargain in a tough way to get all he can as a subsidy; but to use the Legislature as this suggestion seemed to—I make no charges here because I want an elaboration of it—but if that is the case then I think we ought to think twice.

The Ontario people are going to pay their share of whatever federal subsidy is paid across the nation, and for the people of Ontario to be cut off that subsidy, while paying for others, is injustice—and it is something that the government of this province can never justify to the people.

In the third place, this plan is a betrayal of the people of Ontario, because the group plans which are going to be run by the private companies are not adequate to the needs of the people. The government is offering certain benefits through their section of a plan, but when it comes to the group plans, some of these are good but many of them are very inadequate. Many trade unions bargain something in the way of fringe benefits, and they get a group plan in the realm of security, medical care, or pensions, or something else. But generally their first little bit of fringe benefit is pretty small; and they have to bargain twice, three times, half a dozen times, a dozen times, before they get those benefits up to where they think the standard is adequate and where this bill would say that

the standard is adequate—that is the standard in the public part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have to recognize the fact that even though many of these people with group plans have some benefits, those benefits are not adequate; and in many cases they are completely below the standards which the people of Ontario should enjoy.

Then, of course, because of the mixture in these group plans, the people can hardly separate what part is Medicare, what part is pension, and what part is something else. And if, for example, our own civil servants want to opt out of the private plan with the London Life and join the public plan, it is not going to be easy for them to do this. I am not sure that the legislation would allow it; and if it did, the private carrier would try to persuade them that they are paying less, and yet no figures are now available to know exactly how to break down those things; so that transfer of people to the public plan, becomes very difficult. The whole result seems to be that the people of Ontario will be fleeced through the insurance companies, if this plan goes into operation. But, worse still, they are also going to be fleeced by their own government through its part of the plan, the public sector of the plan.

As far as the price is concerned, the hon. member for Forest Hill brought forward certain figures today which he quoted to us; he said that there are so many doctors in the province who belong to the college. I do not know enough about this field, perhaps, to be able to give the proper figures, because he may have had them; but I do ask him if he included the doctors who are on salary in institutions, in universities, the people who are in the public service, the retired doctors—I presume he has. The figure which the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) quoted the other day was 5,500 doctors in Ontario, and I quote now from an article by Perry Anglin in the *Toronto Daily Star* of January 22, 1966:

Taxation statistics for 1964 published by The Department of National Revenue showed that Ontario's 5,456 medical doctors and surgeons make a total net income of \$106,173,000, an average of more than \$19,000 each.

So, Mr. Speaker, I suppose we will have to get the experts together but this seems to be authentic from The Department of National Revenue. These are doctors actually practising in the province. They do not, I presume, include those who have been retired and those who are on salaries in institutions and universities and other places. So that before

the hon. member quotes figures like these, perhaps he had better do a bit of double checking on the sources of his information.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that the people of Ontario have spoken to this government and that the government has not, it seems, been able to hear.

I have here two or three documents which I want to put on record—a letter to the hon. Prime Minister written a year ago, which has a pertinent point of view in it. Dated May 18, 1965:

We believe any Medicare legislation must have, as its basis, universal coverage. This is essential if it is to provide maximum service at minimum cost. With universal coverage, we are convinced that a much wider range of benefits could and should be provided.

Signed: The Ontario federation of labour.

In a brief presented this year to the government by the farmers union of Ontario we have, on page 12, these words:

We would express our disappointment in the Medicare bill which was passed in the Legislature in the last sitting. As the members of the government are no doubt aware, the bill that was passed did not meet with OFU approval since it was neither comprehensive nor universal. We would reiterate our request for changes in this so that our people may be offered a comprehensive, universal Medicare plan within the reach of everyone. OFU protests the fact that some people will be serviced by private carriers and others under a public commission. This is direct discrimination against the partially or wholly subsidized people, dividing them into first and second class citizens.

We would like to draw to the attention of the Prime Minister at this point that during our presentation a year ago he promised us that the departments of his government were available to us at any time. But during the Medicare debate last year when we endeavoured to get in contact with the Minister of Health by telephone so we could arrange an appointment, the Minister did not even return our phone call and has not to this day. Many of our groups from across the province sent telegrams to their members of Parliament and some still have had no reply in this matter.

Walter Miller, the vice-president of the Ontario farmers union, the day after the debate started in this House on the present bill, made a public statement demanding again the universal and comprehensive Medicare plan at low cost to the people.

Last year, as the Medicare bill was reaching its final stages, there took place a dramatic event in front of the Parliament buildings where representatives of the clergy of this city and surrounding areas moved in to conduct a vigil. The message that they were giving the people of this province, and the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health, was a very simple message—that they wanted the kind of Medicare plan which we have been outlining here. They did not like Bill No. 136, and the bill which we are now discussing is in that category.

I have here a statement by the Rev. W. Clark McDonald, chairman of the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church of Canada, and the Rev. J. R. Hord, secretary of the board, February 5, 1966. I think we have to recognize, Mr. Speaker, that that vigil in front of the Parliament buildings last year changed the character and nature of the debate which we were then undertaking and the character and nature of the whole Medicare issue across this province. It was changed by that act from a political issue to a moral issue, and we had representatives of many churches there including Roman Catholic.

Today again I see some representatives of the clergy in the gallery and I hope they are here to silently protest the action which the government is again contemplating. I believe they are here for that purpose.

Now I want to place on the record this statement which I mentioned:

We wish to point out glaring deficiencies in The Medical Insurance Act which is before the Ontario Legislature. The amended bill is an improvement over Bill 136 but it does not meet the requirements as requested by the general council of the United Church of Canada:

1. The Ontario plan is not universal. Since participation is voluntary, the experience of Alberta would indicate that one seventh of our population will not be covered, especially those who find premiums too high but who are not eligible for subsidization.

2. The Ontario plan is too costly. The only way to bring down cost is to make it universal and government-operated. The present competitive system of private carriers is very expensive. The Hall commission reports that the cost of servicing health insurance plans under a voluntary plan such as in Alberta is almost four times that of a government-operated plan in Saskatchewan.

3. The Ontario plan will be very costly to the taxpayer for the services rendered

under the medical services division. The taxpayer will have to carry the high-risk health cases and leave the best risks to the private carriers. The insurance companies will get the cream of the business.

4. The Ontario plan does not meet the standard proposed by the federal government. Indications are that Quebec will soon adopt a plan which will be universal and have lower premiums. Pressure will then be brought upon the government by the citizens of Ontario to adopt the national standards.

We would appeal to the Legislature of Ontario to enact a plan that is national, universal, comprehensive, government-operated, and tax-supported with modest premiums for individuals and families.

This is the statement from the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we have today reached the situation where we have to make a choice. I would have hoped that the federal government long before this would have placed upon the statute books, or at least placed upon the desks in Ottawa, legislation which would call the bluff of this government. All the federal government needs to do to put this government and other governments across the country on the spot is to put on the table a bill which indicates what it is prepared to do and then it can say to the provinces, "This is it." If it has made its estimate of the cost per capita and is willing to pay half those costs, then let the federal government say so and let it introduce the legislation. At that point we will believe that it is sincere and that it means business in this matter.

But this kind of delay, coupled with the kind of amendment introduced into this House, makes one suspicious that the right wing of the Liberal Party is now delaying the bill and postponing the day when it has to face up to the realities of the Medicare situation.

So I say to my hon. friends that they should convey to their friends down in Ottawa the fact that as soon as their bill is in effect placed before the House of Commons then this government is on the spot in Ontario. It will have to act.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Why do you not go down yourself and see them?

Mr. Young: The hon. member is closer to them than I.

But as we look at the situation we are just wondering whether again, after all these years of promising the people of Canada that they are going to bring in legislation, they are still postponing action. You remember last year during a certain federal election campaign, we heard one of the Ministers of the Crown say to the people, "We want a mandate so that we can bring Medicare to Canada." The same statement, of course, was made before the 1963 election.

They have a mandate, it is a tenuous one, I admit, but they have a mandate, and they said they were going to govern as if they were a majority party in Parliament. All right, they will have the support of the New Democrats and I am sure of some other groups within that Parliament to bring this legislation in.

Let them bring it and let them bring it now, and when they do, then this government will hesitate to face the people with this kind of cockeyed plan which it is bringing before this House. Let us see action on both sides and let us not hear any more of this federal blaming provincial, provincial blaming federal, while nobody is getting anything done.

In the face of the kind of public opinion that is building up in this province, I cannot help but think of those lines in Scott's *The Lady of the Lake* when I look at the hon. Minister of Health here—Fitzjames—you remember the picture of him, Mr. Speaker; perhaps you will remember that well through your experience as a teacher:

His back against the rock he bore
And firmly placed his foot before
Come one, come all,
This rock shall fly from its firm base
As soon as I.

This hon. Minister has dug into his position and he is wielding his sword on behalf of this legislation. But what the hon. Minister forgets—

Mr. Dunlop: Claymore!

Mr. Young: All right, claymore. But what the hon. Minister forgets is that he is fighting for the wrong people. He has got the insurance companies and doctors behind him and he has the people in front of him. Remember the clan—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Claymore is the word.

Mr. Young: Roderick Dhu's clan popped up there, you know, in front of him; and when

the Scotsmen appeared that is when he said, "Come one, come all!"

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Scotland still stands.

Mr. Young: But the fact is that Stuart was able to destroy Roderick Dhu and destroy the freedom of that clan, the people who were standing before him.

Well, this is what is happening, and this Minister had better remember that he was elected by the people, not by the doctors and the insurance companies.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will be standing long after the hon. member.

Mr. Young: Oh well, perhaps I should qualify that through you, Mr. Speaker. But in any case he is supposed to be responsible back to the people of this province, and they are the people that he ought to be wielding his claymore on behalf of—if I can finish with a preposition in that awkward sort of way.

Mr. Speaker, this age of technology demands that our society accept high levels of responsibility to its people. Figures have been thrown at us, time after time in this House and throughout the country, that have shown us that every citizen of this country ought to have an opportunity for certain things; education is one of them. And we are told that the more education or training our people have, the wealthier our country becomes, and that any civilization which fails to train its brain and skill is going to go down—in comparison with other civilizations that accept this kind of responsibility.

This matter is also true when it comes to the health of our people. A healthy nation is a productive nation, and public health is just as important, Mr. Speaker, as education.

Mr. Justice Hall in a speech which he made on November 28, 1965, before the working conference on the implications of a health chart for Canadians, said this:

It is estimated that, in 1963, 100 million man-days of labour were lost to the labour force in Canada through illness, with a consequent economic loss of \$1,630 million—or about 3.8 per cent of the gross national product for that year. Now, not all of this loss could have been prevented. There is a staggering loss which ought to cause the nation to seek out ways to reduce it.

The economic loss due to strike action of the labour force in 1963 was 917,140 man-days. This was less than one per cent of the economic loss through illness in the labour force during the same period.

These two sets of figures are unrelated, but thought-provoking nonetheless.

In the same year, the Canadian school children in grades 1 to 13 lost 4.4 per cent of all pupil-days on account of illness. I have not been able to calculate this loss in economic terms but you will appreciate that it is one of major proportions.

Mr. Chairman, I think all of us recognize this staggering fact, and realize that a healthy nation is a more productive nation, in addition to being a far happier nation; and people who are healthy enjoy life and work better. So it behoves us to make the advances in medical science available to all our people, regardless of cost.

The hon. Minister has gone some distance in this direction here, and part of our people who have low income will be subsidized. But he has not gone the distance he ought to go; and in between the doctors and their patients, in this beautiful doctor-patient relationship, there is the insurance company, in too many cases.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what function does the insurance company really play here? What is its purpose? It collects from the people and then it pays the doctor, but this is the same function which is going to be performed by the public part of the plan. Why the duplication? And the company is going to do it less efficiently and at greater cost—28 per cent versus six per cent.

The people can pay into the government fund, and the government fund can pay the doctors, and the doctors will get their pay, but why have this other party in there standing between? One of the fundamental quarrels that we have with this philosophy is that insurance companies are concerned primarily with paying after the fact, after the illness. They are not concerned with preventing the illness, and a health plan which is meaningful for the people of Ontario must be concerned with prevention. That is why the hon. Minister, I suppose, has introduced the idea of the medical examination at regular intervals. But this is not universal in the private plans. The whole plan of prevention is one that should be built into a common-sense medical plan.

So I quarrel seriously with this aspect of the private sector of the plan. They stand between the people and healing. They are, in effect, a toll gate between the great body of medicine, the knowledge we have, the scientific advance, and the people. Years ago we got rid of the toll gates on the highways and are rid of most of the toll gates in educa-

tion, and it is time those toll gates fell in this field.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding my remarks today, I want to call upon the people who sit in the seats of this Legislature. I do not know whether or not the suspicion that came into my mind, when the hon. member for Forest Hill was speaking, is right or not, that this is a matter of bargaining, but for the life of me I cannot understand why this government is bringing in the high rates without the federal subsidy. How can they go before the people of this province and justify it in the next election? How can it be done?

Perhaps the hon. Minister is building in an extra amount so that, just before the election, the price can be lowered. This is not an unknown device in politics in the province of Ontario. But why the people should be squeezed as hard as this, so that there will be something to give them later on, I do not know. This is hardly understandable. But I say to the hon. members in this House that they will not be able to justify to the people of Ontario, when the next election comes, charging \$150 per family when the thing can be done for one-third that amount.

Even if some of the figures of my hon. friend were right, the premiums could not possibly get to the amount that has been suggested. How can this government tell the people that it wants a mandate when it is coming to them with this kind of price, and when other provinces are going to be much less? How can it tell them we are refusing to take the federal subsidy because we are clinging to our allegiance to the private insurance companies?

Mr. MacDonald: Imagine a Scotsman doing that.

Mr. Young: I find it hard to understand how the claymore can be wielded to justify this kind of attitude.

So I simply ask the hon. members of this House, the backbenchers and all the rest, particularly on the government side, to talk to their Minister, give him a little political common sense, tell him the problems they are going to have to face when they go back to their ridings.

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor-Sandwich): We have no problems.

Mr. Young: The hon. member has no problems; well, that is wonderful. All right, tell them about the arithmetic of this thing and then work within the caucus to get some changes in this legislation, to bring it into

harmony with the federal plan so that Ontario gets the advantage of the federal subsidy. Now, if the hon. members cannot persuade him, if that Scots stubbornness is going to stay here, and he is going to keep his back to the wall and fight this through on behalf of the friends behind him, then it might make good sense if the hon. members would simply move him out of there and bring a man into that position who would think in terms of the people and the needs of the people of Ontario in the days to come. In other words, sweep away this bill or sweep away this Minister, because this bill is a betrayal of the people of Ontario.

An hon. member: Both!

Mr. Young: I hear the word "both," and that might be the only way it is going to be done. So let us get rid of them both! Mr. Speaker, I oppose the principle which is laid down in the bill before us.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, for several reasons I feel I should participate in the second reading of Bill No. 6 for a few minutes this afternoon. Probably the most important is that if we as legislators do not make the correct decisions in the important area of a person's health, all of us are going to suffer in the long run. I am sure that when the hon. member for Yorkview, in his opening remarks, said that the amendments contained in Bill No. 6 are not an improvement over Bill No. 136, he was in error because I submit there certainly is a vast improvement in these amendments that are before us today.

Mr. Young: Fundamentally the same bill.

Mr. Harris: Many years ago we came to the conclusion that every child has a right to education, every person has a right to food, everyone in trouble with the law has the right to legal counsel, and certainly everyone who is sick has the right to medical care. As the representative of a riding where I know the average head of a family takes home considerably less pay than his counterpart in the suburbs, I have found that many of these people have been forced to gamble their future health requirements against their present economic requirements. It has always been my view that these people should not be faced with this dilemma and from personal experience with constituents I know that many times after a person has been ill or injured and then subsequently cured, his relief at being cured is tempered by the anxiety about the bills that he faces.

Certainly the average citizen today realizes that part of his tax dollar now goes into supporting hospitals and supporting research laboratories and supporting new medical schools, and all that this citizen asks in return is to have available to him and to his family the skills of the medical profession for a fair premium.

The point made by the hon. leader of the Opposition in his opening remarks on Thursday regarding compulsion and what he believes is best for all our people, to my way of thinking is not the question at the moment. I will say again, and I think I said it last year, it is much better if we can obtain the same results without forcing anyone to do anything against his will and that, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is what this Bill No. 6 will do.

Again on Friday I was pleased that the hon. leader of the Opposition referred to some of the remarks I made last year during the second reading of Bill No. 136, because there were a few others I made at that time that he did not refer to. I think it is fair to say that last year in May when we were debating Bill No. 136 I had some concern that the bill did not meet all the needs of the people, but at that time I did express the view that I was confident the bill was a step forward and if changes were necessary this government would initiate them. In particular I said, and I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition did refer to this particular quote, that: "I have faith in the executive council that sits on my left, and that if this bill does not work out in the first instance, they will certainly amend it to make it work out."

I say, Mr. Speaker, that my confidence was merited and Bill No. 6 does show that this government does not have a closed mind on the needs of the people of this province but is continually assessing their needs and moving to improve them.

Let us just for a moment compare this government's speedy action to what took place in Saskatchewan back in 1944. Mr. Douglas promised free medical health to everyone without any cost and he is quoted as saying that "benefits of medical services would be available to all without money and without price."

But it was not until 1961 that this service came to the people of Saskatchewan and that was 17 years later, and as we all know it certainly did not come free. I might mention that later in that same 1944 campaign the socialists said, and I quote again: "State medicine and hospitalization could be furnished for slightly more than \$8 per annum."

We all know that was not a true statement, but it was worked out in the fuzzy world of socialistic economic theory. One then begins to wonder about some of the figures that were bandied about here on Friday morning by the hon. member for York South.

My hon. friends in the Liberal Party, as previous speakers have said, have been promising us something in this sphere since 1919. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in view of the 17 years it took the ND Party and the nearly half a century it has taken the Liberal Party to face up to this problem that this government is by comparison moving extremely rapidly and extremely competently.

Referring to some of my remarks last May on page 3258 in *Hansard*, I said that I was concerned about the welfare of my constituents and that the passage of the bill at that time would bring relief to many of them, Mr. Speaker.

I also said I would rather move slowly and bring in a prudent health care plan in stages and make sure the people who are most urgently in need of physicians' services are going to be looked after first. I am still of that view, Mr. Speaker, and the present amendments assure that this is going to be done. Again I will say that if events prove more changes are needed we can be confident that this government will make the changes.

Last year I had some concern that in the area of government subsidy a percentage of public money could go to private companies, but this concern of mine has now been completely eliminated in this bill. As section 5, subsection 1, points out in dealing with the availability of standard contracts:

This standard medical services insurance contract shall be made available to all residents and their dependants without regard to age, physical or mental infirmity, financial means or occupation and only by the medical services insurance division.

I am particularly pleased that this will be operated by our own division of government.

Mr. Speaker, just for a few moments referring to several other sections of Bill No. 6, in regard to section 13, subsection 20, I am pleased that the doctors of this province will be assisting the government by accepting 90 per cent rather than 100 per cent of the Ontario medical association schedule of fees. I expected a few chuckles from the Opposition, but I assure you that will be the case.

Mr. Singer: Do they have any choice? Sounds like a little bit of compulsion.

Mr. Harris: During recent weeks we have all read a good deal in the press about the requirements the federal government has laid down in respect to what a province must do in order to obtain a subsidy from Ottawa. We all know that the provincial Health Ministers met early last week, and that three provinces have accepted the federal government's scheme, two are on the verge of accepting and five are uncommitted. Mr. Speaker, we are uncommitted, and in my view, rightly so.

Mr. Singer: That is a good view, to be uncommitted.

Mr. Harris: There are many unanswered questions, as both the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health have pointed out, and we in this province must have these questions answered to our mutual satisfaction. I believe we should wait, at the very least, until the committee of the Legislature in Quebec makes its report to its own government, before we commit ourselves any further. Now when the executive council of this government has these questions answered to their satisfaction, I believe they will do what is required and co-operate with the federal government, as they have always done in the past in co-operating with them on other contentious matters.

The hon. member for York South, about an hour ago, was referring to Quebec's position, and I am sure that in his assessment of Quebec he cannot possibly be any more correct than any of the rest of us in this House. I do not know where he might get his information, so in view of that, we must wait until we know what Quebec is going to do.

All of us, no matter what our political label, are striving to provide our people with the finest medical coverage that we can afford. In the field of hospital care, through the Ontario hospital services commission, we have now covered over 99 per cent of our population. Let us not forget the success we have had in this area. I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, that when this medical plan outgrows its birth pains it will have to merge with our hospital plan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, I submit, is another forward step in this government's progressive programme, which has as its ultimate objective health care of the highest possible order for all our people. I commend the hon. Min-

ister of Health for bringing this legislation before us at this early stage of this session.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, the amendments that are before us today surely came about for two reasons. The first because after the passage of the bill last year it became apparent even to the government that the provisions of this Act were unacceptable to the majority of the people of Ontario. They had the opinion expressed forcibly through the press and from a number of other organizations representing agriculture, the church, labour and many groups of ordinary citizens. Naturally the opinions of some smaller groups were very much in favour of this bill and these opinions are still influencing the views that the government holds in these amendments.

The second reason the amendments are before us is that the hon. Minister of Health and his advisers, attending the conference last July, I submit to you, sir, were convinced that by July 1, 1967, we will have a plan in Canada which will give comprehensive, universal medical care on a portable basis to the citizens of this country. He surely advised his hon. colleagues in the Cabinet; or perhaps it was the other way around, that we had to get ourselves into a bargaining position so that, dragging our feet though we may, when the deadline comes, as it surely will on July 1, 1967, when we, ourselves, will be a part of this universal plan, we will have been able to make the best bargain that canny Scots Minister is capable of.

Now he is our bargaining agent, together with his advisers, when he approaches the federal government, and no matter what is said on the other side about the inability of the federal government to make this plan stick, I submit to you, sir, and to the House, that it is a definite plan and one that will be in effect when that day comes. So let us see what our position is with regard to the federal requirements, which will give us this universal plan in Canada in our centennial year.

We are familiar with the four requirements. I believe that this amendment does increase the comprehensiveness of the Ontario plan to some degree. Without going into it in detail, it is true that it will give better obstetrical benefits, certain dental benefits and some others which will improve the plan to some extent, without of course touching on some of the other important requirements, such as assistance with the payment of drugs, with optometrical care and many other fields. So some attempt has been made to improve our bargaining position as far as a comprehensive plan is concerned.

Portability is something that does not concern us at this point. The main responsibility for this must surely come from the federal level, because as the months grow short towards the deadline there will have to be a lot of bargaining, maybe some wheeling and dealing, so that a citizen of Canada can finally have uniform coverage no matter where he moves within this country.

Universality is the third requirement and something that we have discussed on many occasions in this House. The federal government has been criticized for being too flexible in this plan and in some others in the past. Universality to me, means, that every citizen will take part and I firmly believe that this is what we should achieve in this province.

We have seen the hon. Minister of Health, probably supported by some of his colleagues from other provinces in discussion with the federal authorities, change this concept of universality to some extent. He has said that surely the 99 per cent coverage of Ontario hospitalization should be regarded as universal and this was agreed to by the federal authorities. Then, having put that wedge in the door, he has driven it home further and further, until my understanding of the present state of this horse trading is that universality now means 90 per cent of the citizens of any participating province would have to be members of an approved plan.

In Ontario this means that either 650,000 or 700,000 citizens will not have medical coverage, or at least they could be excluded from whatever plan we arrive at finally, and still the federal government will contribute one-half of the cost of the plan, or at least an average of one-half of the cost across Canada. But we have seen some of the problems that have arisen with our hospitalization plan that has now achieved virtual universality.

Surely there are other members of this House who have had to deal with unfortunate constituents who took the provincial government at its word and realized that they did not have to join the hospitalization plan. We have been in a position where we have had to deal with the hospital services commission for them when they have been struck down by disastrous illness and almost equally disastrous hospital expenses. I do not believe that we can afford to go into a plan which does not cover all of our citizens.

When I talk about universal plan, I believe that it should cover 100 per cent of the people in this province. I do not believe that the figure of 90 per cent should be further negotiable and I would do everything I could to drive from the mind of the hon. Minister

of Health any residual thought that he may have that this figure could be reduced so that more and more we could move away from this very valuable concept.

The idea of universality is related to the fourth, and perhaps most difficult for our hon. friends opposite, requirement of the federal plan, that it is to be a government-operated plan. In my view this means that the branch of The Department of Health that is going to administer the plan that is before us in the amendment now is the type of administration that I would call government-operated. I understand that a good deal of money has already been invested in supplying suitable facilities for this branch of the department. It is largely, of course, a duplication of what some privately sponsored plans already have as far as the building the billing computers and the connection with the medical profession are concerned. Nevertheless, we are duplicating it in order that we can apply the provisions of the plan that were first laid out last year and are being amended today. So this surely is what is intended when the federal government says that it is to be government-operated. That means that a Minister of the government has the main responsibility for its day-to-day administration.

Now how are we going toicker in the business of inaugurating medical insurance in Ontario, if the federal government requires government operation? Let us see where flexibility fits into this. We know that already the civil servants of this province and the hon. members of this House can be, and many are, covered by a plan that is administered by a consortium of insurance companies headed by London Life Insurance.

By no stretch of the imagination can we say that London Life is government-operated; as a matter of fact I have heard some people say—probably unfairly—that the reverse is true. So here is a very large group of citizens of this province who have no option really, if they are going to have proper medical insurance at all, than to be covered by this privately operated plan which is surely a profit-making plan and therefore could not possibly be accepted by the federal authorities.

But there are some other insurance groups, within the province of Ontario, that are giving extensive coverage to a good many of our citizens. Last year hon. members may have heard me talk about the co-operative medical plan set up on a county basis; and since the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health have already indicated that they are members, first, of PSI and, I believe, secondly,

of the London Life plan, I would say that I have had satisfactory coverage for myself and my family with this co-operative medical insurance plan. And, interestingly enough, they have been able to provide myself and my family with this suitable coverage at a fee that is very closely related to the one that, as has been suggested by the hon. Minister of Health, would soon be applied in the province of Ontario under government sponsorship. It is, of course, much cheaper, more reasonable, than the one that is provided by PSI, the other large and important organization that is giving this coverage in Ontario.

I would say that these co-operative groups, if any could be considered an extension of government operation, might very well fit in. I believe that they have the interest of the citizens as their basis of operation.

Let us compare this with PSI, which has the large bulk of the coverage in Ontario. I think you know, Mr. Speaker, that it is essentially an organization that was set up by doctors in order that the doctors themselves could offer a convenient plan of prepayment to the citizens of Ontario; and, although PSI is not profit-making, they do have the high overhead which is almost identical, certainly very similar, with the facilities that the government is presently setting up with the new branch of The Department of Health. But the big difference is that it is a doctors' organization; and surely, when it comes to discussions with the government on changes of the rate structure, they will be speaking for the doctors and not for the citizens who have their medical coverage with this organization.

So how is the federal authority going to deal with this situation? I suppose, once again, that because they have the responsibility for implementing a plan that must surely be national in scope by July 1, 1967, they will approach the Health Ministers with as much flexibility and understanding as is possible. And I believe that they have already said that he would accept PSI as the government carrier under certain circumstances.

The fact remains, however, Mr. Speaker, that we are setting up a parallel structure, which gives us all of the machinery to step into the requirements of the federal plan as soon as the hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet decide that the time is right. It may have something to do with the position that was taken by the hon. member for Beaches who spoke a moment ago, that we in the province of Ontario must surely leave ourselves in the best bargaining position possible. I do believe that this is what is

motivating the hon. Minister of Health; I do believe that he is ready to go, at the urging of his Cabinet colleagues, for something that approaches universal comprehensive coverage. But I think he wants to keep himself in a good bargaining position.

While this may sound good to the reactionaries of the province, those who feel that universal coverage somehow weakens the moral fibre of the individual, I would agree with those who say that Ontario has a special responsibility that far transcends this horse-trading that the hon. Minister has been participating in. I think that Ontario has to lead Canada, as the most prosperous and most populous province, into this national plan that is going to be inaugurated in Canada in the year that is directly ahead of us. I feel that the present amendments set up an expensive duplication of service.

It may well be that we can approach the 90 per cent coverage that the federal people require, with the co-operation of PSI that has given good service in the past. It must surely, however, be our goal that a government-sponsored and government-operated plan avail itself of the facilities that are presently being set up by the branch of the department of the hon. Minister. I believe that the standard contract for everyone in Ontario should be available only through the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health.

Earlier today, a question was asked of the hon. Minister having to do with the feasibility of the hospital services commission taking to itself the responsibility for the administration of this plan. I can hardly believe that a careful investigation of this proposal would indicate that we should set up an entirely new branch to deal simply with the administration of another type of insurance. Surely co-operation would be possible here so that we, as citizens, would not have to pay two premiums, one for hospital insurance and the other for medical insurance; this could be combined so that the citizens would know where they were as far as their expenses were concerned, and surely the overhead associated with it would be reduced.

The machinery and general structure, then, is available. The hon. Minister, through these amendments, has manoeuvred Ontario

into a reasonably good bargaining position. He knows that eventually we must go in to the plan that is going to be in operation in Canada. We all know that Ontario pays more into the federal coffers than any other province. And we will never be in a position, surely, where we will not be able to have our share of federal participation in Medicare so that we will be paying money into the federal Treasury which is then distributed to approved plans elsewhere in Canada. On the other hand, there would be nothing unfair in the federal government proceeding in this way.

When hospitalization was first introduced, there were some provinces which were, at that time, not participating; and it really was the finances of the situation that drew the provinces of Canada into a plan which has worked so well and been so well received by citizens in every province. We are in much the same position; we are going to be a part of the plan.

Ontario has an opportunity, not to be the first in Canada to take part but to be an influential leader in the introduction of comprehensive medical insurance that we all feel and believe is necessary, not only for Ontario but for Canada.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with this debate. On Wednesday the Budget will be brought down. I am proposing that we sit on Tuesday and Thursday nights of this week and, starting next week, we will sit Monday, Tuesday and Thursday evenings. I would like to continue with the method developed in the last year or so, of dealing with the private members' business, and we will take an hour in the afternoons—from five to six on Tuesdays and Thursdays—to deal with those orders, as long as there are orders there to be dealt with. There has to be some degree of flexibility in that regard.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5.55 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	284
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued	287
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Gisborn, agreed to	298
On notice of motion to appoint select committee, Mr. Thompson	298
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Thompson, agreed to	307
Recess, 6 o'clock	307

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Western Ontario agricultural college, Ridgetown, and in the west gallery, Oak Park junior high school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that when this House adjourns the present sitting thereof it do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock tomorrow afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this motion is to provide for a 2 o'clock sitting tomorrow afternoon when the Budget will be introduced.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves, seconded by hon. Mr. Robarts, that this House will tomorrow resolve itself into the committee of supply.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As I understand rule 114 of the House, we cannot move into committee of supply until such time as the Speech from the Throne is concluded.

Mr. Speaker: I would say to the member that it has been the practice over several sessions now that the Throne debate continues at the same time as the supply and the Budget debates are proceeding. Whether or not it is against the written rules to do so, I am not in a position to say.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Who is?

Mr. Speaker: It has been the practice of the House and, of course, we rule in the House according to the usages and practices of the House, as well as the written rules.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would simply like to support the Speaker in his comment that while this rule is there, over a period of years, going back to the last administration which was supported by the party opposite, they used to pass the estimates in one night. We now take a period of months in order that these things may be examined.

Mr. Singer: Twenty-three years.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It is a fact, nonetheless. This has necessarily meant that these two debates tend to overlap. The reason in having the overlap is that the debate on the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne traditionally permits any member of the House to deal with any subject he wishes. The same is equally true of the debate on the Budget. If we were to wind up the Throne debate tonight, for instance, I am quite certain there would be many hon. members in this House who would be left without a vehicle to make the speeches they might like to make. While it is not the tidiest procedure in the world to have two debates of this nature in process at the same time, it does give every member two opportunities to speak on whatever subject interests him. That is why, over the years, this course of action has been developed.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I will read out rule 114. It says:

The committees of supply and of ways and means are appointed on motion without previous notice at the commencement of each session as soon as an address has been agreed to in answer to the speech of the Lieutenant-Governor.

My only point is, sir, if we are not going to abide by the rules we need a committee to examine the rules, in order that they can be changed.

Mr. Speaker: I pointed out to the member that we also rule by the usages and practices of the House. It has been the practice for many years now to have the Throne debate as well as the Budget debate proceeding at the same time.

Therefore, in view of that fact, I would rule the motion in order.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves that this House will tomorrow resolve itself into the committee of ways and means.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), notice of which has been given him.

Has the hon. Minister considered the possibility of co-operating with the state of New York in their project of developing a safer car?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, no consideration has been given for such action. The project mentioned by the hon. member is being financed by a legislative appropriation by the state of New York.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister? Would the hon. Minister welcome overtures from the state of New York in regard to such co-operation; or even seek such?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: That is rather hypothetical. I would hardly know how to answer it. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that The Department of Transport has had continuing concern with the many aspects of highway safety including vehicle design and maintenance. If some useful findings should come out of this project, I can assure the House that our department will give them very careful and detailed consideration.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), notice of which has been given. It is in three parts.

1. Was the order-in-council, 4619/65, December 16, 1965, which varied the decision of the Ontario municipal board dated April 27, 1964, by changing the effective date of the annexation of part of the township of Sunnidale known as Oakview Beach to the village of Wasaga Beach from January 1, 1965 to January 1, 1966, made under the authority of section 94 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act?

2. If so, is the hon. Minister aware that by subsection 15 of section 14 of The Municipal Act, the said section 94 does not apply to a decision of the municipal board providing for an annexation or amalgamation?

3. If not, under what authority was the said decision of the Ontario municipal board varied by the said order-in-council?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I may say as to the first part of this question, order-in-council number 4619/65 was not made under the authority of section 94 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act.

The second question: The Minister is aware of the provisions of subsection 15 of section 14 of The Municipal Act, that section 94 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act does not apply to a decision of the municipal board providing for an annexation or amalgamation.

The third question: The decision of the Ontario municipal board was varied under the inherent powers given to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, as to any tribunal in order that its powers should not compel the impossible.

In regard to order-in-council 4619/65, which was dated December 16, 1965, it was obviously impossible that the annexation could take place on January 1, 1965, because the time had already elapsed, during which the decision was ineffective because of a notice of objection which had been filed under subsection 16 of section 14 of The Municipal Act. Since the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor is given power to confirm the decision, he must have the power to confirm the decision so that it is rational and sensible and does not compel the impossible.

An order-in-council merely confirming the board's decision without variation, on its face would have been meaningless. It could not set time back, as this is impossible. In order to avoid confusion among all parties, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council acted under powers that he must have to enable him to make an effective order.

The question is merely a technicality in any event, as section 42 of The Ontario Municipal Board Act is as follows, and I quote:

42: The board may rehear any application before deciding it or may review, rescind, change, alter or vary any decision, approval, or order made by it.

If the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor in Council had merely confirmed the board's decision, there would undoubtedly have been a review and a variation of the decision to make it applicable. It was to avoid the intervening confusion that it was made clear in the order-in-council that the effective date of the annexation should be January 1, 1966.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Minister the courtesy of a copy of his answer so it might be given to

certain interested parties in the gallery later on?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: I would be glad to do that.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer inform this House why the province levies, under The Tobacco Tax Act, two different rates of tax on identical commodities? A pouch of tobacco that sells for less than 50 cents is taxed at the rate of one-half cent per ounce, or three per cent, while the identical tobacco in one-half or one-quarter ounce cans is taxed at the rate of one cent per ounce, or six per cent.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, I may say that the retail sales tax on tobacco products was replaced on January 1 last by the new tobacco tax. This tax has been in effect in several other provinces for some years and is generally based on quantities. We endeavoured to keep the tax under the new Act at the same amount on various tobacco items as it had been under The Retail Sales Tax Act. It was not possible to have the tax exactly the same on all classes and types of tobacco and still maintain the simplicity desirable under this new Act.

I believe that it is reasonably close in those items which make up a large percentage of the volume of sales, but I realize that there are some smaller lines where it does not work out as closely. These are still being studied to see if there can be improvements or simplifications.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? I believe the hon. Provincial Treasurer's assurance in this House at the time of the passage of the bill was that the half cent rate would apply to the larger packages and the low price tobacco. Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer inform us why he changed his mind?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that we are doing our very best.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, I have another question of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, for which I have already given notice, regarding the combination liquor store and beer warehouse recently erected at Parkhill. Would the hon. Minister inform the House from whom was the land purchased on which this warehouse was built; what was the cost of

the land; who was the architect who designed the building; what was the total cost of the building and who are the operators of the warehouse?

Mr. Speaker: This question was not properly directed. I had it directed to the Provincial Secretary.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): 1. Ralph M. Gray; 2. \$4,000; 3. W. E. Andrews; 4. \$68,416, the contract price to be subject to minor variations, debits or credits, when the final settlement is made; 5. The liquor control board of Ontario, as with all other combined centres.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), notice of which has been given.

Is the hon. Minister aware that Mrs. Margaret Cooper, a leader in the unsuccessful efforts of the Ontario county nurses to get a union, has been fired as the Uxbridge area public health nurse leaving two schools without a public health nurse?

If so, what does the hon. Minister intend to do about this action?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the case to which the hon. member makes reference. The matter is presently being investigated by an officer of my department.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, there is a question of which I gave notice yesterday to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). Would the hon. Minister inform the House if tradesmen are now being laid off with the statement that it is contrary to the policy of the department to retain employees who are beyond the age of retirement and that these men will not be eligible for pension for one, two or three years?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer is "no".

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), in fact two separate questions for the hon. Minister of Health.

The first: Has the hon. Minister considered establishing any formal course of appeal from decisions on certification of foreign doctors made by the college of physicians and surgeons? If not, will the newly proposed council on the healing arts perform such a function?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne it was announced that it was the intention of this government to establish a committee to inquire into all matters pertaining to the preparation, education, training, licensing, control and disciplining of all those involved in the practice of the healing arts. These terms of reference apply to the committee. I do not propose to take any action at this session of the Legislature which might prejudge its recommendations.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Am I then to understand from the hon. Minister that the aggrieved doctors can take their case directly to the proposed council?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know how the committee will choose to function—whether they propose to have public hearings. I would suggest that we will have to wait until the committee is set up and then be guided by their determination in this matter.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, of which he has had notice.

Does the hon. Minister intend to change the regulations of The Ontario Hospital Services Commission Act to permit participation in the Ontario hospital insurance plan by non-residents employed in the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is "no." It is not intended to change the regulations to permit participation of Ontario hospital insurance plan for non-residents employed in the province because the provisions of this Act are aimed at residents only. If the persons to whom the hon. member has reference are Canadians, residents of other provinces, their hospitalization in vogue there will apply in Ontario because there are reciprocal arrangements between the provinces. If they come from foreign countries, of course, their hospitalization will not apply here or they will not be eligible for Ontario hospital insurance until they have established residence.

Mr. Trotter: One short supplementary question: What of the individuals, Mr. Speaker, who perhaps live in Detroit but work in Canada? These people are having the OHSC deductions made at the source and do not get their money back. What can be done for them?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would have to look into this, Mr. Speaker, but my first reaction

is that they are eligible to be exempt from deduction of hospital insurance. I cannot state that as a fact at the present time. Had I known of this question, I would have found the correct answer.

Mr. Trotter: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister would supply that information because this is going on. People in Detroit are being charged and do not get their money back.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Would the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) inform the House as to what transpired in court this day in respect to the application brought by the *Oshawa Times*?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the motion was adjourned until Thursday of this week, February 10, at 11 o'clock in the morning on the request of the applicant; however, with all parties consenting.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor), I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), of which he has had notice.

This is in two parts and is as follows:

Will the hon. Minister table the so-called secret report by his department concerning U.S. action with respect to U.S.-controlled companies in Ontario?

What steps does the hon. Minister propose to take as a result of this report?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member's question, a report will not be tabled. I note that the hon. member referred to the so-called secret report concerning U.S. guideline policies which does not exist, therefore no action is contemplated at this time.

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Speaker, again in the absence of the hon. member for Timiskaming, I have another question of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, notice of which he has received.

Would the hon. Minister inform the House of the total cost of publishing and distributing the booklet "Ontario 66", and what methods does the hon. Minister intend to follow to secure proper distribution?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, a total estimated cost of publishing and distributing

80,000 copies of the book internationally is \$90,800. And the revenue from domestic distribution is estimated to be \$10,000.

The second question—in selecting the names of the people to whom “Ontario 66” was to go to, the following procedures were followed: (a) a selection was made of the names of suitable departmental contacts in foreign countries; and (b) three foreign specialist firms in the U.S., the U.K., and the Netherlands were retained to select the names of suitable individuals, in respect of geographic areas, to receive “Ontario 66.” Distribution is to financiers, industrialists, academics, publishers, some professions, to research scientists, economists and planners, governments and large libraries, business, trade and professional associations, and U.S. labour organizations. And distribution by country is as follows: United States, 24,000; United Kingdom, 13,000; Germany 13,000; France, 7,000; Switzerland, 1,000; Scandinavia, 4,000; Belgium, 2,000; Holland, 2,000; Ontario, 1,000; Quebec, 1,000; remainder of Canada, 1,000; Japan, 2,000; the Far East 1,000; and a reserve of 8,000.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that a letter went forward to all the hon. members of the House outlining the reasons for “Ontario 66”—which is part of our advertising programme—as we designed it for the past year and carried it forward into this year. We thought a direct approach was necessary to reach people who would be interested in investing in the province of Ontario, or buying products from Ontario.

One of the most difficult things to do in foreign advertising is to have enough money to cover all of these markets. For instance, in Norway we want to reach only roughly 2,000 people, and to do this it would cost us \$20 a head.

So, Mr. Speaker, by using not the shotgun approach but the rifle approach, we picked the people who are most apt to have an interest in what we have to offer here in the province of Ontario.

I might also say that the replies and the correspondence we are getting from people who have received it is very encouraging. The best selling book in Canada reaches 5,000 copies; already we are close to the 5,000 so I think we have a best seller on our hands. We are not giving them away; they are being sold for \$2 a copy and are offered in lots of 25 to any industries or any individuals who want to buy them. As hon. members probably noticed, by the reports in the newspapers, one of the banks bought 1,200 copies and others are following. So I think

“Ontario 66” is doing a good job for the province of Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

Would the hon. Minister comment on the remarks of Dr. B. A. Hoddinott, chief psychologist at Thistletown hospital, to the effect that mental health agencies in Ontario are “a disjointed, entangled jungle of agencies”? I quote from his speech.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have no verification of the fact that Dr. Hoddinott used these words other than what appeared in the press; and, with the tremendous pressures under which all our members of the fourth estate are constantly put trying to report meetings of this kind, they are not always apt to catch the exact words.

However, taking this report at face value, I would suggest that Dr. Hoddinott might well have been referring to the variety of unrelated agencies providing services to the various types of children. These are under a number of different administrations and jurisdictions.

The interdepartmental committees on mental retardation, and on emotionally disturbed children, were formed to study the existing situation and to make recommendations to correct it. The report of the committee on mental retardation was submitted to this House a year ago and is in the process of implementation now. The committee on emotionally disturbed children, which was set up in the latter part of 1965, will report, I expect, before the end of this session. The problems of standards and co-ordination of services are among the matters which are currently under consideration by the committee.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister has, in effect, answered my second question. I lost his last words. Will the interdepartmental committee on emotionally disturbed children definitely report this session?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not definitely, but I am assured that this is fully anticipated.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), and several that relate to it, notice of which has been given.

1. Which other children's aid societies, if any, find themselves in the position of the two Metro Toronto societies, namely, the likely municipal rejection of their proposed budgets for the coming year?

2. Will the hon. Minister consider tabling a regulation setting out required standards for protection services under The Child Welfare Act so as to allay municipal budgetary fears?

3. Who are the members of the child welfare review board?

4. How soon after a municipality rejects any given children's aid society budget will the child welfare review board consider the case; and

5. What happens to children's aid societies' financing in the interval?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, in answer to question 1, only one county has indicated that they may take issue with the estimated expenditure for child welfare services—Bruce county. We are not aware that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is rejecting the estimates submitted by the Toronto children's aid society or the Toronto Roman Catholic children's aid society.

2. Section 11 of the regulations of The Child Welfare Act, 1965, provides that:

During 1966, the director shall conduct a survey and compile statistics necessary to formulate a uniform method for determining the standard for the staffing of societies, and each society shall supply such information as it requires for the purpose.

I should also say that, insofar as we know, the children's aid societies have included personnel and funds necessary to maintain their purposes and services in the protection field.

3. A chairman of the child welfare review board has been appointed in the person of Mr. H. Donald Guthrie of Toronto. The other four members will be announced shortly.

4. The child welfare review board will be in a position to consider any appeal within ten days of official notice.

5. The Department of Public Welfare has already made available \$2,679,000, being the provincial share of the estimated expenditures as submitted by the societies. This amount may be subject to adjustment at a later date, but covers the provincial share for the months of January and February. We propose to advance the provincial share for March, the first week in March. I should add that the two Toronto societies received payment totalling \$1,090,864.50—Metro Toronto children's aid society received \$695,016.67, and Toronto Roman Catholic children's aid society, received \$395,847.83. In addition to the provincial payments, it is evident that the muni-

cipalities in general are advancing their estimated share of the costs.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the Minister of Lands and Forests for the year ending March 31, 1965.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), notice of which has been given. Has the hon. Minister of Highways given assurances to the city of Fort William that the requested Windsor street overpass or fly-by will be built in order to provide access to new residential development, which will be cut off from the city by the ring road on which construction is expected to be started this year?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, it is my opinion that a letter dated December 20, addressed to the clerk of the city of Fort William by the Deputy Minister, provided such assurances. A copy of the subject letter was made available to the hon. member; but in the event that he did not get it, I will read to the House the pertinent paragraphs. The Deputy Minister on December 20, in a letter addressed to Mr. D. B. Morris, city clerk, corporation of the city of Fort William, said:

In the absence of the Minister I am replying to your letter of December 15, wherein you draw attention to the resolutions of council held on December 14, 1965, and dealing with a request for the interchange at Windsor avenue on the Lakehead expressway. I notice that nothing is mentioned in the motion of the meeting held on December 10 when his worship Mayor Reid and Mr. Thompson visited me in Toronto for the express purpose of discussing this proposal. At that time, I clearly laid before his worship the department's position which briefly was this: That under no circumstances for operation on safety conditions would a connection either at grade or by interchange be provided at this location, but that if future traffic warranted the construction of a fly-over, sympathetic consideration would be given to it at that time. Possibly the council has some reservations with my using the term 'sympathetic consideration.' If this is the case, let me assure you that if such a facility is warranted by increased traffic volumes, a fly-over will be built.

In the possible circumstance that the hon. member did not receive a copy of the letter

that was sent to him, I tender him another copy of the Deputy Minister's letter now.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a supplementary question? Does the hon. Minister not feel that it is needed immediately in order that the board of education and other civic departments can plan the services for the new development?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think this is all recognized, Mr. Speaker, in the assurances provided by the Deputy Minister when he makes reference to traffic requirements. These traffic requirements simply do not exist at the moment. The full assurance has been provided to his worship at a meeting and by letter, that at that point where the traffic requirements indicate the need for a fly-over such a fly-over would be built.

I think it is fair to say that the Deputy Minister's assurance should be accepted by the city in this instance and I might say I concur with the submission of the Deputy Minister.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) asked a question, which I could not answer at the time, that of the 6,000 doctors licensed to practise in Ontario in the past 15 years, how many were from India. Information is available only over the past ten years. During this period there were 20 medical doctors, graduates of Indian universities, licensed to practise in Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough West on the same day or the day before that, asked a question which I could not then answer. It was in three parts: Would the Minister explain why the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons differentiates among universities in white western countries as to acceptability of undergraduate medical standards but excludes all universities in countries like India and Pakistan?

The answer, sir, is that the schools are required to satisfy the college that their standards are acceptable. The schools in question have not provided information which would indicate acceptable standards.

The second part of the question was: What criteria has the college of physicians and surgeons applied to Indian medical schools to justify its refusal to accept the students from any of these schools?

The answer is that the standards applied to Indian medical schools are the same as those which would be applied to other situations. As indicated in the reply already given, the schools have not established an acceptable standard.

The third part of the question was: How does the Minister explain the recent exclusion of the college of Indian medical schools when more Indian students wrote the medical council of Canada examination in 1964 than students from any other country, and had the highest passing rate of any country in the world?

The answer is that the Indian graduates who took their examinations in the autumn of 1963 and the spring of 1964 were included in the report of the annual meeting of the medical council of Canada in September, 1964. The information contained in the report to this annual meeting denies that either of the points brought out in this question are correct. A number of countries had more students writing the medical council of Canada examination than India during this period, and during this same period students from a number of countries obtained higher passing rates than students from India.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, in direct compliance with your ruling of the previous day, I have three supplementary questions on the three answers given by the hon. Minister.

In relation to the first reply, how can it be contended that all the schools have not answered, and therefore some have been excluded, when the college of physicians and surgeons itself only circulated 30 of the 70 existing universities in India; received replies from only six and based their response in a letter to Dr. Baichwal on the contention that personal visits on the part of doctors had in fact determined the exclusion?

On the second question, Mr. Speaker, what are the standards to which the hon. Minister refers? And, on the third, is the hon. Minister unaware of the statistics given in the medical council of Canada annual announcement in 1965 where the number of students is specified and the percentages as well?

Mr. Speaker: Will the member ask the questions, but refrain from elaborating upon them?

Mr. S. Lewis: They are confined interrogatives.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not an expert in grammar, and I do not really know what the hon. member means. However, it is all right. I did not get that last question; it was so verbose.

The answer to the first question is that the college wrote all 70 medical schools in India, and only 6 concerned themselves enough to reply.

The standards are those that are demanded of all graduates who wish to practise in Ontario, and are comparable to the standards demanded of myself and every other graduate of an Ontario or Canadian university.

I am sorry I did not get the other part of the question. I will have to get it.

Mr. S. Lewis: I think our verbosity is at least equal, Mr. Speaker. I simply asked the hon. Minister whether he was aware of the table from the medical council of Canada annual announcement 1965 which lists the number of students who tried the examination and pass percentages by countries. It indicates that in fact more Indian students did apply and a greater percentage passed.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, in the host of statistics I read I cannot recall that one. However, I would point out, for the information of the House, that passing an examination does not make a practitioner in medicine. One could read all of the text books in medicine—I am quite certain the hon. member could read them all—and could pass an examination with relatively decent marks; that would not make him a physician.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, recognizing your reliance on Westminster for rules, and as you know the leader of the Opposition in Westminster does not need to give written notice of a question, I therefore would ask the hon. Prime Minister: Could he tell us when the report of the redistribution commission will be presented to the House?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I am quite prepared to answer the question without written notice, but I do not want this to be taken as precedent; I suppose you will have something to say about that later on.

As soon as it is ready I will bring it in and I would hope that would be within the next very few days, at least next week sometime.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask a supplementary question, sir? Has the hon. Prime Minister received the report from the commission?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I received a portion of it today. As a matter of fact, it came in this morning. I have no desire to restrain it. There is good news and bad news in it, which is inevitable when you have redistribution. I think the sooner it is here and we all see it, the better.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister is it his intention to refer this matter to a

committee of the House before it comes to the House itself?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think probably the procedure would be to table the report of this House-appointed commission to get it in the records of the assembly and in front of the hon. members. Then we will introduce a bill carrying out the recommendations of the committee. Now that bill, if it was felt necessary, could be referred to the committee on privileges and elections for examination. It may be that the bill could be just as easily examined here in the committee of the whole House. If it appears when it is produced that some purpose would be served by sending it to committee, I would be quite prepared to do so.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Before the member speaks, I would inform the leader of the Opposition that his questions today without written notice are not to be taken as precedent, that in the case of questions before the orders of the day we do not have to go to Westminster; we do have this rule ourselves. The questions are supposed to be submitted to my office before 12 o'clock each day.

Mr. MacDonald: I can see Mr. Speaker, that you are under rather friendly badgering.

Mr. Speaker, I crave your indulgence on a matter of personal privilege. In the late edition of the *Toronto Daily Star* last night there was a report on the remarks of the hon. Attorney General yesterday afternoon and after a quote from the hon. Attorney General there is a paragraph which reads as follows:

Mr. Wishart looked directly at Ontario New Democratic leader Donald C. MacDonald while making the statement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney General sits just across the carpet from me. Unless he turns right or left it is rather difficult for him not to look at me, though I thought on occasions he was looking past me at the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker), during a portion of his remarks.

But since the *Toronto Daily Star* has said by implication, very clearly, that his remarks were addressed to me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make two very brief comments.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Is that any more in order than my statement?

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member, I think, has a point of personal privilege on being quoted in the paper as having had offended one of his privileges as a member of the House. As such he has the right to reply.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. As I read the article, all the article said was that the hon. Attorney General looked at the socialist leader. Now he made a general statement which in its terms applied to everybody in the province of Ontario and if a point of personal privilege arises out of that, Mr. Speaker, then almost anything that applies to anyone in the province of Ontario would allow any individual member to get up at any time during the proceedings of this House and make a speech.

The purpose of our motion yesterday was to bring this matter before the House in a direct and proper manner and you ruled that out of order. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, if you allow the hon. member for York South to continue in this way he is going to be allowed, under the cloak of a question of personal privilege, to do something that you would not allow the official Opposition to do yesterday.

Mr. Speaker: I may say in answer to the point of order, I was waiting to hear the member for York South out and not let him read the article from which he is about to quote. I am waiting to hear whether something in the article offended one of his privileges as a member of the House. I cannot anticipate what the member is going say. If I find that what he is about to say is out of order, I shall have to call him to order.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. After he makes his comment it will be irrelevant to him whether you approve of it or not. On the point of order, I am merely saying to you—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I am sorry. I cannot call the member out of order until I have heard what he is going to say, or at least until he embarks on what he is about to say. He has risen on a point of personal privilege, which is his right if an article in the paper has some remarks about him.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, with respect, he stated it and then he said, "And now I want to comment." It was at that point that I rose. I say that his having stated it is fine.

Mr. Speaker: I will hear the member until I determine if he is out of order.

An hon. member: But we do not want to hear him.

Mr. Singer: We heard a vote yesterday. We heard a vote on the debate yesterday, too.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to make a general comment that may apply to everybody in the province. It is another thing when that general comment is pointed directly at me in this House, which was done in the Toronto *Daily Star* news report. It is on that basis that I rise on the matter of personal privilege.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I will say this: If there is a conflict between public rights and private rights, even when those rights are established by the courts in accordance with a law that has long been questioned, then I unhesitatingly reassert that I shall defend public rights.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. May I ask the member a question? As I am not acquainted with the article, is there anything in the article other than that the Attorney General looked at the member across the House? Is there any more than that in the article?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the article states that the hon. Attorney General was looking directly at me—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I would rule that if there is nothing other than that in the newspaper article then I shall have to deny the member his point of personal privilege.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion for second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

(continued)

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, now that we are setting into the debate on the medical services insurance bill amendment, I think we should all relax this afternoon and spend a little time on the essential ingredients of the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. Minister of Health.

We all recall that last year we were engaged in the same debate, with the same players, the same programme; the only difference was that last year it was a tragedy and this year it is a farce. There is no question that the bill which has been presented to this Legislature is devoid of principle and as it is an unprincipled bill it is very difficult to ascertain the principle which is the subject of this debate today.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to speak at some considerable length and if the audience in the House dwindles any further, we will move the adjournment of the debate until such time—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: As my hon. friend from London South (Mr. White) says, one sometimes rises in sorrow and in anger, and the mixture today in the debate on this bill is a combination which is potentially explosive. If hon. members will recall what this government has done on the question of medical insurance in this province, they will appreciate the difficulty which is faced by us on this side of the House in arousing public attention to this amendment to the third bill which has been introduced by this government covering medical insurance. We can well appreciate that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and his government are faced with a very basic political problem. They sold the people of the province of Ontario, under the guise of public relations during the election of 1963, that there was in fact a public Medicare scheme in force in the province of Ontario at the time that the government went to the people of this province. Following that was the Hagey commission report, following that was the introduction of a bill, following that was the introduction of a further bill and today we have the debate on the principle of the bill which has now been introduced to amend that long series of disasters by this government in the field of Medicare.

The problem with which we are faced is not only to gain the attention of the hon. members of this House about the bill which is before the assembly for debate, but to try to ascertain whether any of the hon. Ministers of the government, other than the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) and perhaps other than the hon. Prime Minister, are going to take any part in this debate. Or is it going to be left to a certain limited number of the private members, in the quaint phrase of the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) who is not in his seat today, of the PC Party to state their views on this particularly important bill?

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday the hon. members who took part in the debate, the hon. member for Beaches (Mr. Harris) for whom I have a profound regard but who finds himself in the terribly difficult position that the majority of his constituents require to be sold on the proposition that there is a universal, government-sponsored, government-operated, comprehensive Medicare scheme in force in the province of Ontario. And the hon. member for Beaches is placed in the difficult position of qualifying whatever is said. It is quite a change from the early part of this debate a year ago when the province of Saskatchewan and the Saskatchewan Medicare scheme were denounced—and I do not think that that is too strong a word—in rather strident tones by hon. members who spoke from the government benches.

This year the reference is rather to the length of time that it took the government of the province of Saskatchewan to bring Medicare into effect in that province, coupled with the statement that it is really a very responsible bill at this time. So now they will be able to say to their constituents that this is a step forward in some form of a logical progression, which will achieve in the province of Ontario a Medicare scheme which is fit for the people in this province.

Mr. Speaker, let us not be trapped by this government into a debate on what may or may not be in the mind of the hon. Prime Minister with respect to the bargaining position of the province of Ontario with the federal government. If that is what we are going to debate, we may as well close the debate at this point because the government has not indicated, in any way, whether or not it is engaged in a bargaining process with the federal government. What we must look at is the public record, and this government is publicly on the record as being opposed in every respect to a government-operated universal Medicare scheme for the province of Ontario. The bill which is before the House today is in no sense a step toward that kind of a scheme.

We have clearly defined in this House, as was stated in the last debate and is stated again today, a government which believes in a private-insurance-company-operated Medicare scheme, with subsidization by the government through a government-operated welfare scheme for certain of its citizens—a mixture of the kind of Medicare which the people of the province of Ontario should have.

We on this side are determined that there

will be, in the province of Ontario, a universal, government-operated, comprehensive Medicare scheme regardless of whether or not the federal government will provide \$1, \$17, or \$20 per capita to enable that scheme to be put into effect. The province of Ontario has the resources, has the ability, to finance such a scheme, regardless of any decision which may be made by the federal government. And we do not think that the basic principle of this bill should be put before this Legislature as a bargaining counter in some continuing dialogue which takes place between the province of Ontario and the federal government.

The reason that we feel so strongly about this scheme is that any scheme, which we as a party have put forward, is usually subject to the criticism, "Where are you going to find the dollars?" And in this particular case, the people of the province of Ontario are being asked by this government to find more dollars than are required to provide a service. And when the government puts forward the proposition that there must be priorities in the allocation of the total resources of the province of Ontario—between education, between the development of facilities, between Medicare, between the construction of hospitals, and all of the other many demands which are made on this province—the least that we in this House can do is to make certain that any given demand on the resources of this province is at the lowest possible economic efficient amount. And this is the ground on which we are prepared to continue, today, the attack on the bill which has been put forward by the hon. Minister of Health.

Before going into that specific matter, I would like to deal with two or three of the original items which the hon. Minister spoke about when he introduced the bill. Hon. members will recall that, skipping the first basic change to which he referred, the bill then provided that the benefit under the standard contract is to be based upon 90 per cent of the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association, rather than upon 100 per cent. In due course, when the bill comes before the committee of this House for debate, clause by clause, we will have some comment to make upon that particular basic change.

I think it is sufficient today to say that this appears to be the reintroduction into this bill of a co-insurance feature, by which the insured person participates to some extent in the cost to him of the services which are provided by doctors, physicians, or surgeons under such a standard contract. I think we

should not overlook that point but we can return to it at a later time.

The third basic change, to which the hon. Minister referred, was the removal of special waiting periods for maternity benefits under standard medical services insurance contracts, and a further amendment to provide that certain surgical procedures performed by dental surgeons in hospitals will be covered by the standard contract. Both of those relate, of course, to the degree of comprehensiveness of the scheme which the government is putting forward, and we are in favour of any enlargement which may be given to the scope of the services to be provided under such contract. There are still large areas that are not covered; one of the principal ones, of course, which is of great concern to the public and the province, is the area of the cost of drugs under such a Medicare scheme.

But if we would now turn to the first basic change which the hon. Minister proposes to this House, we will note that he stated the change to be that the standard medical services insurance contract is to be supplied only by the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health. Accordingly, provisions dealing with the licensing and regulation of carriers in the medical services insurance programme have been repealed and complementary amendments have been made.

In those few words, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister propounded the fundamental purpose of the bill. And if one takes the time to mark up one of the bills with the deletions which occurred through these amendments, one will find that the hon. Minister might have been well advised to have introduced a brand-new bill. I assume that there would have been a degree of reluctance to do so because, while I was not a member of the House throughout the period of all the bills, I believe this would have been the fourth medical services insurance bill to have been presented. But, rather than do it by way of a new bill, he simply introduced a bill which, in substance, deletes many provisions of the bill.

I think that this House is entitled to an explanation from the hon. Minister as to just why this deletion took place. And, failing an explanation by the hon. Minister—and at one point in this debate, if I recall correctly, he denied that this had anything to do with the bill—I would like to give my explanation of what, in fact, took place that led to this particular change.

You will recall last year that at the close of the Medicare debate in this House, the ubiquitous Mr. Watson, the president of the

Canadian health insurance association, was reported in the press to have stated that he was very pleased with the scheme which the government had brought to fruition in this House because it accorded so completely with the brief which they had submitted to the Hall commission on medical services. And you will notice in the paper this morning that Mr. Watson appears not to have made any change in his judgment about the scheme which is now being propounded, but has moved on to two further grounds.

He has extracted from the hon. Prime Minister a statement, for whatever it is worth, that the premiums will be "realistic" under the government scheme. I assume that can be subject to many interpretations. He has then gone on to suggest that perhaps what is in the government's mind is that the 90 per cent requirement of the federal government will now be met by having a substantial number of people under the private insurance plan, plus the additional people who require subsidy in this province under this proposed scheme—and that these two percentages, added together, will achieve the 90 per cent target at least which the federal government purports to require for its scheme.

Well, I would just like to say that we in this party do not accept that principle; and if it is the principle on which this government is operating, I think we should have a categorical affirmation that that is so, or a categorical denial that it is so.

If I may return to the circumstances which led Mr. Watson last year to comment that this was a very fine Medicare scheme for the province of Ontario, I need only refer to not too many sections of the deletions which took place.

But, sir, you will recall that, in the elaborate structure that was raised by the government, there was a proposal to establish a corporation known as Medical Carriers Incorporated; and that this corporation was, among other powers, given the power to "establish and administer a system for the pooling of standard contracts and may upon application therefore exempt a licensed carrier from the pooling requirements."

It is quite easy to explain, to my satisfaction in any event, why this was so acceptable to the government and to the Canadian health insurance association. Because what the government, under Bill No. 136, had done was to take out a large substantial block of people who might be in the category of poor risk, either by reason of health, by reason of age, or by reason of their unemployment or underemployment in our economy;

therefore these were risks which the insurance industry, as such, was not prepared to touch.

The government therefore took over that group and provided a government-operated scheme which would cover just those people; that is, those people who were in the categorical welfare cases, those who had no taxable income, and those who had taxable incomes of, I believe, up to something like \$1,100—meaning a total income of something in the neighbourhood of \$3,100 or \$3,200. Therefore, by taking that large bloc of the people in the province of Ontario—and on the government's own figure, 1.8 million people—out of the field of private insurance, the fact appeared and appealed to the insurance industry that the remaining people in the province of Ontario were a pretty select group, within which they could offer health insurance.

One of the things which occurred in the debate in the House was the sudden realization, through the debate in this House, by the public that even with a proposed pooling arrangement the private insurance companies, providing standard contracts to persons who did not fall within this 1.8 million figure, would be subject to a differential in premium depending on their health and on their age and presumably on their ability to keep up the premiums. So they were going to charge them higher premiums, determined by the risk to which the private insurance companies thought they were subject, despite the fact that they had the facility of pooling any of that group who they thought were not acceptable risks at a standard premium.

It is quite certain that the government closed off the debate and passed the bill under the sudden realization that the people in the province of Ontario would not stand for a differential premium which would be inequitable and regressive on those persons who had to go to private carriers to pay a premium which was not in line with the standard premium paid by the great bulk of the population who were being left to the private insurance field.

So in the interval between the time when the House prorogued or adjourned last June, the government then had to go to the insurance companies and say to them: "The public will not accept differentials in premiums depending on whether or not people are well, ill, old or young. Therefore, we want you, under pooling provisions permitted under this Act which was passed, to come up with a standard premium which you will charge everybody other than the large group of high-risk people that we have already taken

off your hands, a standard premium which is acceptable to the rest of those people."

Mr. Speaker, I surmise, and in the silence of the government I take it to be a fact, that what the insurance companies then said was: "No, the group left for us is not quite good enough. We want you to take out some more of the bad risks for us." The government said: "How can we do that?" The insurance companies said: "Leave us the group business; that is what we want. We can then provide the insurance without being faced with the problem of assessing the high-risk people in the community and you take over those, in addition to the 1.8 million people. Take them into your scheme, and then you will not have to regulate us at all. You will be able to go back to your original position by which you exerted no effective supervision over the rates which we would charge."

This position, of course, is much to this government's liking because this is the very position that the province has been in for many, many years in the field of car insurance; despite the power given to the government under The Insurance Act to establish rates and premiums for the insurance industry, they have not chosen to exercise it. So, incidentally, insurance companies got away from any intrusion into their affairs by the government, which is a terribly bad thing these days.

The result, of course, has been quite clear. The premium which is supposed to be charged by the publicly operated scheme for those people who have no choice but to get their insurance from the government, is going to be an uneconomic premium. It is not as uneconomic a premium for the people in that group as it would have been under the scheme which was jettisoned, or is in the course of being jettisoned, as a result of these amendments. You will recall that last year the only figures that the government would give to us about the premiums were \$72, \$144 and \$180 for a single person, a family of two and a family of more than two. This year, they were able, under this new scheme, to bring those figures down to something like \$60, \$120 and \$150.

I think it is at this point that the reported remarks of the hon. Prime Minister, in reply to the question put to him by Mr. Watson, has very real significance—that is, that he was going to keep the premiums charged by the government-operated plan at a "realistic" rate.

The realism is very clear now, because it not only proves the high risks of the group

that the government is going to insure, but I think it perhaps provides a clue as to the place where the government found the premium which it is going to charge. Under the Ontario, province of opportunity, employees group insurance plan sponsored by the London Life Insurance Company, you find that former employees who are in receipt of a superannuation or disability allowance under The Public Service Superannuation Act and I think that, by and large, we would all agree that people in that category are relatively higher risk people than persons who are not retired—will be eligible for the basic surgical medical benefit under this plan in payment of a premium of \$157.44 for a former employee with more than one dependant.

That is not the cost to a person who is a participant in this group plan; that is the cost which the person who retires from the public service of the province of Ontario in the future will have to pay to continue his benefits. That is not the amount which he pays as a member of the group. And it is not something which is automatic. As a side issue, in the brochure—and perhaps on another occasion this would bear looking into—you will find a statement which applies to the public servants of the province of Ontario. "If your group basic surgical-medical insurance terminates because you cease to be an eligible public servant, and if you wish to change your health insurance benefits to an individual policy, you must contact the London Life office nearest you within 31 days of the date of the termination of your insurance. The benefits and premium rates provided under the individual policy will be in accordance with the rates of the company in effect at the time the application is made."

So that the public servant of the province of Ontario today—let us assume that he is adequately covered under the package scheme—should recognize that the day he retires he has no automatic right to continue that coverage, even if he is prepared to pay the premium. And he does not know what the premium is going to be because the premium, at that time, will be the rate which is in force for such an application.

I would assume that the rate which a presently retired public servant is paying is the current rate, which is \$157.44. I assume that that is the cost to a person in the province of Ontario who falls within the high risk group who is no longer a member of a group, but has to deal with his surgical and medical expenses as an individual, will then have to pay to the London Life Insurance

Company under this scheme, or to any other company, if he wishes to have continued coverage for physicians and surgeons services.

I think, if it is possible for me to draw the point carefully, I am saying to this House that if you are 65 years of age and if you want to be covered by the London Life Insurance Company under this group plan you then go to the London Life Insurance Company and you make an application for the insurance. There is no certainty that you will get it and there is no certainty as to the rate at which you will get it. There is no certainty that you will not be subjected to a medical examination to determine whether your health has deteriorated beyond what is average at the 65-year-old level and that you will not have to take a higher rate.

Then you turn around and go—as my hon. friend from Scarborough North (Mr. Wells) says—to the government. I thank him for the remark, because that is where the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister come in. The rates will be realistic and the realistic rates which the hon. Prime Minister, I gather, has been speaking about to Mr. Watson is the same rate that Mr. Watson will have the London Life Insurance Company charge for the coverage.

As I say, in the absence of explanation by the government, we will make that assumption and it is open to any hon. member of the government to answer it.

The fact of the matter is that what Mr. Watson does not want is to have people urged or anxious to withdraw from group insurance in order to come into a government-operated scheme.

At the present time my understanding of most group insurance policies is that it is tantamount to being a condition of employment. One has to be in the group if there is a group plan covering the employees in a given plant or in a given operation. And by and large one must stay in it, just as a public servant in the province of Ontario must by and large stay within this scheme.

I think I could make a further point that is of great significance to the kind of public relations cloak which the government wishes so desperately to pull over the whole question of Medicare. We should point out that every person in the province of Ontario who is today receiving favoured rates as a member of a group of healthy people within any organization—and the rate is carefully hidden from him because in many cases he pays only a portion of it and in many other cases the rate is fixed in terms of a package programme of which the employee has the benefit. Within that framework he may very well feel

today that he is adequately covered in some way or other.

He is not terribly certain, of course, as to just what the fine print in the contract is going to provide him with, whether the exclusions are large or small, whether there is a basic plan such as this coupled with a supplementary one and whether he signed the proper forms which would give him the supplementary coverage in addition to the basic coverages provided—he does not know any of that. But what he does know is, as with the public servants of the province of Ontario, when he leaves that group he will be in the same position as the retired members of the public service of the province of Ontario and he will then have to come into the government scheme at this “realistic” rate of \$150-odd.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, at the present time the rates which the government is fixing for this plan are, for those people who are going to participate in it, probably the best rates that those people could obtain for insurance against doctors and physicians services. However, they are not the best rate if the whole of the population of the province of Ontario is within the group. There are two groups: The group of the low risk categories left with the private insurance companies and then this tremendous number of additional people who are going to be relying upon the publicly operated scheme.

My hon. leader (Mr. MacDonald)—and there is no need to expound further figures—has pointed out that in any event the premiums which could be charged if the whole of the population of the province of Ontario were covered under a single group, under a government-operated universal scheme, would be very substantially reduced from what the government proposes under the present \$60, \$120 and \$150. Indeed, starting with the figures of the government, as my hon. leader pointed out, the result of the calculations could well be a premium of \$20, \$40 and \$50 for everyone in the province of Ontario.

Now I will leave that point until the conclusion of my remarks having, I believe, to my satisfaction and I hope to the satisfaction of the House, satisfied myself as to the reason why this government has amended this bill. I hope I have conveyed something of the sense of concern that we on this side of the House have in getting the attention of the government to the fundamental problem and getting the attention of the people of the province of Ontario to the fact that this scheme is an unsatisfactory scheme, that it is an uneconomic scheme, that people cannot afford to pay this kind of premium; and

particularly people cannot afford to pay that kind of premium when they have retired.

There may well come a day when that kind of money is not significant, but hon. members know, as I know, that the person who has to pay \$150 a year, plus, I believe, something in the neighbourhood of \$75 for hospital insurance as well, on retirement pay with a total cost to him of \$225, not including drugs and many of the other expensive items of medical coverage under a proper Medicare scheme, that amount when totalled up for a person liable to have a serious illness is an intolerable burden on the people of the province of Ontario and results from the segregation of the people of Ontario into these two classes: The high-risk group which the government will perpetuate, the pool which will continue to be made up of the people who cannot afford to pay that kind of money; and the other groups in the province of Ontario who are lucky enough during the period of their employment or during the other variations of the group plan to continue as members of groups and have the benefit of a lower cost, and in many cases a hidden premium.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend today to take the time of the House to repeat, other than by brief reference, the comments which I made in the debate on the second reading of this bill last year other than to say that we on this side of the House consider this bill to be as that bill was: Uneconomic, inequitable, regressive and one which is fundamentally opposed to the way in which the people of the province of Ontario desire to have the coverage to which they are entitled against the costs of doctors' and physicians' bills.

The uneconomic element of it is perfectly clear. The province of Ontario as a whole, with all the demands on its resources, cannot afford to pay this kind of cost for a total overall Medicare scheme. They can afford to pay the kind of costs which are involved in my hon. leader's figures, and they are not able to pay anything more than that cost.

It is regressive because, to the extent that this kind of premium is in the nature of a tax on people, it means that it bears heaviest on those who can least afford to pay it. And in that sense it is a regressive policy.

It is inequitable—in the same sense that those who are well and healthy, and have the good fortune for a certain period of their life to be members of groups having the benefit of a low rate when they do not, on many occasions, need it, when they get older and are ill, or are more liable to illness and

are more likely to have medical expense, are going to have to pay this intolerable amount for this kind of coverage.

I have tried, because I have no facility with figures, to envisage the kind of people, the kind of group in one place, and relate the cost which this government proposes to that kind of a group. You see the 1.8 million, plus all the other people that they have now taken out of the hands of the private insurance companies in order to leave the private insurance companies just with the group business are scattered all over the province so that no member of this House represents those people. They have no way of making their voice felt in a unified way.

I thought that we could perhaps look at this House today with 108 members. We will call it 100 members for the sake of the simple calculation that I would like to make. Assume for a moment that we all had to be covered under this particular scheme which the government is propounding today, because we did not belong to groups and because we were in the high-risk category. Then you would find—using \$100 figure because, after all, the government has used \$60, \$120 and \$150 and I think everybody in the House would agree that \$100 per member is a pretty satisfactory low average of what the premium would be—that in this House, for one year, 100 members times \$100 would mean that this House would bear and pay for medical services of doctors and physicians, not hospital services and not drugs and not all the other exclusions which are in there, \$10,000; and that defies my common sense. I do not think that at any occasion, at any time, have the physicians' and surgeons' bills of the members of this Legislature been \$10,000 in any one year.

An hon. member: Prove it.

Mr. Renwick: An hon. member asked me to prove it. What we are asking the government to do is to produce figures which will persuade me that this does not appeal to my common sense.

I will give another example which, whether or not I can prove it, is satisfactory to me. And, as a person who represents that riding, I would not stand for one minute, nor would the hon. member for Scarborough North, or the hon. member for Beaches, or the hon. member for London South, or any other hon. member in this House, if he makes the calculation.

In my riding of Riverdale, and making the projection that the people in Riverdale had to be covered at this cost, there are 15,000

households in my riding and there are between 35,000 and 40,000 people. For those who are not aware of its limits, it is a small riding. It extends from the Don River to Jones avenue, and from the boundary between the township of East York and the city of Toronto down to the lake. For the people in my riding, using again the conservative figure of \$100 per household, under the premium which the government proposes to charge, this would mean that there would be extracted from my riding, for doctors' and physicians' services in one year, \$1.5 million.

Or again, with the only kind of mathematics that I understand, if this was the kind of premium which was being charged to my people, and if you put all the people who are going to be covered by the government scheme into one constituency and they had a representative in this House, in ten years those people in that constituency would be paying \$15 million in doctors' and physicians' bills.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps you will understand, and this House will understand, why we in this party and on this side of the House, including the Liberal Party, are going to fight this bill and the principle of this bill until it is defeated, whether it is done this year, next year, or the year after. And we want simple, clear, unequivocal answers to the questions which I have tried to place on behalf of my party in this debate.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a rehash of medical insurance again this year as we have on other occasions. I listened with very great interest to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) when he spoke on and proposed amendments to the bill. I could not help but think, Mr. Speaker, that the once great Liberal Party, which stands for some of the things that the Conservative Party stands for—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Cowling: The once great Liberal Party of Ontario, I said. They are now moving just a little bit over toward the socialists when they propose such an amendment as the hon. leader has proposed.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): They will change it tomorrow.

Mr. Cowling: I would think that they would be supporting, as I support, the system of free enterprise where people have a choice

to make whether it is in the purchase of insurance or anything else.

Mr. MacDonald: It is absolute.

Mr. Cowling: But they are not doing that. They are moving away over to the other side. As far as the NDP is concerned, I can understand their attitude; they are for state control of everything. They are socialists and they make no bones about it, so we will have to give them marks for that.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member's definition of socialism is a little off.

Mr. Cowling: Well, I have my definition of socialism, and it applies to the NDP, in total.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member should have heard what an insurance agent said about him.

An hon. member: Are you in favour of this bill?

Mr. Cowling: I am in favour of this bill; is that clear? And I am going to tell the hon. members why.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): The hon. member was in favour of the last one.

Mr. Cowling: That is right. I was in favour of the last one. And I will probably be in favour of the next one, too.

An hon. member: When will that come?

Another hon. member: Every week a new bill.

Mr. Cowling: Mr. Speaker, if the Opposition continues to vote against this—and I was quite amused by the last speaker and what he had to say about the poor insurance companies; they get an awful going over in the House. He said that they were going to fight; well, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that group could fight its way out of a paper bag if it had to.

As far as the insurance companies are concerned in the province of Ontario, let us be realistic; they perform a very good public service for the citizens of Ontario. They pay millions of dollars in taxes to the various governments in the province.

An hon. member: They get it from us.

Mr. Cowling: What is wrong with that? Why put them out of business? They are just making an honest dollar the same as any-

body else. I do not pretend to speak for the insurance companies because I have no particular brief to hold for them. As I said before, I believe they do a great public service, the companies and their agency forces, and I think that there is a place for them in the community.

There are two or three articles in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, which caught my attention in connection with this bill, Mr. Speaker—one by Peter McClintock. He goes on to quote Premier Manning and some of his objections to this type of medical care insurance; this is what the Premier had to say and I think I agree with him. He said:

It is a compulsory programme in which participation is compelled by the state and not left to the voluntary choice of the citizen himself. This feature of the plan violates the fundamental principle of a free society, namely, the right of each citizen to exercise freedom of choice in matters relating to his own and his family's welfare.

So you people are going to take that away from him.

It is alarming to hear this plan being advocated as a programme to provide free medical services to the Canadian people. A service does not become free simply because the government pays the bill. It is a misleading thing to give the Canadian people the false impression that their governments can take on additional expenditure, amounting shortly to over \$1 billion a year, without imposing heavy additional taxation on both the federal and provincial levels.

Here is where we go, Mr. Speaker. How far are we going to go on these welfare services? How far are we going to relieve the people of making some decisions on their own? I would like to suggest that the time has come to make a stop. I think that this bill fulfils the requirements of the citizens of the province and in talking to my people in High Park riding I hear very few objections to the principles outlined in Bill No. 6.

I think just for the benefit of the House, and particularly those on the other side, Mr. Speaker, we should briefly run over just what this bill provides. In the first place, it is universally available to everybody.

An hon. member: So are Cadillacs.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, yes; that is a point there. Is the hon. member going to speak in this debate, by the way?

An hon. member: Yes, I am.

Mr. Cowling: Fine, I will look forward to it.

It is universally available to everybody in the province. Those who have the wherewithal can purchase a medical insurance plan of their choice and those who do not have the money are going to be assisted by the government.

Now I cannot see anything that could be fairer than that. What is the point of paying premiums for people who can look after themselves? As far as the group business is concerned in the province, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of thousands of people insured in groups in our provinces covered by medical care insurance who are paying premiums far far less than the ones suggested in this bill. In many cases these agreements have been negotiated and the employer is paying half the premium or in many cases the employer is paying all the premium. So how foolish would these people be to give up that sort of a situation and buy the government plan.

Now the other thing is that the low-income groups are invited to obtain the coverage. It is just a plain simple fact if one is not satisfied with the coverage one has the government plan is available at a price; and I think at a very reasonable price: \$60 for the single person, \$120 for a man and his wife and \$150 for the man, wife and a family. Knowing something about medical insurance rates I do know that that is a reasonable and sensible rate and one that most people in our province can well afford to pay.

Now, the third point in this bill, the proposal, is complementary to present insurance programmes providing for groups. Here again we leave an area where private insurance companies through their agents can still be in the field of medical insurance. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have got to realize that medical insurance was first provided for citizens of the province of Ontario by private insurance companies and private insurance companies through their work have at the present time upwards of 83 per cent of the people in our province covered by some form of medical coverage. I think that is a pretty good record.

I think we would be very foolish, Mr. Speaker, to step into this situation and say OK, we are going to provide everybody with a medical insurance plan. I just do not think it is fair to the other citizens who are providing something on their own. This idea of compulsion and telling people that they have to do certain things, I think, should be kept to the absolute minimum.

The fourth point is that this will facilitate comprehensive physicians' services to all. Some hon. member the other day was talking about the need for taking a hard look at the medical services provided for the people of our province and some hon. members have been very critical, not only of the insurance companies but of our doctors, our medical doctors, in the province of Ontario. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I think we would be in pretty poor shape if we did not have our medical profession on the job and looking after us. It is all very well to criticize these people, it is all very well to criticize the medical doctors and to tell them the poor job that they are doing and that they are overcharging and what their average income is and what not; but as hon. members know the average medical doctor puts in longer hours than we do.

An hon. member: It is all these insurance companies we are against.

Mr. Cowling: But the hon. members are also against the medical profession. I have to admire the hon. Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker. The hon. Minister of Health has sat through this debate. I do not know how he has retained his seat as well as he has, I doubt very much if I could have done so. He has very quietly and very courteously listened to the comments of the hon. members on the other side, some of them not very complimentary. As a matter of fact, there are hardly any that are complimentary. I am sure that when his opportunity comes to answer some of these criticisms that we will all enjoy quite a speech, as we always do.

I am for the doctor. I am for the medical doctor and every assistance that we can give him, I think we should; because God help the community if we did not have the doctors, so more power to them.

Now we have taken care of the insurance companies and the doctors. Another feature of this bill is that there are no exclusions for reasons of health, occupation of financial circumstances. In other words, it is open to everybody and it is going to be available for everybody.

An hon. member: The group coverage is not open to everybody.

Mr. Cowling: Well, the groups do not need it. If one has a group plan where one is paying an annual premium of \$50 why would one pay \$150 for this? As far as the hon. members are concerned they could make it \$25; the hon. leader of the NDP came up

with some figure about \$28, which sounds pretty fantastic to me.

Another feature of the programme is that benefits are comprehensive and can cover practically all physicians' services. I have already covered what a good job the doctors do, Mr. Speaker. I think this bill will be the answer to many of the problems of our citizens who are not in a position to provide medical care insurance.

Under the government plan they will have practically all those services taken care of and the premium provided by the government. It is designed to dovetail into hospital insurance and in that way I suppose, in the foreseeable future, we could see the hospital insurance and the medical insurance being moved into one area.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that there is much to be said for the voluntary plan. That is the point I really want to get across. The advantages of a voluntary plan ensure that medical health services will remain at a high level. The doctor-patient relationship will not be disturbed, and the plan retains a flexibility which will allow change without chaos. Further, under the government's voluntary plan, large scale tax increases on personal income or corporation taxes will not be immediately needed. This means, in a period of economic expansion, that tax measures which would retard the growth and development of the province will not have to be introduced.

Equally important is the freedom of the individual to decide on a course of action without being penalized for making a decision on his own behalf while, at the same time, knowing that those less fortunate will be looked after in part or in full by the government.

The other day the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) was talking about the Magna Carta and the fact that, over the last thousand years, we have come a long, long way in our freedom and in our form of parliamentary government and in our affairs generally. And he said it was a long hard fight—and I agree with him—to arrive at the stage at which we have arrived today. But there again, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this proposal in Bill No. 6 by our government is doing precisely that. It is providing adequate care for those who cannot provide it for themselves; and it will permit freedom of choice for all others.

I urge all hon. members to support this bill and not to support the amendment or proposed amendments from the other side.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, one of the advantages of following other speakers is that one has an advantage of dealing with some of the statements they make. This is the second time in less than a year that we have been presented with a Medicare bill in this House. Last year's Bill No. 136 was totally inadequate to the extent that the government decided to bring in an amendment to The Medical Services Insurance Act which is the bill we have before us today.

As I listened to a number of government speakers extolling the virtues of this bill, I could not help but think back to last year, when the bill was before the House; in most cases, these very same members took the opportunity to give Bill No. 136 their full support. It was obvious, right from the start, that the bill would have a short life, but that did not deter the hon. members on the government benches from getting up and supporting it wholeheartedly. It is coincidental that last year, on second reading of Bill No. 136, I was preceded in the debate by my hon. friend from High Park—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Pretty shabby experience to have.

Mr. Gaunt: Very much so. My hon. friend has once again taken up the cause of the insurance companies, as he did last year. I can almost detect, Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to make a personal observation, the dollar signs in my hon. friend's eyes as he espouses the interests of the insurance companies.

I recall last year that my friend, the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling), on page 3490 of *Hansard* said:

As a beginning, I just cannot possibly see that we are going to have too much objection to it.

Obviously, there was a great public outcry over the bill—so much so that the government has decided to bring in this amendment. Of course, last year's bill, in my mind, was not Medicare, it was doctors' and insurance care. Basically, this bill is no different.

The hon. member for High Park said on second reading of Bill No. 136 last year, found on page 3488 of *Hansard*:

Let us give our government credit. We are proposing something new today. We have finished with the report—

he is referring, I presume, to the Hagey report—

—and we have taken note of the recom-

mendations and now we have come up with a bill and this bill contains all the things we think it should within reason.

Mr. Speaker, in retrospect, I say to the hon. member for High Park that if last year's bill contained all the things that it should have, I find it difficult to understand why the government has scrapped the entire bill except for five sections. One almost gets the impression that government members will support anything, provided the government sponsors it.

Then I turn to my hon. friend from Renfrew South (Mr. Yakubuski). Last year in *Hansard* he is quoted in the same debate. At page 3522 in regard to second reading of Bill No. 136, he says:

I might say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I am supporting this bill completely because I feel that this will be the beginning of the greatest health plan known anywhere on this continent.

Here again, Mr. Speaker, it clearly indicates that the government members did not grasp the import of last year's bill, nor are they grasping the import of the bill this year because we are witnessing the same old story all over again.

We know that good health is costly, but we consider that poor health of people is more costly to society. The world health organization, in the preamble to its charter says:

Enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health is one of the fundamental rights of every human being without distinction of race, religion, political belief, economic or social condition.

It goes on:

The health of all peoples is fundamental to the attainment of peace and security and is dependent upon the fullest co-operation of individuals and states.

In a democratic society, our most treasured possession is health. The economic capacity of a country's citizens to be productive depends upon their health and vigour as much as upon their educational attainments. There is a shortage of nurses and doctors and paramedical personnel. We have heard this many times; it is a well-established fact. We have heard it from government members, we have heard it from Opposition members, we have heard it from all members at various times. The unfortunate thing about this plan is that by excluding all of the paramedical groups in the province, even greater pressure is put upon the limited medical resources. Indeed, those resources would be pushed and

will be pushed to the breaking point if the bill is not amended to include these groups.

Let us take a look at some of those groups. The point I want to make in relation to these groups is that by exclusion of such services the hon. Minister, through this bill, is not allowing freedom of choice but is, in effect, denying it. Let me explain.

Statistics show that in Ontario one out of every six people utilize the services of chiropractors at a cost of \$6 million annually. This implies that over one million people are now using chiropractic treatment in the province of Ontario. Indeed, the role of the chiropractor in the health service field is gradually and slowly being recognized. Saskatchewan included chiropractic care in their medical programme on April 6, 1965. The governments of Alberta and Manitoba provide chiropractic benefits to recipients of welfare and pensions. As a matter of fact, right here in this province we provide chiropractic services under The Workmen's Compensation Act without suffering financial penalties. It is interesting to note that chiropractors are the third healing profession in their field. Let me leave that for just a moment.

Now, a word about the optometrists, another group that is excluded in the present bill. At the present time, optometrists perform 65 per cent of refractions in Ontario, beyond welfare cases, and 2,151,250 Ontario residents and dependants require vision care services on a continuing basis. 600,000 refractions are performed by optometrists, who have more than 1,700,000 patients in the province of Ontario. It is rather obvious that if the optometrists are not included, this will mean that more than 1,500,000 residents of the province will have to pay for that service themselves, or they will attempt to get the same service by going to an ophthalmologist, who are already overworked to the extent that you have to wait for approximately three months in order to get an appointment.

However—and this is in addition to what I have already been saying—63 of the 110 Ontario communities with a population of 3,000 or more, have optometrists as the only practitioners, and I underscore that, as the only practitioners available to provide the refraction benefits. If optometrists are not covered under the bill, this means in effect that the patient is not in a position to make a completely free choice of practitioners.

In one case, the patient has to pay out of his own pocket, and in the other he is covered by his medical insurance. I would strongly suggest that unless optometrists are

included in any Medicare plan, it would mean a decrease in availability of vision care services, and subsequently a lowering of vision care standards.

This kind of situation will not enhance the health care in the province of Ontario. The hon. Minister has made much of the fact that he does not want this plan to be compulsory. He wants everyone to have, as he puts it, freedom of choice. My hon. friend has underscored this time and time again. He did it last year, he has done it this year and I imagine he will continue to do it: The point is that a patient does not have freedom of choice in this kind of Medicare. A patient who wishes to engage the services of a chiropractor may feel that he cannot do so because he cannot afford it, particularly when the services of a doctor are covered under the plan. The same holds true, of course, for the services of an optometrist and others in the paramedical field.

The government has, in effect, made a valued judgment by saying that we will include doctors and nothing else. I say that, under these conditions, the patient does not have freedom of choice. One of the hon. Minister's fundamental principles in guiding the drafting of this bill has been negated. The patient has lost his freedom of choice. It gets down to a matter of what amounts to a ridiculous judgment between the loss of freedom embraced by Bill No. 6 and the loss of freedom embraced by a universal comprehensive compulsory Medicare plan against the background of meeting the health needs of the people of the province.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting that we should have a definite undertaking that these services that I have been talking about should be phased into the programme as quickly as possible. As of now, to my mind, we have not had this definite undertaking. I stand here to oppose the principle of this bill.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion by Mr. A. E. Thompson (leader of the Opposition):

RESOLUTION: That a select committee of this House be appointed immediately to review the rules and procedures of the House and to recommend appropriate

changes, including a complete reorganization of the committee system and amendments to the rules, to permit the filming and tape-recording of the regular business of this House, providing certain safeguards against interference with the proceedings or dignity of this chamber.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, this is the second year that I have tried to initiate a debate on this resolution and I suppose there are some hon. members who would feel I should be grateful to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) for permitting me to bring the resolution forward.

No matter how many hon. members of this House have a sincere and genuine personal respect for any members of the executive, I think it should not blind them to the fact that such adulation does not mean that you hand over the whole and the total business of the House to the initiative of either one man, Mr. Speaker, one party or one bureaucracy. The practice and the rules of this House are very clear on private bills. It was never the right of the hon. Prime Minister to decide whether any resolution should be called or not. It is very clearly stated in the rules—rule 28—when private members' bills should be called; he has been breaking that rule, as his predecessor had. It is clearly stated in the rules—rule 31—that all items standing in the orders of the day shall be taken up according to the precedent assigned to each. The hon. Prime Minister has been breaking that rule, as well.

I suppose in this debate, as I look at the way rules have been broken and the way that the executive have trampled, suffocated and submerged the rightful position of the Opposition, that I could wax bitter. But I do not intend to do that because I think that there is an atmosphere of wanting to de-deem the things of the past. It is for that reason that I am going to speak in moderate tone about something which I think, if I expose it, has really made a sham of this parliamentary assembly.

In order, sir, that you will not have the slightest inclination to rule me out of order, although I know that is the last thing you ever want to do, I should like to define what I mean by parliamentary procedure. I go to May as my authority. He breaks it into three classifications. The first is the forms of proceedings used in either House, and by that he means the process of bills, debates by motion, questions, and so on. The second is the machinery of direction and delegation

established, and by that he means officers and committees. The third is the rules which govern the working, or the form, of procedure.

As we all know, sir, the traditions and the practice of Westminster were formed when Parliament was in opposition to the monarchy. In the early days, there was wide scope to individual members and there was very little scope to the government. But with the advent of parties and the use of Cabinet, it became more necessary to have standing orders in order to give shape to parliamentary deliberations. Parliament is a strange, almost a schizophrenic being, in that it has two contradictory functions. In the parliamentary forum there is, first, the governing body which has to put into legislation its mandate from the electorate. On the other side, there is the Opposition, which has to be provided with the necessary time and with the information to perform its constitutional functions. That is why, sir, the written rules provide for certain days on which private members' business takes precedence over government business. With all respect to the hon. Prime Minister, he is completely wrong when he says that government must always have precedence. It shows a lack of understanding of this great forum. Government does not always have precedence, there is the time for the Opposition and private members to have their say.

Indeed, sir, as we read this little booklet that we get from the well-known family on parliamentary procedure, and I am referring to *Parliamentary Procedure in Ontario* by Alex C. Lewis, we become quite inspired as Opposition members when we read the opportunities that we are going to have. With your indulgence I will read from page 14, and it says:

In one other important feature the Ontario House differs from its Imperial ancestor.

With great respect for the knowledge and contribution which the Lewises have made to the Legislature, as a Liberal and not a Conservative as Mr. Lewis was, I understand—not when he became Clerk of the House but when he was, I think, a Conservative member—perhaps that is why he refers to an Imperial ancestor.

I notice on another page he talks about the British Empire; but I understand we are not a colony, we are a nation. For new hon. members I think it disturbs us if we look at this—

An hon. member: That was okay, but where is it in 38?

Mr. Thompson: In 39? May I say that it says:

In the Legislature the private member receives much greater consideration than he does in the British House of Commons. In the latter House the proportion of private members' bills which become laws is very small indeed. Friday afternoon is the only time provided for the use of the large number of private members, and unless a bill is absolutely non-controversial and is passed by agreement it has very little chance of being considered.

The private members—

and this is referring to Ontario:

The private members in Ontario get full preference on Wednesdays and Fridays and divide the time with the government on Monday afternoons and as a consequence no bill introduced by a private member need fail for lack of proper consideration.

I think that has been wishful thinking for year after year in this Legislature, because I want to establish that we have not been getting the opportunity to bring forward our point of view in this Legislature.

I looked on last week, last Monday, as an historical victory for the Opposition, even though I noticed that there was a reporter from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* who suggested that we lost the battle. I think it is because he does not know the background of the difficulty of the Opposition to have resolutions and bills brought before this House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): They have always been brought.

Mr. Thompson: I will indicate to hon. members that they have not been brought, including my own bill right here which was not brought last year. If they have always been brought, why were they not brought last year?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: They were brought.

Mr. Thompson: It most certainly was not brought last year.

An hon. member: How many were?

Mr. Thompson: I will go into the fact of how many were not. I was very glad to hear the agreement that at the end of the day's sitting—five o'clock—we were going to debate a resolution re hate literature. I thought the other thing which was historical was the fact that the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) had played a part in bringing forward a resolution; that the Opposition were going to have a resolution—admittedly in co-opera-

tion with a government member—that was going to be adopted. If you look at the history of this Legislature, you will find that is a unique experience.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Oh, no. It happened back in 1957.

Mr. Thompson: 1957 is a long time, all the same, in comparison with the U.K. and also with Ottawa.

Mr. MacDonald: I believe it was one of my resolutions that got amended and passed.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say, for example, in the U.K., that first of all a time of debate for private members is established. There are 20 Fridays given over to private members. And I admit they say it is a blind chance; they had to go through a ballot in order to know who would be permitted to bring forward a resolution, but there are 600 members in the U.K.

In Ottawa there is a definite time for debate for private members. However, you get the opportunity to speak in the Legislature; you have one hour of the first three days of the week. In the Ontario Legislature, as yet, there is no set time, even though the rules definitely say this. We have the rules broken by the hon. Prime Minister and we have to wait on his whim whether we will have our resolutions and bills brought before the Legislature.

Now, I will show, Mr. Speaker, that private members' bills and resolutions of the Opposition have not been brought before this Legislature. The hon. Prime Minister has said they are always brought forward. Let me give you this sordid tale. In 1960 there were 12 private members' bills introduced. One was debated.

In 1960 to 1961, 14 were introduced; five were debated. In 1961-62, 17 were introduced and four debated. In 1962-63, 12 were introduced and three debated. In the 26th session the total time given over to private members by this government, through breaking rules so that we could not speak, was five and a half hours of the total session. In the 27th session, through breaking the rules so that we could not speak, we were given one hour and eight minutes. And yet we introduced our bills early in the session.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: What year was that?

Mr. Thompson: In 1960; I said the times in the 26th session and the 27th session given over to private members' bills. In 1960 we introduced ten bills in the first month. So if the government says we introduced them too

late to be fitted in to any time this is utter nonsense. In 1961 and 1962 ten were again introduced in the first month, and none was debated until the second to the last day of the session. One was mine. You know, Mr. Speaker, as a fair man, the short shrift that we have had from this government.

An hon. member: Right.

Mr. Thompson: They will draw in our resolutions and bills in the dead of night, or else they wait until the very last day of the session and put them in to give us some small satisfaction in it. This time we are going to expose to the people of Ontario the fact that a government arrogant and complacent with its full majority is stamping on the Opposition and the rights of an Opposition and therefore the rights of the people of this province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: What about resolutions? The hon. Prime Minister said you could always bring your resolutions in. In 1961 and 1962 six resolutions were brought forward. None was debated by a Conservative Prime Minister who does not like debate in the House, and who does not like points of view expressed. Therefore, our resolutions were simply discarded and ignored by breaking the laws of this Legislature.

Let me point to the British House, vibrant and virile with great traditions of free speech—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Objection to that.

Mr. Thompson: Let me point to Westminster.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: In 1961 and in 1962, Mr. Speaker, six resolutions were brought before this House. Not one of them was permitted to be debated. In Westminster in that same year, there were 17 resolutions brought forward and eight of them were passed. There seemed to me to be more courage on the part of a government in Westminster, more recognition of the tradition of a free parliament, than by this government. Bloated by its swollen majority, indifferent to the rights of the people, it will not permit discussion by private members, and the record is sordid and speaks of arrogance. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that last Monday a battle was won by us.

Why do we have private members' bills,

Mr. Speaker? We have private members' bills because the government, although it may feel that it covers all the necessary legislation for the people of Ontario, is also the representative of the people of Ontario; and we have concerns of our people which we want to have discussed in this House. This is the way by which we can have these discussions, and that is why we have bills by private hon. members.

May I state another fact, sir—that if there was more opportunity for private members to participate there would not be so many of those men in the background there, in the back benches, sitting and dozing day after day, making little contribution to anything. There would be opportunity for them to suddenly take a new interest and bring forward a resolution, and they might then begin to know what a parliament is all about.

The other and most important point, I think, in having an opportunity for private members' bills, is that there must be an opportunity for the Opposition to have initiative in the House. Not only should we always have to debate government legislation but, in turn, government should have to debate the legislation which we propose. Therefore, for that reason, we are still not satisfied.

We appreciate that the hon. Prime Minister has stated that there will be periods for us to debate private members' bills, but the rules are there; it is set down that there should be a set time. It was recommended by two select committees that there should be a set time for private members' bills, and we hope that the hon. Prime Minister will say that definitely there will be a set time for private members' bills. There is another aspect to this: If you would do this it allows all of us who have resolutions to know that we should be preparing ourselves for that time.

The role of an Opposition, sir, is not only to have the opportunity to initiate legislation but is also to be able to draw out information from the government. And yet, sir, as you well recognize, in a government that is indifferent to the rights of Parliament, there is a tendency for it to abuse its opportunity in giving information. May I say that, in Britain, when a Minister makes a statement, on the whole—if you will study that area—you will find that usually it is a written statement because of the procedure they go through.

I notice, in one of your rulings, you were saying that a Minister in Westminster has the opportunity to make a statement. I would suggest to you that, mostly, it is a written statement that is made. In Ottawa, when a

Minister makes a statement it is a brief statement; and, again referring to May, you will find that it is the understanding that it should be a brief statement on policy.

In Ontario, we have this peculiar situation: First of all the Minister makes a statement after first reading—perhaps some day you can explain that to me, that he does not introduce his bill before he presents it to the House, but it passes in first reading and then he makes a statement. And may I say, in all candor, sir: What a statement he makes sometimes; what an epistle he gives; and how many chapters are included!

In 1964 there were 136 statements by Ministers. And let me outline the classic one: May says these statements should be short and brief and to the point. Well, it took the hon. Prime Minister of this province an hour to make one of his statements; that is how short and brief he was. That was on April 22, 1964.

And then we saw the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), how he has abused the situation where he has the privilege of making a statement. There was a shocking situation, for we had to listen to his diatribe about his political philosophy. I am not sure at that time if he included how he looked at Bennett or not—that was another occasion I think, when he was introducing the medical insurance Act. He took five pages of *Hansard*. I do not consider that particularly brief.

As well as that, we have had statements by Ministers before the orders of the day. In 1964, we were swamped with them—we had 44 of them—and they took up four hours of this Legislature's time. I could refer to May in connection with these statements but I bring it to your attention, sir, because I know that you would not want the Opposition to be abused through an overflow of verbosity on the part of the government. We want them to get to the point.

While I am at it, sir, there is another Minister over there, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). There was a classic. There was a fighting member up here who had raised a question about the economic board, I think it was, and we listened for hours to the hon. Minister—there are so many fighting members here that they do not know which it is. In this case it was the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent) and we had the hon. Minister of Economics and Development—he swung as though he was Tarzan or something; he was all over the map in answer to the question. I would have hoped, sir, that

you would have called him to order. By my making these points—I know he is a sensitive man who would never want to be accused of abusing the rights of Parliament—he will remember not to swing all over the place again.

Let me repeat the question, sir. Again, this is so the Opposition can elicit information. I may say that the first question recorded having been asked—I know this is of interest to the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope), a historian of note—was about the South Sea Bubble, not Windfall, and was put to the Prime Minister in 1721.

The clerk of the British estimates committee had said that questions were one of the most effective methods of control of the executive ever invented—and this executive knows it.

Do they want to have any control by the people; do they want to have an examination and a scrutiny before this Legislature by this Opposition for benefit of the people of Ontario?

Hon. members have seen the way they have dodged around in trying to answer questions. Look at the rules here for the written questions. The written question in Ontario is distinct from Ottawa and Westminster. In Ottawa we have a starred question which means that the Minister has to answer aloud.

With us, if we have a written question, look at the subterfuge. First of all, our question goes through you, Mr. Speaker. I do not know why it does not go through the Clerk, or why you, sir, have to act as the censor, a fair-minded man like you.

It would be better if questions went through the Clerk. Why should you be embarrassed and put into a position like that? In Ottawa and Westminster, they have starred questions and they want an oral answer.

Here, when you write an answer, you know what happens, Mr. Speaker. You blush just as much with shame at this government as I have. You know what happens; the answer is never read aloud. In a hushed tone, it is handed back and the Minister, so scared he may have to say something on policy, hides behind the skirts of the hon. Prime Minister. He is the man who tables these answers, not the Minister himself.

Why? Think that one over, Mr. Speaker. I do not want to embarrass him by suggesting why, but you may have ideas.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): What kind of ideas?

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Use your fertile imagination.

Mr. Thompson: And yet in 1960 the select committee recommended the amendment of rule 37 to provide for starred questions, to which oral answers should be given. But the last thing a scared and apprehensive government wants to do is stand up on their feet and answer questions, if they can have the hon. Prime Minister waiting until the end of the session and then handing out the answers. That is far better. But that does not make good government and does not show respect for this Legislature.

I notice—and he is not here, unfortunately—that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), when I had to read a question to him, seemed to have a sympathy for the straitjacket into which we are put, and that we had to read these questions, because you are being placed in this unfortunate embarrassing position in which you have to censor a question. You have to watch it so we do not miss a word or change a word and so on. This is unfortunate. In Ottawa, again, you do not have to go through this rigamarole of rushing into your office with a question. Some people, sir, have suggested to me when they have to get those questions to you before 12 o'clock that this means you have to get on the phone. People have suggested this; I do not know if it is true or not; and you phone the Minister and tell him: "Look, you have got a question; get your civil servants to get an answer for you so that you will not look silly. Get an answer."

An hon. member: That is exactly right.

Mr. Speaker: We just transmit the questions.

Mr. Thompson: But this is it, of course: Why should you be placed in a position like that where people might think you are a sort of a hack, sir? We have far more respect for you than to ever think you would be, but some people might think you are a hack or a messenger boy for the Cabinet. Why should you be in a position like that? Why should we not have a more open form of question without this censorship to which you have to be put?

Mr. MacDonald: He has to rule on it.

Mr. Thompson: He could rule in the House.

May I say on another point, sir, that the hon. Minister, as we have seen—and he is not here either, the hon. Minister for Municipal

Affairs (Mr. Spooner)—he shows such arrogance to this assembly that when you ask him a question he goes into something about the benefits of OMERS, which has nothing to do with it, and then sits down again.

Mr. MacDonald: He acts just like C. D. Howe.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say that in Canada, in the federal House, the Speaker has ordered an answer to be erased from *Hansard* as irrelevant and ordered that the answer be given if the question is asked again. In Britain—and I know your reverence for Westminster, that is why I am bringing up Britain as much as I am—in Britain a Minister has to give a reason why he does not answer. He has to give a good reason. The usual reason he has is that it is contrary to the public interest and the other is because it is not his responsibility. If he does not give a good reason for not answering, there can be a motion of censure.

Now, sir, when we ask the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs how many times or with whom he has negotiated and he starts talking about the joys and benefits of OMERS, surely we should have been able to say to him: "Give us a good reason why you will not answer. Is it because it is contrary to public interest?" I can think nothing that is more to public interest than to know where the government stands on integration or stacking of pensions: Or is it because it is not his responsibility?

Tell us one or the other, put him on the spot. If they are not capable of standing on their feet, then let the public know that. Do not have this hidden kind of camouflage they have in connection with questions.

Let me say this. In Ontario one of the real frustrations is, of course, that even though we write questions in and go through all the formula that is set up—the delays we have to go through and the censorship and so on—even though we write the questions we are often lucky if we get any answer at all. Usually we get the answer at the very end of the session, the last day in some cases.

In the 1962-63 session of this Legislature, 81 per cent of the written questions were answered and that is a shoddy performance in relation to either Ottawa or to Westminster. One of the excuses—I have said this before and I want to emphasize it—the hon. member for Downsview put in 112 questions last year and we waited and waited and waited to get replies to these, and one point raised in excuse was that they are overworked, the administration is overworked.

As I pointed out to the hon. Prime Minister, in Westminster there is an average of over 12,000 questions that are asked during the session. There is an average in Ontario, in this Legislature, of 83 questions. In each sitting day in the United Kingdom there are 105 questions; in Ontario there are six questions. Surely an excuse that the civil servants of the department are overworked, in light of the very small number of questions we bring in, is not adequate.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope: (Minister of Mines): You are not doing your work if that is all the questions there are.

Mr. Thompson: One of the reasons—let me emphasize to the hon. Minister of Mines—is the fact we do not get answers to the questions. We do not get answers, and this is tabulated.

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I should congratulate Professor Schindler for having done this study which exposes the arrogance and the indifference of the government in giving information to the Opposition and to the people of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, will you permit a question? I just wondered where the hon. leader of the Opposition was able to acquire a copy of Professor Schindler's report. As the hon. leader of the Opposition knows, we helped finance that as a government, but I have yet to—

Mr. MacDonald: It is filed at the university.

Mr. Thompson: Well, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Prime Minister, it is at the university and Professor Schindler has also made several speeches. I would strongly recommend that he get it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Just while we are on the question, to answer the hon. Minister of Mines—because I like to be prompt when I answer, even though the government is not—in answer to the hon. Minister of Mines, we do not get answers to questions. In the 1964 session it took on the average 48 days to get an answer from this government to written questions. What about the U.K.? In the U.K. they were first of all instructed to have answers in seven days, and remember they had over 12,000 questions in a year. Then R. A. Butler, acting as Prime Minister in 1960, said: "We are going to get answers in three days." They knew how to manage a department and they were on top, to some extent anyway, of their job and they were

prepared to give answers. They recognize Parliament as a place where information should be given freely and not hidden away until the end of the session.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member means the distance to the office of the hon. Minister.

Mr. Thompson: Let me say why we need answers, Mr. Speaker. Among many reasons is the fact that first of all there could be a situation with which the public had deep concern and they want to get an answer as to where the government stands. If we have to wait 48 days the situation is past and there is no reassurance to the people of the province that the government even knows about it, let alone what they are going to do, if they make us wait for the 48 days.

Another question occurred, sir. When the estimates come up—and this is the case with the hon. member for Downsview—it is important that prior to the estimates coming up that he should have knowledge about the department and that is why he asked the written question. I think it ill behoves a government, wanting to show a democratic face to the people, it ill behoves it to hold off on giving answers until the particular Minister has shuffled his estimates through this House and then later, at the end of the session, he comes out with the answers. This shows a fearful and an apprehensive man, not one who is on top of his department. Yet, in many cases they have the answers.

The hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. K. Bryden) asked a question of the hon. Minister of Labour about automation. It was in 1963, I think, where he asked the question about whether the hon. Minister would set up a committee on automation.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): As they announced they were doing.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, and we would still like to hear what they are doing on that by the way, but we will bring that question up a little later.

But when he asked this question, for three weeks, I think it was either three or five weeks, he waited for an answer.

Mr. Bryden: I have waited five months sometimes.

Mr. Thompson: And then, during the estimates on labour, he asked the hon. Minister, he said: "I have a question to which I have wanted an answer." And the hon. Minister said: "Well, I will give you the answer right

here." It is quoted right in *Hansard*. He said: "No, I have not set up anything."

Why could not that have been done within three days, the way it is in Britain? What are you trying to hide, Mr. Speaker? Why are they fearful of showing the people of Ontario what their policies are? Surely a government, a democratic government, would want to show to the people, to show to the Opposition, that they are on top of answers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what our statements are for.

Mr. Bryden: Now the hon. Minister should be careful. His statements are just to avoid debate.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to another area which is again tied in with this need to both get information and to be able to initiate, and that really comes to what we were discussing yesterday. May I say, sir, that nothing hurts me more than when I have to stand up and challenge a ruling of yours. Let me say that as far as I am concerned, I consider you one of the great Speakers of this House. I think, sir, you have an impartiality.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not what the hon. leader of the Opposition told the press.

Mr. Thompson: I said that unfortunately there are occasions when I have had to disagree and I said, even on television, I was disappointed because he is a fair man. But in this case, I thought that he was; that is why I challenged his decision—because this comes to the point of a motion. Again I think we are put in an embarrassing position when we make a motion to adjourn on a matter of urgent public importance. I say this because, according to rule 38-A, previous notice of the matter has to be submitted to you and approved by you, and yet you have no guidelines. Both in Ottawa and Westminster, they have guidelines upon which the decision is made. This is just something you have to think through on your own.

Again in Ottawa, and also in Westminster, instead of having to get the decision from you in your chambers as to whether we can raise a question of urgent public importance, in both Westminster and Ottawa the person who wants to make the motion stands up on the floor of the House and states it. Then the Speaker asks either for 20 or for 40 people who will also support the motion, and it is done in the open. In you, sir, we are fortunate

that we have a man of fairness and impartiality; but when you think back to other occasions, when there was just a slight suspicion that a Speaker might be cowed and ruled by a Prime Minister, when there was that situation what chance would we have—going into the secrecy of the Speaker's office to bring up a matter of immediate public concern? And how many such motions died in that outer office, rather than being brought onto the floor of the House?

I may say that, on the whole, I think you have been very fair; you have let us bring it onto the floor of the House and then you have made your ruling in public. But I think we should have a change in the rules because, much as I hate to say it, I do not think you are always going to be the Speaker. In fact, in maybe a year or two years, you no longer will be there; then we may have another fair Speaker, but there may be later occasions when there would not be.

I come again to the point of initiative. The Opposition must have the opportunity, in the Legislature, to censure the government, to challenge the government, to overthrow the government if necessary. Yet, in this Legislature, we are saying that this opportunity has been taken away from us. The eagle eye of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) first noticed the surreptitious manner in which the government was even trying to take this right away in the motion of supply—for you were being sent out like a messenger boy. I have spoken of it before.

There are, in Ottawa, six occasions in which the Opposition can raise grievances, can challenge the government. And, since 1960, we have seen where the government is trying to take that opportunity from us. We feel very strongly about this, because we, as Opposition, differ from other dissenting groups outside the Legislature in the one fact that we can, in this Legislature, challenge the government and overthrow it. Other groups who dissent with the government—and there are more and more of them, when you stand out in front of those steps and see the people coming forward from the churches and labour groups and farm groups and so on—cannot overthrow the government. We can.

This is the great essence of the parliamentary forum, that we can challenge them with the threat of overthrowing them. And yet even that opportunity is being taken away from us. For that we are going to fight—to see that it is brought back again. We will be watching closely, in the motion to move into committee of supply, to see that it is done

with the proper regalia and dignity that befits you, sir, and befits this House.

There are only two occasions on which we can move a vote of censure now. There is the Budget debate and the Throne debate and it may have been in the past—when we had short sessions, when we did not have as much responsibility to the people of Ontario—that only two occasions were needed. But I suggest that there should be more occasions than that today, when we think of the complexity of government and the growing length of sessions. I would hope the hon. Prime Minister might consider that we could establish either five or six occasions definitely when we might have that opportunity to move censure. I do not say we are going to, but we certainly do not want the opportunity taken from us.

Coming back again from initiative to information, one of the great needs of an Opposition, in order to be able to give an intelligent scrutiny and analysis of government policy, is to know; and I look at the hon. Minister of Labour, I look at him when I am saying this because I know he is sympathetic. He wants to give us every disclosure that he can, and yet he sits just a few seats away from one who is an artist in being able to hide figures. Do you know who that is? That is the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) of this government.

The executive branch—from the study by Schindler—when they are preparing the Budget—as I understand, and perhaps you would be good enough to correct me if I am wrong—asks the Ministers to submit to the Treasury board, by early fall, an outline of what they consider the revenue they need.

This outline that they submit, Mr. Speaker, is divided into amounts of salary and maintenance. But the hon. Provincial Treasurer found that he needed greater clarification so that he would know what he would give to the various departments, and he asked that there should be programme descriptions and costs. He asked that the proposed new programme should be broken apart from the old programmes. He asked that the existing programmes should be separated from the proposed expansion of programmes. He even got an analyst in, in order to study this more closely so they could make an intelligent assessment.

They went further than that, of course. They have a list of programmes according to priority, and if they feel they cannot afford all of these programmes then they know which ones the Minister would want to see financed. I do not suggest that we should

know the Minister's priority but I certainly suggest that we should have a clearer clarification of the estimates because, having broken that down so clearly for the hon. Provincial Treasurer, having even included an economic paper with these estimates, what happens then? What happens when it comes before the House? It is all grouped together again, shuffled around, presented to us in disguise so that we cannot take as an analytical and as clear a look at this as we should be able to.

Another thing they do, sir, and we have asked about this: The public accounts committee has asked that there should be a clearer breakdown of the estimates; and I am hoping that, with the estimates coming up this year, and because of the concern which a government should rightly have to give clarification to the Opposition so that they can make constructive, intelligent criticism, we will find that in the estimates coming this year.

May I say that there are other ways by which this government has tried to hide the true facts of spending. There is a difference between the estimated and the actual spending. The estimated is always greater. I suggest that this cannot, year after year, be poor forecasting. It has just happened too many times; a fellow cannot be wrong for so many years. I suggest it is put there because they want to hide and blur what they are really going to spend. They want to hide from the Opposition and from the people of Ontario.

Another thing that I noticed, when I looked at the estimates, is that time after time the heavy estimates come up at the end of the session, and the only thing that I can assume from this is once again that the government holds back from the opportunity of thorough scrutiny in this House, and holds back on heavy estimates and brings these in and piles them up at the end of the session.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: You may not be aware of it, but there are some others who are aware of this.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: We will stay here all summer if the hon. leader of the Opposition wants to.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. In the last three weeks of the session between 1960 and 1964, on average, this is what took place. The hon. members were asked to study an average of 28.6 pieces of new legislation, and they gave second reading to an average of 43.8 bills.

In the last three weeks they were asked to consider 88 bills in committee of the whole House, and they were asked to give third readings to 88.6 bills. If that is not being pushed all into the very last three weeks, I do not know what is. Fifty and one-half of all bills taken through the House were taken in the last three weeks.

Let us take the last five days of a session so that it becomes more apparent to the people of this province the way this government ran things at the very end so that we cannot get proper scrutiny.

In the 1962-63 session, which was one of the longest, 23.1 bills were given second reading in the last five days. There were 62.3 of the bills which went through the committee of the whole in the last five days. In 1964—imagine this, Mr. Speaker, just to show how chronically bad they are in arranging their business—there was a bill to create a new department, The Department of University Affairs. When was that given considered and reasoned opinion and scrutiny by the House? It was given on the 57th day of the session. It was called for second reading only three days before the ending. I suggest this holding and piling up of legislation cannot help but create suspicion that the government does not want adequate scrutiny and examination of legislation.

I would like to come now, sir, to another problem. This is one of the very real problems of a Legislature, and it is the problem of proper scrutiny of finances. A problem arises when an appropriation voted by the Legislature proves inadequate, or when a need arises for money for a particular project which has not even been included in the estimates. In Ottawa and Westminster, the usual method for coping with this is to go back to Parliament and ask for approval of supplementary estimates or excess votes. But the session here, sir, is short, and these techniques are never used. This is going to be a shocking one when you think that one of our main jobs—in fact, the fundamental purpose of Parliament—is to look after the financing of the people. I want to develop this a little further.

What happens here? Much more usual is the device of the special warrant, Treasury board orders and commitments. The special warrants are used to create new appropriations to cover unforeseen expenditure. Treasury board orders increase inadequate appropriation by specific amounts. Commitments are, in a sense, delayed Treasury board orders that are used when the amount of overexpenditure is not certain. The execu-

tive branch is, in a number of ways, able to check on the issuance of special warrants and Treasury board orders. The amounts issued in this way are published in the public accounts and in the auditor's annual report. However, both of these publications are made available some time after the fiscal year to which they relate is over. The important point is that the Treasury board orders and special warrants are not subject to any kind of formal legislative review. Large amounts are involved; I want to bring up how much is involved in the use of these instruments. In the years between 1959 and 1964 there was an average—an average, Mr. Speaker—of more than \$17 million a year authorized in Treasury board orders, which were never brought before this Legislature, despite the fact that government departments traditionally overestimate, as I pointed out before, to blur the actual costs. Despite that, they had a \$17 million average in Treasury board orders so that \$33 million last year—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): \$43 million last year.

Mr. Thompson: \$43 million. Year after year this arrogant spending—and the rights of the people to have it scrutinized by this House are ignored. I did not realize it was as much as \$43 million.

Between the years of 1959 to 1964, an average of more than \$1 million a year was authorized in special warrants. These sums in absolute terms are much larger than the entire Ontario budget before World War 1.

In Ottawa, all appropriations made under government general warrants, the equivalent of Ontario's special warrants and Treasury board orders, must subsequently be approved by Parliament. Honestly, much remains to be done in this field if this Legislature is to assert its traditional controls over the spending of money by the executive.

Mr. Thompson moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Bryden: Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask the hon. Prime Minister what the order of business will be tonight?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will resume the debate on Bill No. 6.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 8, 1966

Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued	311
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. S. Lewis, agreed to	331
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	331

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The fifth order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill No. 6 intituled, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

(continued)

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate on the principle of Bill No. 6 amending Bill No. 136, I would first like to make it clear to my friend the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) that I, and I am sure our party, are not opposed to doctors and are not trying to do the doctors in. We have as much respect for the medical profession and confidence in it as anyone else has. We are not entirely opposed to private insurance companies.

What we are opposed to, Mr. Speaker, in regard to health insurance, is this government allowing the insurance companies to make their dollars at the expense of an orderly, economically run insurance plan for the people of Ontario. We have always said there is room for free enterprise in this province and in this country; Toryism is based pretty firmly on that premise. They feel that a person should have the right to go into a business and make a buck; they also feel that a person should have the right to starve to death or live under a bridge if he so chooses. This is part of different philosophies in trying to make a country run in a fashion that democracy calls for.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that we are misleading the public somewhat in using the title of this bill, called The Medical Services Insurance Act. In my opinion, there is no relationship between the bill we are dealing with and a medical services insurance Act. Rather it should be called an Act to provide for the prepayment of doctors' fees, because that is about what it does. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we should stop talking, in this debate at least, about the comprehensive all-encompassing programme that our party is in favour of.

We understand that the Liberal Party both in this province and federally are in favour of an all-encompassing comprehensive health programme for the people of Canada, taking in all of the things that people need to have good health.

It has been mentioned many times that doctors' services, hospitalization, drug coverage, dental and mental care, orthopaedic and appliances, diagnostic and preventive care, along with the many things that health clinics could provide, and should be provided when one feels sick or is sick. He should not actually have to be sick to have the use of the facilities of the medical profession. If he feels he is sick he should have some place to go to get the attention he deserves.

It makes me feel a little ashamed, Mr. Speaker, that again this year, as last year, we have to spend so much time in a province as rich as this one—considered one of the richest areas of its size in the world—debating to such an extent a prepaid doctors' programme for the people of Ontario.

My friend, the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), has put before the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) many questions, Mr. Speaker. He has made some assumptions as to how and why the government arrived at the amendments to this bill and, sir, all of us are anticipating some answer to some of the assumptions and some of the direct questions he raised. I want to raise one or two myself, because I think it is important we should know just what is going to happen in the different areas regarding the doctor fees coverage for the people in this province. I have been fortunate enough to have some experience in assisting and sitting in on negotiations for both medical plans and hospital insurance plans over the years in regard to collective bargaining. Some of the things I say will be from direct experience and some, of course, will be from reading the surveys and results arrived at by investigation in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that through the years, and climaxing with the debate last year in this House on Bill No. 136—and with promotion of the programme federally—that we have now mutually debunked some of the

main oppositions to government-sponsored health programmes or doctor fees programmes. I think we have to drop the old argument that we cannot afford it. I think we have overdone this argument that the cost will be astronomical and the taxes will not stand it, and that people cannot afford to pay for their coverage. I feel that if this nation was faced with a warring aggressor in the near future we would find the money to oppose it to the best of our ability.

It reminds me of a fact some years ago, which I read in the federal *Hansard*. Tommy Douglas, then the hon. federal member—in September, I believe it was, in 1937, at the tail end of the depression years—rose in the House of Commons—I believe the hon. Mr. Abbott was the Minister of Finance—to ask if he would inject \$5 or \$6 million into the economy for a public works programme to try to create some jobs for the large masses of people who were unemployed.

The Minister rose and said it was a fine idea, but money does not grow on bushes.

About two years later to the day in the same House, when Canada declared war on Germany, the same Minister rose and informed the House that he had made an appropriation of \$15 million to put towards the war effort. We all know from history what happened then.

We put uniforms on the backs of our people and shoes on their feet and they were enlisted in the army. The money came from somewhere without any problem whatsoever. So I think that term of not being able to afford the kind of a health programme we want should be gone forever.

I think also that the argument about compulsion or voluntary persuasion should be also left out of any kind of debate in this regard from now on. The bill before us provides a certain amount of compulsion. Those in group coverage, of course, will be left to stay in the voluntary plans. There is another group that is going to be compelled to take the government insurance. It is all right to say that they will have to apply for it, but this again is the old idea of saying you will have this or go without coverage, and that is the position they will be in. It is not compulsory in the strict term, but you either take it or leave it.

The idea that any kind of a government-sponsored programme will decrease the doctor-patient relationship, I think, is in the horse-and-buggy days also, because people are ever increasingly becoming nothing but medical cards in the files of their doctors.

Because of the fact that has been set before us this week about the lack of facilities and the lack of medical doctors, I think it was a very revealing fact put to us by the hon. member for London South (Mr. White) that, in the last 10 years, there has only been the same number of medical doctors coming out of university each year. I believe the number was around 840 or 860.

This is going to create an ever-increasing decrease—if I can put it in those terms—of the doctor-patient relationship. The problems that people are having today, in getting service from their doctors, is deterring them from going to their doctors or attempting to get the services of their doctors when they need them. They feel that to go and sit in the office for two hours, three hours, four hours, or five hours in some cases—in my own particular case, my doctor's office is filled every afternoon—deters people from going when they should go.

Also, people have to lose time from work to get their medical attention. Everybody knows about the system of reference in medical treatment: You go to your family doctor and he feels you should see a specialist; and he gives you a note to go on a particular day. Invariably the breadwinner of the family, if this is the case, has to lose time from work to go and get the medical treatment he wants.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on a couple of points I think are relevant, and this is in regard to the groups—those who are in group insurance coverage, either under physicians' services type of coverage or the commercial insurance type of coverage.

The steelworkers in Hamilton, in 1960, conducted a very professional type of survey over a full year's period. It included 600 employees—300 from the Stelco plant and 300 from the International Harvester plant. It was a very concise, expertly done, survey to ascertain what portion of their wages was paid for medical coverage, over the term of a year, that was not covered by the kind of plan they were in. The statistics have been mentioned here before today, by the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter). They found that the commercial insurance type programme in effect at that time covered just a little over 30 per cent of the cost of the medical doctors' fees, and the PSI insurance type covered something like 60 per cent of the cost.

I will admit that, over the years, in these particular plants at least, those plans have been increased to almost total coverage. But some very enlightening things came out of

the plan, and one of those was the rebuttal of the argument that increased coverage caused an increase in the services of doctors, thereby decreasing or harming in some way the kind of attention the doctor could give. They found that the relationship between the contact of the insured with his physician or surgeon in the PSI plan, and the contact of the insured in the commercial plan, were almost identical. Yet the PSI type of insured plan had almost unlimited coverage and no financial deterrent, while almost 30 per cent of the cost of the commercial plan was still being carried by the insured; but their contacts were almost identical in the 600 surveys taken over the period of a year.

Another point that they found, and they made mention of this, was the emphasis in their submission to the Hall commission on health that the sickness plans provided under insurance plans—whether they be PSI-insured plans or the commercial coverage plans—had little or no supervision as to the type of service one was getting or the type of service that he was entitled to—whether he was being treated properly by his doctor, whether he was able to get a doctor when he needed one, or whether he had to wait a length of time to make an appointment, or otherwise. There seemed to be no supervision whatsoever.

We find also that there is a built-in protection against the application for preventive medicine, by requiring as a condition of securing benefits or reimbursement that the patient must have a symptom of illness. This meant that before he could go to his doctor, under any one of the plans, he had to be sick and be able to say to him on the phone that something was wrong with him; and the doctor had to agree that it was well worth an appointment or a visit to see him.

Mr. Speaker, the questions I would like to pose to the hon. Minister are in regard to the group coverage—and I hope that he will explain some of them because I feel that there is going to be some chaos in regard to collective bargaining plans. What will happen if the union, which has bargained collectively for a plan, decides that it no longer wishes to bargain for coverage with its employer and convinces its members that they should go into the government plan? This will have to be explained, because all of the contracts that are negotiated are not the type that are negotiated and accepted in some of the big industries.

Many groups are being organized every day, are being certified, are going in for their first contract, and invariably one of their

requests or demands for a contract will be health coverage. They do not always get the full coverage in the first agreement. They have to be satisfied in most cases with a partial plan. They are not going to do that in the future. They may rather tell their members to go into the government plan. Are they going to be allowed to do this? We would like to know.

Another interesting point in relation to the two big plants in Hamilton: The Stelco plant and the International Harvester plant are both under collective agreements and both have what is considered the best in group coverage plans. Both plans, Mr. Speaker, as well as covering the employees who pay a portion of the premium, and of course a portion is paid by the employer, cover the retirees from that plant—those who are on pension, in both cases. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that 90 per cent of those who are retired from these two plants would be eligible for government subsidy, if not eligible to have their whole portion of their plan paid for if they were eligible to get into the government plan. As I understand it, now that they are in the group they are restricted there and there is no way that they will be able to go into the government plan.

I am sure that it will not seem fair and the employees will not think it fair that when there is a government plan that the retirees, the pensioners, are entitled to get into they should have to pay into a fund to look after their medical premiums.

This is a question that will have to be answered. I am sure that some of the people in charge of this responsibility are thinking now that they likely would have to—and it would be fair—to drop the retirees from their plan and therefore force them into the government plan; either by complete coverage, because of their financial situation, or partial coverage under the terms of the plan.

These are the types of problems that we are going to be faced with, Mr. Speaker. As I mentioned in the outset, I think we are dealing with the amendments to Bill No. 6 only in trying to develop the first phase of the programme, which is prepaid doctors' fees for the people of Ontario. I think that we should go all the way now so that we have, at least in Ontario, established the first phase recommended by the Hall commission.

While we do this I think we should set the groundwork. The government should immediately develop a plan to provide the first step of the second stage, that is supplying the facilities, the buildings, developing the

students and the medical doctors so that we can, in an orderly and economical fashion, go forward towards a full comprehensive programme in the province of Ontario.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, as was raised last year when we dealt with Bill No. 136, that there are many organizations and interested groups across the province watching the results of this debate and I am sure that if the government does not give some indication of their projected plans in relation to a comprehensive programme fitting in with the federal government's offer, that we will have the same uprising and outcry as we had last year.

The government again will be forced to retrench and come forward with something that will fit into the plan that is being adopted by other provinces and make preparations so that we in Canada can say to many countries in the world, even though it has taken us many years to come up with the kind of a health programme that you have had in your countries, we are now somewhat proud of the type we have.

The utmost, I believe, Mr. Speaker, is the comprehensive programme, developing into group clinics as we have even in some parts of the United States, where a person, regardless of what shift he is working, has no need to lose time from work and go to that clinic. He can go in at any time of the night or day and have himself looked after, regardless of the type of service he needs, from dental to the tops in specialist care, and come out and feel that he has been given the kind of treatment that we feel everyone should have.

I am sure that we will have more questions and problems to raise when the bill comes before the committee of the whole House by specific sections and I am sure that the hon. members following me, both from the government side and from the Opposition side, will have more problems to put before the government in regard to this bill. We hope that collectively we can come to a conclusion that we have done our best and that the government will pay some attention to the real problem and develop the kind of a programme we deserve in the province of Ontario.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to take part in the debate on the amendments to Bill No. 6. It was my privilege to take part in this debate in this House last year on the original bill and I would gather from the remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) during this debate that he

felt I was one of those; I think he said my motto is: "My party, right or wrong, all the time." Now I would have to take exception to those remarks, because I have always felt that as an individual member here I have been able to apply my own intellect and judgment to those issues that come before us and to decide for myself. I guess the reason that in my decision I usually decide the way the Progressive-Conservative Party thinks is the reason I am a member of that party.

In discussing this issue, however, I would like to take the House through some of my thoughts regarding the amendments to this bill. I think, as the previous speaker, that this is an issue that should be discussed in an intelligent, sane way without overemphasis on emotionalism. I think that this is the type of issue where there can be two sides and there are certainly different ways of arriving at ultimate goals. I personally favour certain ways of providing for the health needs of our people. Now these ways naturally differ from what some of my hon. friends in the other parties suggest.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The hon. member's ways are a change in fashion.

Mr. Wells: I will come to that in a minute.

Certainly if anyone cannot change I think that it is a pretty sorry day for any of us, if our minds become so solidly made up that it is impossible to ever change. But what I want to say, Mr. Speaker, is that I think that in approaching this whole issue of medical insurance there are different ways of providing for the health needs of the people.

My hon. friends have presented one way and I respect their opinions and their ideas in this matter. I wish that perhaps they could, in the same light, respect our ways and our ideas. They seem to portray everything that they do as the essence of virtue, all clothed in whiteness and we on this side are in some other area, damned to hell because of the ideas that we have on this very important subject.

I would hope we could perhaps get down to the principles of this bill and throw away some of this verbiage that we have used to cloud the real principles of this Bill No. 6, this amendment to our Bill No. 136.

This is the way I look at it, Mr. Speaker. Last year I spoke in favour of Bill No. 136 and I did so because, as I said then and I still say now, it was a good bill. It provided for the setting up of a medical insurance division of The Department of Health. It provided for the establishment of a standard contract, it was set out in the schedule to

the bill, and it provided coverage at either no cost or at a subsidized cost. It provided a standard contract or made available a standard contract to 1.8 million people of this province—those who desperately needed help in the medical insurance field.

Since that time many things have happened in this whole area of medical health insurance. Dominion-provincial conferences have been held. This is a subject which receives wide study and wide comment. Another significant thing that has happened is that other provinces in Canada have experimented with various plans.

One of the provinces which experimented with a plan was British Columbia. British Columbia came up with a plan very much like our Ontario plan, but perhaps with two or three better features and these features are the ones which we are now suggesting be introduced into the Ontario plan. We can learn from experience, we do not have a closed mind on this subject and I think these are the principles of this bill, these features which we feel are better than what was in the original bill.

And what are these features?

First of all, the medical services insurance division is now going to be able to sell standard contracts to those in other than the subsidized category. This is a good thing. This is what the British Columbia plan did, and I am told that it has been outstandingly successful in its first year of operation. This kind of thing is the real reason why there is so much opposition here today and why there is so much emotional verbiage, because our friends are afraid that our plan, with these features in it, is going to be so successful that their ideas are going to be washed out. Of course, I predict that this will happen.

But let me say this, Mr. Speaker, if it does not happen, if it does not provide for health coverage for all our citizens that they can afford, I will be the first to stand here and support something that does.

I could not obtain the figures for British Columbia for this year because I understand the hon. Prime Minister of British Columbia is going to use them in a speech in the Legislature sometime in the near future to show just how successful this plan has been there.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Except that he is going to change it.

Mr. Wells: Yes, I understand he is perhaps going to change it and lower the premiums. And this, perhaps, is what will happen here.

An hon. member: Will this government do the same next year?

Mr. Bryden: No, he is going to bring it in line with federal requirements.

Mr. Wells: Let us not forget that this is the essential feature of these amendments here. This bill is to provide, first, the standard contract to anybody who wants to buy it as an individual for \$60, \$120 or \$150. The people who would be most likely to buy this are those in business for themselves; farmers, people who are not in groups. At the present time if they wish to get individual coverage they can go to a private insurance company, say, such as the Continental Casualty Company which has offered "Medical," and pay about \$219 a year for a family.

If they happen to have been in a group and have gone into business for themselves, they can carry on an individual coverage or direct payment contract with a PSI Blue Plan and get it for about \$204. They will now have the opportunity to go in and buy this, as of July 1, from the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health a family contract for \$150, much lower than any other place that you can obtain this coverage outside a group and even \$9 cheaper than we who are in a PSI Blue Plan group, where the premium is \$159 for family coverage.

Of course in group plans, Mr. Speaker, the employer is paying part of the premium, but most of these people to whom this individual contract will now be made available are those who are like farmers or in business for themselves, who I suppose you could say are self-employed. Therefore, as a business expense or an expense of their doing business, they will have to provide the full premium for themselves. But they are getting a bargain. They are getting rates comparable to group rates for their insurance. This, I think, is a commendable feature of this bill.

To say, of course, as the *Toronto Daily Star* and many hon. members are saying, that what we are really doing is skimming off all the bad risks and leaving the good risks for the insurance companies; I do not think is correct. The insurance companies and private plans are being left with the group coverage, which includes bad risks and good risks. If you have a large group, a large industrial concern, there are going to be those young healthy people, and there are going to be people who are bad risks, all grouped in together and this is where you get your group rate, the good carry the bad.

I do not think we are going to skim off

all the bad risks in Ontario, there are going to be lots of them left with the groups. But let us also remember this, Mr. Speaker, the groups that we are leaving are not all insurance company groups.

In a speech in this debate last year the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said this:

A secondary but vital point has been ignored by the Opposition in their concern over insurance companies. More than 2.6 million people in Ontario were covered by medical services insurance policies administered by non-profit plans operating by either the doctors or the co-operatives. We have heard a great deal about the 200-odd insurance companies but very little about the non-profit carriers. These non-profit carriers include Physicians' Services Incorporated, Associated Medical Services, Windsor Medical Service Incorporated, CUMBA, and other co-operatives.

What we have left in this group business are a great number in these non-profit private plans, some in the insurance run group plans. This mix that we have, this mix and this competition, is the kind of thing that is keeping our group rates down. It is keeping them down to a rock-bottom price and I think this is good in the group business. I can see nothing wrong with it now. It is providing coverage for the people of Ontario. Let us remember that 80 per cent of the people of Ontario now have adequate coverage.

I see that the hon. member for York South laughs as he usually does. He presents figures but when we present figures he disputes them, as we always dispute his.

Mr. MacDonald: That was disputed before the Hagey commission and the Hall commission and everywhere.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I have here a statement which shows that the total coverage for 1964 in the province of Ontario was 5,249,000. From this it is necessary to deduct 201,000 people who have surgery only contracts and 29,000 who have medical only contracts, which are not considered complete coverage. From this, also among those with insurance companies there are 196,000 who have coverage for in-hospital benefits only and there are 245,000 who had only the PSI Brown Plan. This is a total number of 661,000 who would be taken from the total coverage because they do not have adequate insurance, leaving a total of 4,588,000. This is an increase of 9.1 per cent over the number who had adequate coverage in 1963.

In 1963 there was an increase of 16.8 per cent over those who had adequate coverage

in 1962. In other words, the graph has been steadily going up and up. Now if we project the rate of increase at 9.1 per cent, which is the rate of increase from 1963 to 1964 and use this to project to 1965, we find that there are about five million people who will be covered in Ontario.

Take five million people and add to that 500,000 who are covered under special government coverage, the welfare plans and the Indian coverage and so forth, and we have 5.5 million. Take that from an estimated population of 6,825,000, which is the estimate for the population of Ontario at the end of 1965, and we get 1,320,000 people who do not have adequate coverage. In my simple mathematics we divide it out and we find that 80 per cent of the people of Ontario have adequate health insurance.

Now there is, of course, a great overlap here because the figures presented by the Hagey commission and by all the studies on health insurance suggested that in the subsidized groups there will be 1.8 million people. Of course, there is an overlap here in people who would be eligible for subsidy but will be in groups. But I see nothing wrong with this.

So what I am suggesting here, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill goes a long way to closing the gap, which is really all we want to do; and this is where I get back to what I began with. What we want to do is close the gap, close the gap so the people of Ontario are covered by health insurance, be it by private insurance companies, non-profit insurance plans, subsidized insurance or contracts from the medical services division of The Department of Health.

I suspect, and I believe, that the plan that we have presented, with these amendments, will close that gap. They will close it so that over 95 per cent of the people of this province will be covered within a year. That is why I support this bill, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to say several other things regarding this bill. In this bill, there is a provision to change from the 100 per cent of doctors' fees, which were included in Bill No. 136, to provide that only 90 per cent of these fees be paid. I suppose that this has come about because PSI, one of the largest insurers in this province, has only paid 90 per cent to participating physicians for many years now.

I think it is a good thing that we are only paying 90 per cent of the fees now, but I think that here I want to ask the hon. Minister of Health to look very carefully at this section, to be sure that those who obtain

insurance, either under the welfare plans or in the subsidized categories, are not going to, in effect, suffer from a co-insurance feature.

In this morning's Toronto *Globe and Mail* there was a news story stating that the doctors in Scarborough had decided not to bill the government plan direct when it comes into being, but to send the bills to the patient. It is their feeling—and they consider this a matter of principle—that they should bill the patient and that the patient should send in his bill and get the money from the government and then pay the doctor. Of course, if this is carried on, if a patient has a bill for \$10 from the doctor and sends it in, he will get only \$9 back—and I presume that these doctors intend the patient to pay them \$10.

We have established that it is the right of doctors under our plan to either operate within or without the plan. And this is a basic right that doctors feel they must have. But I feel, Mr. Speaker, that with this right goes some kind of responsibility; and while I would agree with the rights of doctors like Dr. Bentham in Scarborough to operate outside the plan and bill the patient himself, and let the patient collect, I certainly would not agree that, by coercion or by any other veiled threats, any efforts should be made by doctors in a community to attempt to get all the doctors in that community to operate outside the plan.

I think that the people must be offered a choice in their community between doctors who participate—that is, who will send in their bills directly and therefore not charge 100 per cent of the fee schedule—and those doctors who will not participate but will bill the patient directly. I think that this is a right that doctors have, but that it should be an individual right. And I would hope that in no place in Ontario will doctors attempt to gang up and, by any means such as limiting privileges in a hospital or anything like this, attempt to force their colleagues into all operating outside the plan.

I think that it is interesting to note that in Saskatchewan, of course, when the original medical health insurance bill was brought in, there was no provision for doctors to operate outside the plan; and in the battle that followed one of the rights they won was the right to operate outside the plan—that is, to be able to bill the patient.

Mr. Bryden: They always had that right; it was just a matter of policy.

Mr. Wells: Well, they did not always have that right; this was one of the rights that they

won. The right was won, but what has actually happened in Saskatchewan is that 92 per cent of the doctors bill direct rather than billing their patients. So what this means, Mr. Speaker, is that the doctors cherish this right and they want it, but they do not necessarily all wish to exercise it.

I am told that in British Columbia, under their plan, a similar thing to that in Saskatchewan has happened. Many of the doctors operate under the plan, but in each community there are a few who protect this right by operating outside the plan and sending their bills directly to the patient. And I hope that the doctors in Ontario will heed the actions taken by their colleagues in the rest of Canada and not force the hon. Minister of Health to have to come up with some method to ensure that those people who receive the government contracts will not have to pay an extra billing from a doctor, unless they themselves choose to do this by picking a non-participating doctor. They must have the right of choice in the community, and they must know which doctors participate and which doctors do not participate.

The one other thing I would like to speak about, while I am talking on this debate, Mr. Speaker, is something that has bothered me; and it has bothered a lot of my friends in the church that I belong to. I would like to begin it by saying that much is made of the fact, in many statements by the Opposition speakers, that this plan is not supported by the people of Ontario, that the public is against it and so forth. Well, as I said, I am not one to accept things from hearsay, and I conducted an opinion poll in my riding on this and several other questions last year, after the House adjourned.

The question was asked: "Do you think the new medical services insurance Bill No. 136, described in this booklet, is sensible for the present time?" And the answers I got back were that 65 per cent of those replying said it was, and 32 per cent said it was not. I found this to be a general consensus of the people I talked to, in all walks of life. They felt that the type of thing we were doing was the right thing at this time. Now we said "at this time"; and I am not standing here and saying that in a few years I may favour something else or that I may not if this does not work. But at this time this was the right thing.

Mr. Bryden: How many replies?

Mr. Wells: How many replies? There were 160 replies.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that the membership of your association?

An hon. member: No, it is about 800.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): There are 75,000 in the riding.

Mr. Wells: No, there were 16,000 sent out. There was a one per cent reply—which in advertising circles is a pretty good response to any type of question or poll like this.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): That is as much as an NDP convention.

Mr. Wells: Yes. Now to get to the point that bothers me about this—that the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) alluded to earlier. This is the attitude of members of the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church of Canada and the ministers who marched here during the last days of the last session. Unfortunately, I was away at the time and did not have a chance to talk to any of them.

But a friend of mine who did a survey among those ministers said that they were a church group opposing this iniquitous bill, and he found that about 80 per cent of those ministers out there were either card-carrying members of the New Democratic Party or supporters of the New Democratic Party.

I do not object to this, Mr. Speaker; I certainly uphold the right of the clergy of any church, and particularly the United Church to belong to a political party. This is their right and I hope they will exercise it. I do not say that any members of the church should not do this, or parade in this manner, but what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is let us be honest about this. That was not a church protest against our bill out there, it was an NDP protest against our bill. Because many of these—

Mr. Bryden: Could I ask a question?

Mr. Wells: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to ask the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, if he has noticed the recent statement on this subject by the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church of Canada and whether he considers that it consists of NDP members too?

Mr. Wells: Well, I am just getting to that, Mr. Speaker. Now I consider Ray Hord a personal friend of mine; he is the secretary of the board of evangelism and social service.

I have discussed this with him; I have debated with him on this matter. My feeling here is—

Mr. S. Lewis: Is he also a New Democrat?

Mr. Wells: I do not know, but certainly many of those who marched here turned up as NDP candidates in the last federal election.

An hon. member: I wish we had 80 per cent of the membership.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Wells: What I am trying to say is that I am an elder of the United Church. There are many hon. members in this House who either belong to or are on the various boards of the United Church of Canada. We have never been consulted about this action that the church is taking. I talked to doctors, to insurance men, to labour men in the United Church, in my own church, and they have never once been consulted on this.

When I talk to them they say: "Look, we are in favour of the kind of bill you are presenting. I do not know where these fellows on the board of evangelism and social service get their ideas. They are embarrassing us. We are ashamed of what they are saying because as United Church members we do not feel this way.

"But we do feel, we do have a sense of compassion. We have a sense of compassion."

"We feel." I know I do and I know all these members of the church I have talked to also do. We have a sense of compassion that something must be done to help those who need help and we feel that this bill is doing that.

Now the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church has a broad policy in favour of a universal national health plan and they are sticking to this through thick and thin. They have never even bothered to look at the Ontario bill in the sense that the board has studied it and is actually looking at what it does in the light of how it might even be moving towards their ultimate aim.

Mr. MacDonald: That is a slanderous comment on the heads of the hon. member's church.

Mr. Wells: I have talked to Ray Hord—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! The member for Scarborough North is making the address.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, I am in no way maligning the members of the board of evangelism and social service or the fine gentlemen who make up this board. I am just trying to point out that in reality they do not speak for the United Church of Canada. The laymen who speak for the United Church of Canada sit around this room here.

Mr. Bryden: That is the Tory party.

Mr. Wells: They sit in many parties and believe me there are lots of them who are not in the Tory party who feel that our bill is a good bill.

Mr. Bryden: We do not substitute ourselves for any church, I can tell the hon. member.

Mr. Wells: What I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, while I am on this, is that the real crux of the matter here is that a Christian, I think, should have a sense of compassion, and this is what should show in his attitude towards legislation and this is what we show towards this legislation.

It is like the parable of the good Samaritan. There is the man lying at the side of the road, wounded, dying and along comes the priest. Now I do not know whether the priest represents some of the clergymen who marched out here and are members of the New Democratic Party, but in their desire for some great ultimate end they overlook the problem that is right there with them.

And, sir, along following the priest comes the Levite, a lawyer who is a member of the Liberal Party; and there he is, he is not concerned about the need that is right there immediately before him, but he is going to go ahead and send this matter back to another committee and have it studied. But then along comes the Samaritan, a Conservative, he sees the need right there now and he does something to help the need that is present.

This bill will make available on April 1 of this year—not July 1, 1967, or some other time, but April 1 of this year—this bill will make available a standard contract to all those in the welfare categories. They will have it April 1; and on July 1, over one million of our people can come and get this insurance.

We have seen the need. I think this bill shows a compassion for that need at the present time and it is doing something about it.

There is one thing I would like to say before I close, Mr. Speaker, it is on just one other area of this bill; and perhaps this will delight my hon. friends because this is an area where I differ from the government.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Not from the church!

Mr. Wells: I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the civil service insurance plan within a year should be switched into the government agency that is providing medical services insurance.

Mr. Bryden: Why just the civil service?

Mr. Wells: Well, I am not worried about the others—they are well covered in groups with no contribution of government money.

Mr. Singer: Careful, the hon. member is not going to go down well in London—

Mr. Wells: If you have a bake shop of your own you do not go across the street and buy bread at somebody else's bake shop; so if we are setting up an agency to provide insurance I believe that the public servants of Ontario should be scheduled into that insurance in the near future.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member will go far with that speech.

Mr. Wells: Now that in no way means that at this time I favour switching any of the other groups in, but I think this is a particular and special area. I would hope that the government would give consideration to this because this is highly subsidized insurance.

I think that the hon. member for York South talked about the people in the civil service insurance plan and mentioned that these people were locked in and would not have the benefit of obtaining insurance under the new plan, even though there were many of them in the low income categories. Of course the fact is that these people are getting insurance at even more attractive rates than the other plans. The single employee gets his insurance for \$12 yearly, the employee and one dependant pays \$38.40, and the employee with more than one dependant pays \$58.20. Of course, this is operating on the same principle that operates in all the many industrial groups where the employer pays a large percentage of the premium cost. But I think with so much government money being paid into this plan that eventually within a period of time this should be switched over to the medical services insurance division of The Department

of Health, and I have felt this for a considerable time.

Mr. Speaker, in closing my contribution to this debate I again would like to say that I feel that what we have here is a sound, sensible, basic plan which is capable of logical expansion. It is a plan which sees the need which is with us right now, does something about this need and yet leaves itself open to change if change is necessary. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am fully in support of this bill and opposed to the amendments which have been presented.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, rising to take part in the discussion of the principles of this bill, I say to you, sir, that it is always refreshing to hear an hon. member who ordinarily supports the government, and indeed is elected under the banner of the government party, express his disagreement with some matters of government policy. One gets the impression that the willingness to disagree amongst private members of the House, in respect to government policy, is a variation in direct proportion to the distance from the Treasury benches; and there may be a moral in the story because the hon. member may feel that, in the nether region to which he and the rest of the Chicago gang have been assigned, they are all but forgotten by the occupants of the Treasury benches.

I am not sure I agreed with, though I much enjoyed, his analogy of the good Samaritan. I must reread that story. I do not recall that the good Samaritan, coming along the road and seeing the man who had been beaten and robbed by the bandits, took a look at him and said to him, or to himself, "Before I give aid and succour and comfort to this victim I will adjourn for a year to think about it." That may be the story. If it is not then my hon. friend is ready to join the ranks of the legion of writers who worked for Cecil B. DeMille, who were often bent on rewriting the Bible.

I think it is a strange and remarkable coincidence, if it is that—and I reflected on this last year during the second reading of the infamous Bill No. 136—that the defence of a matter of government policy, at least in the early and indeed the middle stages of the debate on second reading, is left to private members of the government ranks. The hon. Minister of Health, on first reading, made a brief statement, about 500 words as I calculated them, in which he enunciated in the barest outline the changes that were being made in the statute which this House adopted last year, and to which this Honour gave assent on the last day of the session.

And if one examines the hon. Minister's statement, if one reads it and re-reads it, then one fails to see any ringing declaration. And, knowing the hon. Minister as we do, he is a man who, when he feels it, can give the appearance—not only give the appearance but convince one—that he can hold tenaciously to principles; and he can give articulation to them if he wishes to express them.

One gets the feeling, when one looks at the remarks—and I must confess I was not here that day—that he made on the introduction of the bill, that he is a man who is little changed from the character in which he has been at least put by other hon. members of the House. He clings tenaciously, as many of his brethren in the medical profession do, and doggedly to the principle that government ought not to be operating in the field of medical care. He does not believe in government participation.

I have the suspicion, and it is not an ethereal thing nor constructed out of whole cloth, that when it became a matter of government policy to change the structure of the method of administering the medical insurance contract, the hon. Minister of Health gave in to it reluctantly. At least I have never heard—and I follow his words and his declamations as well as I am able—the hon. Minister of Health on any platform, and I have never heard him in this House, ever speak favourably in favour of the principle of government operation of medical care. Indeed not.

He is like so many vocal members of his noble and learned and skilful and community-minded profession—and all those words suit. They see government participation in this very important field as the grossest form of interference. I will underline that by reading, a little later, into the record some remarks a doctor made two days after this bill was introduced. To his principles—and I do not mind that he is looking at me. They can put in the papers that he is looking at me; I do not mind.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): We will not mind.

Mr. Sopha: No, I will not rise tomorrow on a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. MacDonald: It depends what he says about the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: One gets the impression that in the fixation, nay, the obsession, in his mind about medical care being administered by

private groups bent on the making of profit, he holds on to that idea like a lobster with lockjaw.

An hon. member: That is a good phrase.

Mr. Sopha: It is not my phrase. Some hon. members will know who said that about whom at one time.

I pointed out to the House last year that, during the whole course of the second reading debate, neither the hon. Minister of Health nor indeed the hon. Prime Minister participated.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I cannot sit here any longer. I certainly did participate in the debate.

Mr. Sopha: Up to the time I had spoken. That was within the framework of my remarks, in invisible ink. The hon. Minister spoke last; he spoke second last.

Mr. Singer: Third last.

Mr. Sopha: Third last, near the last, at the tail end. And indeed, because of the change in policy that is inherent in this bill, one must assume, one is entitled to conclude, that it is a matter of government policy. Government is venturing into the field of medical care, albeit reluctantly. Then I ask, rhetorically in case he should dash in from the wings: Why does the first citizen not participate and tell us, and give us some enlightenment about the change?

Now I come to the point where I make the confession that the introduction of this bill, and the principle that it contains, gives rise to reflection and some of the frustrations of being a member of the Opposition—and there are many. Last year the debate raged on, day after day. Day after day, virtually every hon. member of this party spoke, and indeed every hon. member in the New Democratic Party spoke, because a grave matter of importance to the contemporary well-being and the future health of our people was at stake, and it invited the attention of every hon. member of the House.

Yet I have looked in vain in the editorial comment in the newspapers, since January 27, to see where there is the barest hint of an acknowledgment by an editorial writer that perhaps, in the vaguest meanderings of the imagination, we in these two parties had something to do with the change in government policy. One fails to see it. So there is merit in the hon. leader of the Opposition's suggestion earlier, or that which is encompassed in the four corners of his resolution,

that there ought to be filming and tape-recording of what goes on here.

I venture to say that if the TV cameras ever got in here, only about four or five would be re-elected at the next ensuing election.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sopha: But it would be a means of acquainting the people of the province that last year we took a stand on principle. Speaker after speaker got up and took a stand on principle in respect of Bill No. 136. We identified ourselves, and said we were for government operation of medical care, and we were for universality—call it compulsion, identify it with any dirty epithet you want to give to it, but that is where we pitch our tent. Somebody said, no doubt in a state of euphoria, that we would fight an election on it, on the issue of government operation of medical care. Yes, we did. My hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) aptly points out we did; we fought two of them.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He probably does not state the outcome.

Mr. Sopha: In the interstice between the meeting of the House; I had forgotten that. Our candidates were endorsed and, indeed, I recall that in the Nipissing by-election, which is up my way, much was said about the government scheme of medical care. But again, all the editorial writers, 250 miles away, in the ivory towers at the top of those buildings at Bay and King streets, said: "Poor Smith, poor Richard, you cannot win. The Tories will take Nipissing." And in trooped the Cabinet Ministers, one after another. You would think it was a meeting of the clan. One after another they came in. For some reason there must be something attractive in Nipissing to the Cabinet, because every election, like bees to the honeycomb, they are in there.

Well, we fought an election, as my hon. leader aptly points out. It really gives one a sense of frustration because there was no acknowledgment. How can we get the message across to the people? How can we say what is now Bill No. 6 enunciates in part the principles we espoused in the Legislature and the government has adopted them, reluctantly? The government has taken a step in the right direction. How can we say to them we will not be satisfied until medical care is operated *in toto* by the government and is

universal to every citizen in the province? How can we get that message across?

I speak in the late hours of the debate. I look at the clock and I look at the press gallery and it is so vacant that one would think Lord Thomson of Fleet was up hiring reporters for \$5,000 a week. Well, Lord Thomson might be up there for all I know.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): The reporters are fed up with listening to this.

Mr. Sopha: I do not often go up. How can we get that message across? Well, I am not going to go in that vein. We can get it across by telling our people, I suppose, at every opportunity. But in the final analysis, the hon. leader of the Opposition, who delivered a lengthy disquisition as the first speaker in this debate, enunciated in the most careful terms the position this party takes. To give credit where credit is due, indeed, the New Democratic Party has done the same only to end up, in the words of the hon. member for York South, to end up with nit-picking. He picks nit, knits picks, or whatever it is, in quarrelling with the verbiage of our amendment.

Mr. Bryden: It is full of verbiage, the hon. member has got to admit that.

Mr. Sopha: It is. He quarrels with the form of our amendment. When read, one readily comprehends that it merely means that at this session of the House we are advocating that this bill go to a committee and be so rewritten that it shall contain the matters enunciated by the hon. leader of the Opposition under the several seven heads of his amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not nit picking; that is just tactical common sense.

Mr. Sopha: That is what I call it. The hon. member can call it whatever he will. I will not quarrel with him about it. Indeed, if the government had the courage, if it but had the courage, and it often lacks that elementary quality, the hon. Minister of Health ought to have come into the House with a bill that would have re-written Bill No. 136, instead of chopping away at it in the fashion this does. I defy any citizen in the province beyond the walls of this House to pick up Bill No. 6 and without having before him Bill No. 136 and a goodly amount of time to go from one to the other like a tennis ball, I defy him to comprehend it.

Surely the hon. Minister owed that, at least that, to the citizen who follows the course of

government, who is interested in legislation. He owed the courtesy to bring in a bill called The Medical Insurance Act, 1966, because I am told by those who have studied this and perhaps it has been said in the debate before, that only 40 per cent of the original statute remains, 60 per cent has been amputated or has been changed beyond recognition.

Then the doctors! One should say a word about the doctors and their attitude and their influence on the government because I strongly suspect, and again it is not just vapid dreaming, I suspect their influence is great. A warm admirer I am of the hon. Minister of Health, I mean that sincerely. I admire his human qualities, his spirit, his determination. I admire the fact that unlike Bennett, whom he admires—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Great man!

Mr. Sopha: Yes. Unlike Bennett, the hon. Minister of Health came to Canada and gave Canada the benefit of his talents. The man he admired took the boat the other way. We were better off in both connections. But the Minister of Health, I said last year and I reiterate it just to show him that I have not changed my mind whereas he has changed his, the Minister of Health ought not to be a doctor. He should be a layman.

An hon. member: Should the Attorney General be a lawyer?

Mr. Sopha: He has got to be. He has to be. The Attorney General—let us not get into that, but the Attorney General occupies a very special place in the government. He has to be a lawyer. He is the law officer of the Crown. He enforces the government's orders. But I am not going to be drawn off into tangential disquisitions with the hon. Minister of Health. The hon. Minister of Health ought to be objective. He ought to be objective about the opinions of doctors, their views, because I have said to them—

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): The hon. member finds it very difficult to be objective about the opinions of lawyers.

Mr. Sopha: I beg pardon, I am always interested in what the hon. Minister says.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am pleased. The hon. member finds it very difficult to be objective about the opinions of lawyers.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it is, especially when it comes time to pay the bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: I can imagine, is it unreasonable to postulate that the vocal group from the medical profession would approach the hon. Minister of Health from the point of view they would say: "Doctor Dymond, you are one of us, you are one of our own, you are part of the club?"

The hon. Minister of Health does not want to be an apostate. He does not want to feel that he is outside the club to which he belongs, that he is under some edict as a result of going against his brethren in the medical profession.

And what is the type of thing they say? I do not know if they say it to the hon. Minister of Health. Let me give hon. members an illustration of the type of thing the doctors say, and the pity of it is that it is listened to. Doctors are men of immense prestige. People naturally and properly place great faith in their advice, their counsel, their opinions; most families have an intimate connection with a doctor, their medical consultant and advisor.

An hon. member: How about their lawyer?

Mr. Sopha: Many do. Here is the view of a doctor. This letter was stimulated by the introduction of this bill. The heading is not the doctor's but the city editor's, the news editor or whoever it is, he put it on. It is interesting to read the heading: "Mother-in-law's Gall Bladder or New Highways?"

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order!

Mr. Sopha: I quote: To the editor, Sudbury *Daily Star*.

I am going to read it and I do not treat this facetiously at all. I treat this with every bit of seriousness that it demands.

"Catholics may now use birth control pills. The Pope was unavailable for comment." Would you, as editor, publish such an absurd succession of sentences? No.

Consider then your front page of January 22: "Doctors of this area have no thought of enlisting the aid of their patients to fight Medicare. Dr. F. L. Power was unavailable for comment."

I should interpolate and say he is quoting what the front page said:

"Doctors of this area have no thought of enlisting the aid of their patients to fight Medicare. Dr. F. L. Power was unavailable for comment."

Dr. F. L. Power is the president of the Sudbury medical association. I go on:

How sad. In your frantic effort to a deadline how often you distort the truth. How often in the process of recording fact do you also play the judge. As an individual doctor in this area, and not speaking for my fellow physicians, let me enlighten you on a few facts:

1. Doctors of this area are opposed to Medicare in its present format.

2. The imposition of socialism on an unsuspecting populace will pave the way for communism.

3. Medical care, as provided for in the government budget, will have to compete with a multitude of government agencies for funds; in effect it will be your mother-in-law's gall bladder against a new stretch of highway.

4. Doctors have in the past, and will in the future, provided services to those who are unable to pay. When was the last time you gave away a newspaper?

5. Those interested in a doctor's reaction to Medicare would be well advised to read Ernest C. Manning's speech on national Medicare: "Government is bribing the people with their own money." I would suggest that all pay particular attention to his statement: "The socialist element in any society is always vocal far beyond its numerical strength."

I would also ask you to consider that the doctors who will provide these services, attend to the scheme proposed, were not consulted. In closing I would ask you, who defend so vigorously the freedom of speech and the right to publish, to expend the same effort in the search for truth. As an individual first, and secondly as a doctor, I am deeply concerned that you publish without proof, prove with prejudice, and prevaricate with pride.

P.S. I doubt that you will publish this letter.

Mr. MacDonald: The doctors were consulted in about a dozen meetings last fall.

Mr. Sopha: I would hope, with all courtesy to that man, that the views expressed in that letter are only shared by a very small minority of the medical profession.

Every time in the record of human history—at least the history of the west—every time people collectively took a step to ameliorate the lot of those who suffered from affliction, pain, suffering, misery, every time there were

those who cried: "Communism! You will shackle the initiative of the individual. You will turn him into a walking zombie." That refrain has been sung throughout human history.

Mr. Bryden: Especially by the Liberals.

Mr. Sopha: No, indeed not by Liberals. And in that regard, sir, having listened to you people, I consider myself in many ways to be to the left of you.

Mr. Bryden: The point is that you do not know where you are yourself.

Mr. Sopha: I stand with Roebuck. I stand with Mackenzie King.

Mr. Letherby: Well, where did he stand?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I think perhaps we could have a much better debate if there were not so many interruptions and interjections. It makes it most difficult for the person speaking, and it also makes it most difficult for our interjectionists. I would ask your co-operation to give the speaker the attention he deserves, and not to interrupt him.

Mr. Sopha: I thank you, sir, for those remarks designed to assist me in saying the few things that I want to say, because I could not be more serious—in speaking for myself and, I know, sharing the views held by the man who leads our party that this is a grave matter of principle to us. We believe, with Mr. Justice Hall—indeed his report was the signal for the rallying point of the forces of liberalism, with a small "l"—that medical care on a universal, comprehensive basis is the next leap forward in the social welfare history of this country.

That is what he said, in these words:

What the commission recommends is that in Canada the gap be closed, that as a nation we must take the necessary legislative, organizational and financial decisions to make all the fruits of the health sciences available to all our residents without hindrance of any kind. All our recommendations are directed towards this objective. There can be no greater challenge to a free society of free men.

Those are his words.

He is a Tory of home standing. A Tory bred on the prairies. No people hold Tory principles more tenaciously than the Tories from the prairies. It is one of the great social documents of this century. I would posit two great social documents of this century: The

Hall report and the Massey report—two great contributions to the future of this country.

"Why do we wait, we say? Why are you so grudging, it takes you a year to change your mind?" I ask rhetorically of the hon. Minister of Health. Last year he vigorously defended the participation of private groups. 'I said, and I repeat, that we run a risk in opposing those groups. We run a grave risk under the present systems of the working of parliamentary democracy. We run a risk in opposing them; they are powerful. Every day I practise my profession, I become more convinced of the influence in the laws of our country of the insurance group. I become aware of it.

Last week I sat in court and said what a strange system of justice this is, that the plaintiff can have one lawyer putting forward his case and the insurance company can have two. They can have two. We will take that up at another time. That is a strange system of justice.

But I am aware of the insidiousness, the infiltration, and the impact of their power. We oppose them. Indeed, the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Butler) sits here because the leader of the Opposition before the excellent young man who now leads this party had the temerity to impose on insurance companies in their own bailiwick, in the capital of the insurance industry of Ontario—Kitchener. The hon. member for Waterloo North sits here for that reason and no other.

We take our stand because we believe, with Mr. Justice Hall, that a system of universal government-operated medical care is nothing else but a measure of making toward the equitable distribution of the wealth of this country among those who produce it. It is but a device. We use the state, we Canadians who have no fear of the state remember that. We have no fear of the state. Americans have a great horror of it. They can go into spasms of Biblical palsy about the interference of the government. We do not have any such fear of the state. We are accustomed to state interference. We have learned to live with the state. We know the state is but the organ, is but the vehicle, of putting into effect those measures that improve the lot of the citizens and work toward the greatest good for the greatest number.

No one sitting on that side can say with justice, these words, "Frankly we are concerned about the feeling that exists among many people in this province. They simply do not want everything done for them by the state."

That is not the history of this country. Everything big and important we ever did in this country—and these are not idle words, I can buttress it with evidence that would convince the most obtuse—everything we ever did of importance; big, monumental, gigantic, directed toward the development of this country; was done by the state. Everything! We had to, because Canadians unfortunately are not willing to gamble, they do not want to take a risk. If there is a risk the government must do it. Leave it to the government.

The imagination of people of 100 years ago linked this country together by rail as they did without the granaries of the west and without the big industrial complex of the east. But they did not have that wealth, they did not have those resources. The government did it. And when the CPR did not like the way the government was doing it the CPR, which is so sensitive about its integrity today, bought the government, purchased it, for a couple of hundred thousand dollars. They are awfully sensitive about their integrity today. I do not deny they have it.

The state is the natural vehicle for the implementation of medical care. Mr. Justice Hall said it is an absolute necessity.

To give you an example, to get down out of the aerie heights and give a concrete example: I was one that stood in the House—I remember the young hon. member for Scarborough West was another one, and indeed the hon. member for Woodbine, the hon. member for Parkdale—I recall this part of the debate where we complained, four of us complained, about this limitation period for pregnant women. We tried to put it 65 different ways, we tried to say the very people we should be concerned about, the very people above all others that we should be worried about are the young, the woman carrying the child in her womb, those are the ones that we want to get medical care. That is our future wealth, the health of our young is our future wealth. This proposition, we felt on this side of the House, only the most contumacious could dispute, as a matter of principle. A year later, grudging, reluctantly, in the role of Tories who are dragged kicking into the twentieth century—is that the phrase?

An hon. member: Kicking and screaming.

Mr. Sopha: Kicking and screaming, yes! The same party, of course, that voted against old age pensions in the Senate; the same party, led by the knight on his charger, the hon. Minister of Health—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: I do not recall that, I was not there. I know the Tories voted against it, the same people. Indeed the same people of an age not too long ago—there are some in the House who were here when it was said—that damned a whole province in respect to family allowances: A “bribe to Quebec”—is that the phrase? These are matters of principle.

We say this is the rock on which we are going to pitch our tents. One can probably say it in a hundred different ways, but it boils down to the same thing. Medical care for our people is a matter that commands our undivided attention. Now! Today!

It is not capable of simple solution and I would not want to put words in the record for people who may read it 10, 20 or 50 years hence to glean from what I said that I thought it was an easy problem. It is not. It is a very complex problem, a very difficult problem. Reading the 1,300 or 1,400 pages of Mr. Justice Hall's report one begins to comprehend the enormity of the problem; how we need not only doctors, trained technicians, therapists and all the other ancillary people that march in the army of those that work in the field of the health of our people.

We can fault the government on that score. I said before—and like the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to refer to earlier speeches, he revels in it—I said before that if one sat down in 19 and 45 at the end of the war—19 and 45 is the way Laurier used to say it—if one sat down and got somebody from the life insurance company, an actuary, one could calculate how many children would be born in this country in the next 20 years—the rate of population increase. It would not take any special skill or any special learning to do it. Any well trained actuary could do it, Mr. Speaker.

It could have said, the party that came to power in August of 1943 could have said, in 1966 or 1965, we are going to need this many trained doctors per year. But they had the public confidence in the intervening two decades, they had it. They did not ask, they felt they did not have to. For some amazing, strange reason that is going to come to an end in this province, all they had to do was go to the polls and be endorsed. They did not provide for the training of doctors. We come along in the '60's, and indeed on the first publication of Mr. Justice Hall's interim report where he posits in very glaring terms the need for doctors in this country, and

suddenly there is great activity to open medical schools.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): And they will not graduate until 1971.

Mr. Sopha: Right. My hon. leader says they will not graduate until 1971. In the year 2,000 if some of us are still around, God willing, the '60's will be the years of the university building era. They will be the years in which we founded universities; in a mad scramble, with tremendous expense to get universities started to train people.

So it is with doctors. One could see, and one does not have to be an Einstein or a genius, one could see that in the field of dental care that one dental school in the province was not enough. Indeed, I am told there are only two; in the whole of Canada there were only two, one in the west and the one in Toronto. Perhaps I am mistaken, but the president of the Canadian dental association told me that. That failure to act, and here is the point that I strive to arrive at, one of the reasons for the complexity of the problem now was the failure to act to train people in the field of health care 10 or 15 years ago.

If I may, with the hon. member for Scarborough North, transgress into the theological vein: "As you sow, ye shall reap."

The hon. Minister of Health with his great learning of Biblical lore will understand that. We sowed 20 years ago; we sowed the wind and we reap the whirlwind. The federal government recognizes these problems. As the days go by I find that I must say in all honesty to myself that I develop some misgivings about some of my brethren in Ottawa, but I say that only out of honesty. I will not dwell on it; perhaps at another time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Perhaps they have some misgivings about the hon. member.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I have never heard of them.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have.

Mr. Sopha: Has the hon. Minister! All right; fine, fine!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will tell the hon. member about them.

Mr. Sopha: I usually speak well of them. I would have liked to think, Mr. Speaker, that they spoke well of me.

In a field that is not a matter of federal jurisdiction, the framers of the Constitution

stipulated that the health of the people should be a matter of provincial responsibility, the federal government it seems to me, I mean both governments, I mean the Diefenbaker government as well as the present one, has been eminently fair. They have given notice that it is a matter of policy with them that whatever plan Canadians are to have ought to be universal and comprehensive.

And to that end, though I would not pretend to have knowledge of the details, they have said here is the amount of money that we are willing to give by way of contribution, and they say they stipulate certain conditions that were related by my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Nixon). I do not go into those.

It seems to me I read in the paper that the Hon. Mr. McEachern said that the Ontario plan approaches the satisfactory state. I am quite certain I read that he said that. The hon. Minister of Health nods his head in agreement.

An hon. member: Well, it means that Mr. McEachern is coming down.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. member does not need to worry, he did not commit the government with what he said.

We in Ontario—and here to me is another significant thing, that I think we must never forget, and it does not matter if the people beyond the Rockies or on the prairies or down in the Maritimes hear me say this—that what Ontario does in this country has immense influence and impact on trends and developments.

As at Confederation, so through all the history ever since Confederation, Ontario has been the fulcrum, it has been the very centre-piece, the balancing point for the development of this country.

Our friends down in La Belle Province seem to be caught up in the nationalist surge; they seem to be distracted by matters that concern them and that stem from their history; they seem to be mindful of the fact more so than they were 10 or 15 years ago that in 1840 the English set out to destroy them and their language. They have resurrected all those things, as they have in cycles ever since the conquest, they have done that.

But what we in Ontario do is important for the development of this country and we must always remember that it is incumbent upon us to act responsibly because we lead the way. We are the wealthiest province, we are the most populous; we have perhaps the most resources, as yet undeveloped. We had a large stake in the formation of this country.

We do not fear the central government, and this is the important thing; we do not fear centralism.

Residents of Ontario, I should judge, are inclined to be centralists. They are inclined to favour a strong central government. They are inclined to see that the vehicle for a proper and adequate health plan for the citizens of this government is the federal government; a plan organized by the federal government, administered by the provinces, and financed largely by the federal government with its great massive tax-gathering powers, which we do not have; we will have to change that some day, but they have the access to revenue, which we have not.

I like to think—and I could put this in a different way but I have not the courage to do so tonight, I have gone on too long, there will be great general agreement with that—but I like to think that, speaking for myself, I would be willing to sacrifice some of my standard of living if it would raise the standard of living of people in other parts of this country.

This country cannot go on—notwithstanding the reasons Mr. Lesage gives that it cannot go on, in a speech last night that is worthy of study, not worthy of agreement—this country cannot go on half prosperous and half pauper, prosperous at the centre and poverty stricken at the extremities. And in that sense the analogy of the human body is perfect; if there is an accumulation of blood in the head and none in the extremities, the patient is going to die of a cerebral hemorrhage. This country cannot go on, I say, in that way.

A universal comprehensive medical care plan for all Canadians, from Cape Race to the Queen Charlotte Islands, is the ultimate goal; the only worthy goal. And what could be more worthy of Ontario, and the citizens of this province, led by its government—if it were a resolute government, if it were a dedicated government to the principle—what could be more worthy than Ontario leading the way to bring the highest standards of medical care to people in all parts of this nation? There is the challenge. There is the gauntlet that I throw to you.

So my plea is this, and I am inclined to be reasonable tonight, I hope it is a reasonable plea, stop nibbling around, stop fooling around with these amendments in the direction of where we want to go. And I think I can say that you would find—and I do not want to squeal on anybody—but you would find that last year when the government forced through Bill No. 136, Mr.

Speaker, with a big majority, a commanding majority, an overwhelming majority—and it was forced through—only reluctantly did many of the private members vote for it; reluctantly.

How do I know that? I listened to one of them on the radio on January 27, the day this bill was introduced; I listened to one of your hon. members on the radio, and his words were these, and I paraphrase them accurately. He said: "Today the medical care insurance amendment bill was introduced. The government lost no time and introduced at the earliest opportunity a bill designed to change the method of underwriting the standard insurance contract."

Then he went on and was caught up in a state of effervescence and euphoria and he said: "This bill today was one of the most significant pieces of social legislation in the last 20 years."

Brave words; he voted for the opposite last year, since he was called upon to vote for the opposite last year—the party discipline being what it was. He could not believe the two things, he could not, in integrity, believe both.

If this is a significant piece of social legislation, then with integrity he could not support the bill that he was required to vote for last year.

Our position has not changed and I will wait in vain, as I look at that press gallery, I will wait in vain for an editorial acknowledgment that our position never changed. We were steadfast. We say the same things today as we said last year in the debate.

Mr. Bryden: But not the year before.

Mr. Sopha: That may be so, but I speak for myself. I say to the hon. Minister of Health: your position changed, it changed greatly, but not a blush crosses his otherwise rosy cheeks. Not a blush; no embarrassment when he brings this bill in; not a tear drops from his eye. Now look, it is 500 words long and I see no acknowledgment that this is the obverse of the bill he defended last year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Pure business, no frills, pure business.

Mr. Sopha: This is the obverse. This is the contradiction of the position he took last year. No explanation by the first citizen, none at all. No participation; no explanation given of why the reverse. Maybe we are not entitled to know. I will not be too greatly disappointed if I do not know what impelled it, what stimulated it. But at least as I sit

down, I will have the satisfaction, I will sleep well tonight, as I put my head down on my pillow, and I will think that there is not really frustration in being in the Opposition.

It is not really frustrating; because you find that if you stand on principle, if you pitch your tent on that rock and you do not budge, if you say in a world that is deflected in its conformity, where people do not want to be different, if you say, "My mind is made up and nothing will change it. I have thought about it and my mind is made up and I am not going to change my mind," then, if you continue to stand there, you will not be budged. As a member of the Treasury benches told me one time, "When you come into this House, park your heels deep in the rug and nobody can bowl you over." So eventually, if you adopt that posture, it will get through over there. The message will be received, and through that way you will have your influence on the government of your province and of your life.

And, as the first citizen said, in a phrase that I captured in my memory and I will always have it, "It is better to be part of government than just to be governed." That is what he said. So, if our ideas are adopted, as they apparently were in Bill No. 6, for the reasons expanded by the hon. leader of the Opposition, in that sense you are part of government, playing a very effective part in government.

Our friends in the fourth estate can tell the editorial writers that in that sense we do not need the accolades, we do not need the acknowledgments. They do not need to waste any ink on us. They do not need to point out to the six per cent of newspaper readers who read the editorial page—only six out of a hundred—they do not need to tell them that we had a profound effect on the development of medical care in this province. And if we stick to our guns, if we do not budge, then next year will be the last year for those Treasury benches. The year after, we are going to have in this province—nothing can stop it, we are going to have it, whether you like it or not—a universal, comprehensive medical care plan. And indeed, eventually, we are going to have it for the whole of this country.

I say, finally, that I do not condemn or revile or criticize the doctors for the stance they take. I disagree with them, but they have the right to their opinions. I just wonder about them. I just wonder about some of them. Such a contrast between lawyers and doctors; lawyers do not fear government interference.

This session we will have a legal aid plan. There will not be a lawyer in the province that will complain about becoming servants of the state. We are accustomed to the state fixing our fees. Any citizen that complains about any fee we ever charge can run to the state, to an officer of the The Department of the Attorney General; he can run to him and complain about it and, indeed, he has the power to reduce our charges.

Mr. Bryden: He is a lawyer, too.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no, he is a public servant.

Mr. Bryden: He is a member of the law society.

Mr. Sopha: So I say to the doctors that I respect their fears, their concern, but I know in my heart that the medical profession does not own the human body; it does not own health, any more than lawyers own the law. They merely operate in that field, and universal medical care is not a medical problem. It is a political problem.

The community has made up its mind. The community has found its voice in Mr. Justice Hall and that voice is articulate. The voice says, "This is the next step in social progress in bettering the lot of our people. This exhibits our concern for the future health of our citizens." That voice will be triumphant in the final result.

Join with us. Hasten the day—not grudging, not complaining, but willingly, enthusiastically. Withdraw this bill; come in with a proper one that recognizes the articulated needs of our community in 1966.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this discussion, I wish to know first whether it is permissible to look anyone in the eye, or directly at them, when speaking or making a statement in this House. I did note that the hon. member for Sudbury gave the hon. Minister of Health permission to look him in the eye when he was talking to or about him.

I cannot for the life of me understand why these groups on my right are opposing this Bill No. 6 so violently.

Mr. Gisborn: We did not expect the hon. member to.

Mr. Letherby: Well, why would you not?

Mr. Yakabuski: You know, when the hon. leader of the Opposition was replying to the Throne speech a number of days ago, he referred to the group on his left as the socialists. And I think it is one of the contributions that

the hon. leader of the Opposition has made to this House at this session. Actually, I want to thank him for activating that term "socialist." You know, the label "socialist" is used widely in Europe, and I think it is about time we started to use it here in Ontario and in this country also. But I might say to the hon. leader of the Opposition and his party members over there, that if that group on the left are socialists, then I say that his platoon is made up of semi- or half-baked socialists.

The hon. member for Sudbury made reference to a government which was in power in Ontario in 1943, or came into power in August of 1943, and he said or asked why that government had not done something about foreseeing the health and hospital needs of the province at that time. He is not in the House at this moment, but I would ask him and his fellow members what the government of the day in 1942 did about the same problem? Actually, when we go back to the government that was in power from 1934 to 1943, why, they did not even foresee our power needs of 1945, 1946 and 1950. I think the people of this province must be thankful that the government was changed in 1943 or there would have been a continuous power blackout in this province for perhaps a decade.

The legislation that is before this House now is the type of legislation that we need to fill the gap in the medical needs of the people of this province. It is good legislation. It covers those who need assistance most, and it also covers all the others who wish to participate in this plan. On listening to the hon. member for Sudbury speaking so strongly on a universal and a national Medicare plan, I might mention to the hon. leader of the Opposition that it would be advisable for him and his group to disassociate themselves from Pearson and his bungling buddies. We recall what happened to the former leader of the Opposition back in August and September of 1963, when he bent an ear to the then Minister of Health and Welfare in Ottawa, Miss Judy LaMarsh. We know what happened to the leader of the Opposition on September 25 of that year. It might be advisable for the provincial Liberal Party to disassociate themselves from the plan that is being advocated by Ottawa.

I for one would not want to see the government of the province of Ontario get sucked into a universal compulsory Medicare scheme. I do not feel too good about having been sucked into the Canada pension plan. When the farm communities of this province

and of this country and the other people begin to understand what the Canada pension plan is all about, I think many of us will agree that it was an ill-conceived and hasty piece of legislation.

When we compare a free plan with a compulsory plan, I might refer to our hospital insurance plan which took effect on January 1, 1959, some seven years ago. It is not a compulsory plan and it is working out very well.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Seventy-four per cent of it is.

Mr. Yakabuski: There are very few citizens in this province who are not now covered by Ontario hospitalization insurance. I will only take a guess, but I would say the percentage is less than five per cent.

Mr. S. Lewis: Point six per cent.

Mr. Yakabuski: Point six—so it is just about 100 per cent. And mind you, that other small percentage—you could not even insure those people with a compulsory one. The plan which is covered in this bill I know, I am sure, is the beginning of a great Medicare plan. The hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) this afternoon, when I was out replying to a telephone call, had something to say about what I said regarding our Bill No. 136 last June 1. At that time I said:

I might say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that I am supporting this bill completely because I feel that this will be the beginning of the greatest health plan known anywhere on this continent.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): That is the quote I used, all right.

Mr. Yakabuski: Well, I might say to the hon. members here and the Wingham clipper—

Mr. S. Lewis: Who is the Wingham clipper?

Mr. Yakabuski: —that I repeat that statement tonight, only this time much more emphatically.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, next year the hon. Minister can do the same thing.

Mr. Letherby: He can add to it next year.

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, the eyes of every provincial capital in this country, and the eyes of the federal capital, are upon this Legislature as we debate this issue. They

will be most interested in the outcome of this issue. There are many people in the centre of our Canadian west who wish they had another opportunity to debate this issue again.

I would like to quote a letter that appeared in the *Ottawa Journal* last Saturday. It is entitled "Medicare":

Sirs:

If we can judge from the press reports there is a general misconception regarding the Medicare situation here in Saskatchewan. A large percentage of the people are not as reconciled toward it as others would have you believe.

Now the hon. member for Woodbine is not here and I am very sorry that he is not in his seat; but I want to continue:

True, the majority had favoured medical insurance long before compulsory state medicine was used to force people into further dependent servitude. Not many more people are covered now. It wasn't the Medicare, it was the compulsion they feared. In spite of anything said to the contrary, many Saskatchewan citizens still value their individual freedom and rights beyond all else.

And, Mr. Speaker, this letter to the *Ottawa Journal* is signed by a Mr. S. Ward of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that here is a Ward who does not want to be a ward of the state.

I said earlier I could not understand why the socialists, the semi-socialists, and the half-baked socialists oppose this bill so violently.

I think this is what they have in mind: They would like to see this government back out of this legislation, retreat, and take up the stand that was taken up in Saskatchewan. They would like to see chaos in this province because they know if we as a government were to introduce a compulsory Medicare scheme, that they would have a very good chance of defeating this government when we next go to the polls. This is the only reason that they oppose this bill. They have seen what has happened in Saskatchewan and they think they can use the same tactics here. I am sorry that the hon. member for Woodbine is not in his seat. It is a very unfortunate situation when we are talking about Saskatchewan and the person that we are directing part of those remarks to is not in his seat at the time.

Mr. S. Lewis: Sure he is.

Mr. Bryden: I came as soon as the hon. member summoned me.

Mr. Yakabuski: The gist of it was, Mr. Speaker, that things are not going too well in Saskatchewan. Really, Mr. Speaker, I think this is what happened out there. When the hon. member for Woodbine had a sojourn on the prairies a number of years ago, you know what I think happened? I think he had a part in striking the match that started the Medicare fire in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Bryden: I thank the hon. member.

Mr. Yakabuski: And then he saw that this fire was going to burn beyond control and do you know what he did then? He scattered out of the province.

The other day there was a report in the newspaper that the government in Brussels, Belgium, had resigned. A further report the following day indicated that King Beaudoin did not accept the government's resignation. The report regarding the resignation read as follows:

Fayat told reporters the government resigned after an emergency Cabinet meeting and because it was unable to resolve its difficulties over Medicare.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we see why the socialists and the semi-socialists want us to get into the same jam. This is their only chance of taking over this government.

But I know that this is not going to happen. The hon. member for Sudbury said that we have backtracked, we have not stood fast to our original bill, that he and his group have stood fast in everything regarding this bill. But I want to say, Mr. Speaker, we are as flexible as the fast-moving times we are living in. Many times what applies today does not apply tomorrow. This is a sign of a government that is awake, a government that is on its toes, whereby it can change its course when the course needs changing.

I might say too that I think both these groups here have lost touch with the people of Ontario and the people of Canada completely. If they were in touch with the people of this province they would not dare rise in this Legislature and oppose this bill because this is the legislation that our people want.

After Bill No. 136 was passed here last June, did hon. members hear of any violent complaints, did they hear any reaction in the press? No, they did not. The people of this province were happy; they are going to be even more happy with Bill No. 6.

I might mention, when talking about the

press, I read in one of my own papers here last week-end, the *Renfrew Advance*, where this government was adopting the wise course in having a non-compulsory medical scheme for the people of Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis: Which paper?

Mr. Yakabuski: The *Renfrew Advance*. It said that we were covering the people who should be covered, and, Mr. Speaker, the *Renfrew Advance* never jumps over any high walls to compliment this government.

This is why I say the group over here have lost touch completely. I think that if they want to redeem themselves and if they want to improve their image with the people of this province that they should join our band wagon and support this bill.

This government, Mr. Speaker, unlike the government of Belgium, is not going to be crowded into a corner like the Opposition here would like it to be. This government will not be resigning. It will probably be coming back; after this bill has been implemented and after we go to the people again, this government will be back with the platoons over there much, much smaller. Therefore again, Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as one who feels he is in touch with the little people of this province, that I support this bill. I know that we are going to go on from here. This is just the beginning. We are going to go on from here and encompass these other groups—

Mr. S. Lewis: When?

Mr. Yakabuski: When the time is right.

Mr. S. Lewis: When is that?

Mr. Yakabuski: When we are called on to take that course. This legislation will be enlarged as time goes on to cover dentists, chiropractors, the oculists, drugs and all things that are not covered in this plan today. But we have to start somewhere and we have made that start.

Back in the early '50's when the great government in Ottawa was still in power—hon. members know the one that was there for 22 years, that one—well, when they were in power the Prime Minister of the day in this province, the hon. Leslie Frost, wanted to introduce a hospital insurance scheme. And do hon. members know who was stalling? It was not the Tory government down here in Toronto, it was that Liberal government in Ottawa.

Mr. Frost laid his cards on the table and put it down on the line. He said: "If Ottawa

will not participate or contribute to this hospitalization scheme we have in mind we will go it alone." It was because of the government here, led by Premier Frost, that this province and nearly all the other provinces in Canada have today a hospital insurance plan.

Therefore, we are starting out in the Medicare plan. We are not the first, but I will bet that within five or ten years we will have the finest Medicare plan in this country or on this continent.

Mr. Bryden: Why not have it now?

Mr. Yakabuski: And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Opposition to change their course, to support this bill, and go back to their people and say: "I am sorry, I know better now."

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, the hour is late and before the period of adjournment perhaps I could reflect on some observations made by other members during the course of this debate.

I was interested by the infusion into the debate this evening of a wide degree of professional pollsterism indulged in by the Progressive-Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Scarborough North in justifying the legislation of last year, Bill No. 136, based his justification on 160 replies in one riding out of 16,000 mailings. Then to bulwark that tremendously documented case, he introduced a somewhat more amateurish poll where a visiting dignitary had interviewed United Church ministers, demonstrating in front of these legislative buildings, and had decided that 80 per cent of them were practising New Democrats. Thus do the polls proliferate.

Further, on the basis of the conversation which the hon. member had with the executive director of the board of evangelism and social service of the United Church, he came to the conclusion that that board, and the church hierarchy in general, did not represent its membership and the people of the province of Ontario in relation to medical care.

And lest we for one moment feel that the debate was not sufficiently strengthened, the hon. member who preceded me managed to impugn the entire Saskatchewan plan, the participation of the doctors, the 95 per cent provincial enrolment, by quoting one letter from one citizen in the city of Moose Jaw published in an individual newspaper.

Now I say these things, Mr. Speaker, for a purpose; because they represent one of the

factors which plagues this debate. During the course of the afternoon sitting, my hon. colleague for Riverdale advanced a theory which he said came in absence of explanation from the government. The hon. Prime Minister—I hope I quote him correctly—said that that was quite an assumption, directing his remarks to my hon. colleague. But it was an assumption, it was a postulate that necessarily came in the absence of any legitimate debate in this chamber on the bill before us on second reading.

Mr. Speaker, the bill itself is not so much a fraud as the debate which surrounds it is fraudulent. The whole procedure in this chamber during second reading, I submit to you sir, is laced with cynicism. Not in terms of the bill, or in terms of individual members, but by nature of the debate itself. There has been no debate, because there has been no confrontation, because none of the arguments put forward on the part of both the Opposition parties has been confronted by hon. members of the government.

Indeed, as the hon. member for Sudbury said, the hon. Minister of Health and the hon. Prime Minister of the province have not even yet condescended to enter the debate. Not a single hon. member of the Cabinet has given indication that he intends to participate in the debate. And government back-benchers, who spoke on second reading last year, speak on second reading this year, with precisely the same arguments.

Now let me make an observation, Mr. Speaker. Some of us are also speaking again on second reading. I say with the necessary glimmer of a smile on my face, that we are limited somewhat in the distribution of speaking authority. Some of us necessarily repeat. But that only 12 or 14 hon. members of the government in total, out of 77 members in this House, should condescend in two years running to participate in a bill of this magnitude, when debated in principle, is a total abdication of political responsibility.

So what do we have, Mr. Speaker? What do we have? We have this ritual dance that all of us go through, where we recite speeches into a vacuum, where there is no exchange, no honest interchange of ideas; no dialogue established. Government speakers direct themselves to the periphery of members' remarks, to the trivia related to some of those remarks, but never to the substantive arguments which the Opposition attempts to make.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, by way of observation, and you have allowed a considerable latitude in this House, that as

one member of this House that is what I find particularly demoralizing about the proceedings of this Legislature. It is increasingly difficult on second readings, on principle, to engage in a meaningful debate in this Legislature.

When the bill was in the fire last year, when the hon. Minister was against the wall and unable to reply adequately, when the seeds that eventually resulted in the modifications to this bill were sown, those events took place on the clause-by-clause debate. But we can never exchange in this House in a debate on principle. And that I think, Mr. Speaker, is a sad commentary on the proceedings of the House and why, as the hon. member for Sudbury says, many of us from time to time feel a considerable frustration.

Now one asks, Mr. Speaker, where is the government leadership on this bill; when will it come; which of the Cabinet Ministers will participate? One hopes the hon. Prime Minister himself may consider intervening at some point.

We in this party, Mr. Speaker, and I know it is true of the Liberal Party as well, are not at this time so much obsessed with arguing pros and cons, because we do not wish to insult the hon. members of this House. All hon. members recognize the arguments on both sides. What we wish to achieve is to rejuvenate debate in the Legislature on second reading on principle and try to get some confrontation of ideas.

I would therefore like to suggest some of the basic factors that have been set out, none of which has been replied to, and ask the government that they grant us the prerogative of reply somewhere during the course of this debate, before second reading is over.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that what I am about to embark on is rather lengthy in the setting out of these arguments, and with the hon. Prime Minister's concurrence I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will meet at 2 o'clock for the presentation of the Budget, and if there is any time remaining in the latter part of the afternoon we will resume this debate.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.25 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 9, 1966

Budget address, Mr. Allan	338
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Oliver, agreed to	352
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued	352
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Dymond, agreed to	370
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	371

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 1966

The House met at 2 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: In both galleries, Hillcrest public school, Clarkson; and in the west gallery, Western technical and commercial school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

Would the hon. Attorney General inform the House if arrangements have been made or could be made to have Sir Guy Powles, the parliamentary commissioner for investigations in New Zealand, address an appropriate select committee of the Legislature on the subject of his office?

While I have used the words "select committee" in my question, I really did not intend to imply all the things that are meant by a select committee. What I really mean is an appropriate committee, perhaps a committee of the whole House, or the committee on legal bills or something along that line.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, Sir Guy Powles will be here in Toronto, according to the itinerary I have now, on February 24. It appears he arrives on the afternoon of that day and will be here on the 25th, at which time he will make a presentation to the Legislature, as this programme reads. I do know that he has quite a full schedule, filled with appointments. We are planning to offer him a luncheon and it was my thought that on that occasion—we did this when he was here, I believe, about a year ago—we will have quite enough time to discuss with him some of his work as an ombudsman for New Zealand. It was my

thought that hon. members of the House representing all the parties, selected persons, might be guests at that luncheon and would have an opportunity to meet him and talk with him.

I would like to say, further, that the matter of an ombudsman was referred to the commissioner on civil rights, I think about a year ago. It is therefore being studied by Mr. McRuer, and I would expect that he will be in a position to report before too long on that subject. I know that he has explored the matter in his studies, in his visits abroad, and in discussions with persons in those countries where this office now obtains.

I have no objection to having Sir Guy Powles address a committee if this can be worked in. But I would like to suggest to my hon. friend that perhaps in the circumstances, where we might in a sense be trespassing on the field we have allotted for, at present at least, to the commission on human rights, it might serve if the opportunity were afforded to Sir Guy to meet with certain interested hon. members from his party, from the New Democratic Party, and from this side of the House, the government. We would then hear what he might have to say to us, rather than attempt to set up a committee—especially at this time when I think his programme appears to be pretty well filled. However, I am not opposed to the suggestion. If it is feasible I shall be glad to follow it and see what might be done.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), notice of which was sent to him earlier in the day. Since he is not in his seat, and since the question is of such great concern to the people of my area, would you permit me to state the question and perhaps he would answer at his earliest convenience?

In view of the latest in a series of fatal accidents at the intersection of Highways 5, 24 and 99, what is The Department of Highways prepared to do to eliminate the serious safety hazard at that point?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker,

on January 28, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) asked a question which I was unable to answer at that time. Since asking the question, I have received certain information and I would be very happy to answer it today.

A copy of the reasons for judgment, dated November 9, 1965, in the case of Harold Praill, plaintiff, versus Keystone Contractors Limited, defendant, heard in the county court of the county of Kent, has now been received, Mr. Speaker.

The reasons for judgment review the facts of the case, and His Honour, Judge W. B. Beardall, then gives his decision, and I quote:

The defendant, however, pleads that this sewer was constructed under contract for the Ontario water resources commission, and section 35 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, RSO 1960, chapter 281, provides that sewage works that are being constructed with the approval of the commission and, in accordance with the terms and conditions imposed in any order, direction, report or regulation of the commission, so long as the sewage works are being so constructed they shall be deemed to be under construction by statutory authority, and section 11 of The Public Authorities Protection Act provides that no action shall be instituted against any person for any act done in pursuance of any statutory authority in respect of any alleged neglect or default in the execution of any such duty or authority unless it is commenced within six months next after the act, neglect or default complained of, or in case of injury or damage, within six months after the ceasing thereof.

As mentioned before the work, insofar as it affected the plaintiff's property, was completed in November 1963, and the beginning of the damage being apparent, was a few days thereafter.

The greenhouse finally fell on March 5, 1964, but the writ on this action was not issued until September 22, 1964, which is more than six months after the damage was done.

The plaintiff points out that section 15 of The Public Authorities Protection Act provides that the Act does not apply to municipal corporations. However, I think that this does not take the action out of the ambit of section 35 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act.

The action will, therefore, be dismissed with costs.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), notice of which has been given. The question is in three parts.

The first is:

1. What damage was caused to the government property during the riots at Millbrook?
2. Has the damaged property been replaced?
3. What was the cost of replacement?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question—what damage was caused to government property during the riot at Millbrook?—I presume the hon. member refers to the fires at Millbrook, as there has been no riot there.

Mr. Ben: No riots?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Am I correct?

Mr. Ben: Is that the hon. Minister's statement?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I presume you refer to the fires; there were no riots.

Mr. Ben: Is it a statement by the hon. Minister that there were no riots in Millbrook?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, is this what the hon. member means? Does he mean the fires, or does he suggest there was a riot there?

Mr. Ben: I think the hon. Minister has answered the question. Thanks.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not answered the question; I just wanted to make it clear. There were no riots there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ben: Then why the use of the tear gas?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I take it the hon. member suggests there was a riot?

Mr. Ben: Then why the use of tear gas for five days if there were no riots?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am trying to get the hon. member's question clear. I presume the hon. member suggests there was a riot there?

Mr. Ben: May I put it to the hon. Minister this way—during the disturbance after the fire?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member himself has stated publicly he could find no evidence that there was a riot there. The damage to the government property was: smoke damage to walls, requiring repainting; electrical work on the ceiling burned up; one wall at the back of the vault cracked—burning of steam line covering—hot water storage tank and steel screen partition needing replacement. The second fire in the Braille shop burned a certain amount of paper and library books.

The second part of the question is: Has the damaged property been replaced? Not completely; approximately 90 per cent is now completed. What was the cost of replacement? About \$15,000.

Mr. Ben: May I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister, Mr. Speaker? What was the damage during the trouble that ensued after the fire when tear gas was used?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with any damage caused subsequent to that. If the hon. member wishes to ask me whether there was any damage subsequent to these particular fires, I would be glad to get it for him. Is that his question?

Mr. Ben: That is my question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get the information.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

In the night edition of the *Toronto Telegram* yesterday, February 8, there appeared on page 2 a news item under the heading, "Strike Injunction Reform Promised by Province." The article states:

The promise came yesterday at a meeting with Premier Robarts, Attorney General Arthur Wishart and Labour Minister Leslie Rowntree.

Mr. Speaker, this subject was not discussed at the conference and no such promise was made. The article continues:

In a discussion of the Oshawa *Times* strike, the union men were also told by Mr. Wishart that the Ontario provincial police would not be sent into the strike.

Mr. Speaker, this matter also was never discussed and no such statement was made by me.

In these two instances, the article in question is entirely without foundation in fact. I was not interviewed by any reporter after the conference and it would appear that the

two paragraphs of the article which I have quoted were purely speculation and manufactured out of whole cloth. Both statements are untrue.

In this same article, reference is made to a conference I had with Mayor Lyman Gifford and the hon. member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) and it is stated I was told there was no need for Ontario provincial police because the city police have the situation well in hand. No such statement was made to me. I did assure the mayor that the law would be enforced and that if he found it necessary to request the assistance of the Ontario provincial police he would immediately receive all necessary help.

One further thing, Mr. Speaker: The injunction here was not obtained *ex parte* and without notice. The notice of motion was served on all the defendants two days before the hearing. The defendants were represented at the hearing by Mr. J. H. Osler, QC, a most eminent and capable lawyer, and expert in labour matters. It was arranged that he might examine the chief witness for the plaintiff on his affidavit at 9:30, some two hours before the hearing on January 31. A shorthand reporter was present and took a verbatim report of the examination. The hearing took place two hours later at 11:30 before the hon. Mr. Justice Donnelly at Osgoode Hall.

But prior to the hearing, the solicitor for the union and the defendants, Mr. Osler, and the solicitor for the Oshawa *Times*, Mr. R. V. Hicks, settled the terms of the injunction. As a result, when the counsel for the Oshawa *Times* presented the application to his lordship, union counsel indicated that, while he was not consenting to the injunction, he was not opposing it. The injunction was then granted by the hon. Mr. Justice Donnelly.

It will be understood that the defendants, through their counsel, had full opportunity to request an adjournment to file material, to examine any other company witnesses and to make a full argument before the court.

The injunction, therefore, was obtained on notice to defendants and was not *ex parte*.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have here two messages from the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, signed by his own hand.

Mr. Speaker: W. Earl Rowe, the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, transmits estimates of certain sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1967, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, February 8, 1966.

And the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor, transmits supplementary estimates of certain additional sums required for the services of the province for the year ending March 31, 1966, and recommends them to the legislative assembly, Toronto, February 8, 1966.

Orders of the day.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer) moves that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into the committee on ways and means.

BUDGET ADDRESS

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I am delighted again today to have a former Treasurer in the House in the person of the Hon. Leslie M. Frost, who was Treasurer of this province. I had hoped that the hon. Mr. Justice Porter would be here also. He may be a little later. I believe he is the only other living former Treasurer of this province.

In commencing my eighth annual Budget statement to this House, I am particularly happy to be able to report that the past year has been another year of marked progress for Ontario's economy and people. The exceptionally long period of economic expansion which began in 1961 was sustained throughout 1965. I am confident that this expansion will continue in the coming year.

This broad economic advance is, of course, the result of many factors. For our part, we have continually sought to provide the environment in which such growth can flourish. Indeed, we have initiated many farsighted policies designed to exert a positive influence upon the economy. In the field of social services, we have diligently striven to promote the development of human resources and thereby assist our people and industry in achieving their maximum potential. The creation of new physical assets in the form of universities, schools, hospitals, highways, parks and other public works, and the development and conservation of our natural resources have also been important economic stimulants. In these and other ways, we have contributed in no small measure to our economic progress and rising living standards.

Prosperity is also having a beneficial effect upon our revenues. For the current fiscal year, the yields from a number of sources, and from the personal income tax particularly, are expected to be higher than could reasonably be anticipated a year ago. For this

reason, we can look forward to a more satisfactory result in the current fiscal year than was forecast. At the same time, the demands to enlarge and adjust our expenditure programme to meet Ontario's changing needs continue to mount relentlessly.

With the total demands for public services continuing to grow rapidly, it has become necessary to place greater emphasis on determining expenditure priorities and ensuring maximum efficiency in the use of our financial resources. To this end, we are constantly striving to plan our activities on the basis of thorough knowledge and understanding of economic and social conditions and trends. At the same time, we are keeping our administrative techniques and procedures modern and efficient in order to effect maximum economy in our day-to-day operations.

Because of the increasingly interdependent nature of the society in which we live, and the growing role that government is expected to play, there is a greater need than before for the closest co-operation and understanding among government, business, labour and others. Policies and programmes should not be conceived and implemented without regard for the objectives and goals that we all have in common. Between governments, particularly, there is a great need for consultation and co-operation in the formulation of policy. We welcome the new awareness that the policies and programmes of the various levels of government must be integrated if the best interests of the people are to be served.

In these introductory remarks, I have referred to the importance of economic growth and intergovernmental relations. I should now like to consider these matters in greater detail, commencing with economic conditions.

This month marks the end of the fifth year of the current economic expansion, and the economy is continuing to grow. During 1965, gross provincial product increased by about nine per cent or \$1.7 billion, reaching a new high of \$20.7 billion. New records were set in every sector of the economy, particularly in construction and manufacturing. The prosperity of the province continued to be so attractive to people from abroad and from other parts of Canada that Ontario's population rose by 2.2 per cent compared with 1.5 per cent for the rest of Canada.

More significant than Ontario's gains in production and employment in 1965 was the increased tendency of our people to invest in future growth by improving the quality of the labour force. In spite of the temptation to enter the labour force at a relatively early age, our young people have become more

aware of the need to further their education and training. We should be as proud of the increasing tendency of our people to invest in their long-run potential as we are satisfied with the expansion in our economy.

While the tendency to prolong education and training restrained the potential increase in the labour force in 1965, the fast rise in employment opportunities absorbed many of the unemployed so that Ontario's unemployment declined from 83,000 to 66,000. The unemployment rate fell from 3.2 per cent in 1964 to 2.5 per cent in 1965, the lowest of any region in Canada.

Ontario could have achieved greater growth if a larger supply of qualified labour had been available. The limiting factor to Ontario's rate of growth in 1965 was not capital but qualified managerial, professional and skilled labour. Consequently, the government has supported accelerated programmes to upgrade the existing and potential labour supply. Despite the shortage of qualified labour, the province set new records for output in every sector of the economy. The major engines of expansion in 1965 were the manufacture of durable goods and construction. It is estimated that factory shipments of durable goods rose by almost 13 per cent in Ontario compared with five per cent in the rest of Canada. Indeed, production of motor vehicles, an activity dominantly located in Ontario, increased by 27 per cent.

The net growth in Ontario employment in 1965 was 75,000. The major areas of increase were the following: about 30,000 in manufacturing, 14,000 in construction, 15,000 in wholesale and retail trade, and 17,000 in commercial services. Despite a large investment in improved technology in 1965, we can find no evidence to support the idea that automation is creating a general unemployment problem in the province. In fact, while Ontario is moving rapidly in the process of introducing automation, our unemployment rate is the lowest in Canada. Indeed, were it not for the labour shortage, we would have increased manufacturing and other employment to a greater degree.

Although automation generates new jobs, it may create problems for some individuals. Therefore, we must ensure that the economy continues to provide adequate job opportunities. To achieve this, we must provide for adequate education, training and retraining, and must facilitate mobility so that individuals can adjust to a progressive world. Policies with respect to growth and development, education, and manpower must be formulated and implemented together within

a system of goals and priorities designed to provide the people of Ontario with the best possible standard of living.

The people of Ontario can expect another substantial increase in economic production in 1966. The substantial rise in business investment last year, combined with the large increases in investment in human resources and social capital, will contribute further to the productivity of Ontario's economy. Exports of raw and processed materials as well as manufactured goods should remain buoyant. Consumer demand for nondurable goods and for services will continue to increase, while the market for durable goods should be sustained by residential construction, by rising personal incomes in Canada, by the introduction of new products, and by a strong replacement demand. We must strive to ensure that these conditions will be maintained if we are to meet the growing demands for government services and social capital.

One of the basic requirements for sustaining economic growth is vigorous and positive action at all levels of government. This in turn requires that each government has adequate financial resources and that machinery exists to provide for an integrated approach to the implementation of public policy. These matters are the basic concerns of federal-provincial relations to which I would now like to turn.

Any federal system of government will experience periods when adjustments in inter-governmental financial arrangements and responsibilities will be required to meet changing conditions. At the present time, provincial and municipal governments are faced with huge demands for investments in human and physical resources. The federal government is also required to implement new policies and programmes in many areas under its jurisdiction. We are thus faced with the challenge of reconciling the need for a strong central government with the present and continuing strength of the provinces. If we approach this challenge reasonably and conscientiously, we will have no difficulty in finding acceptable answers to it.

The government of Ontario recognizes the need for a strong central government to protect and promote the national interest in both the national and the international economy. In our endeavours to preserve national independence and to achieve a satisfactory rate of growth, we confront international challenges and the need to harmonize internal growth policies. A strong central government is essential for meeting these challenges and promoting this harmony.

At the same time, the provincial governments have jurisdiction over matters that are also vital to the national interests; they have a direct responsibility in building a strong economy that will be capable of supporting federal efforts to protect and promote the national interest. The importance of these matters is illustrated by the fact that in 1964 the provincial and municipal governments together accounted for 81.7 per cent of total capital investment made by all governments in Canada.

The effectiveness of government at the federal and the provincial levels depends upon two prerequisites. In the first place, the provincial governments must have revenue resources commensurate with the importance of their constitutional responsibilities. It is becoming increasingly clear that the combined total of provincial and municipal expenditures will continue to grow at a much more rapid rate than the corresponding federal commitments.

In the second place, because of the interdependence of economic circumstances and policies today, there must be adequate consultation, co-operation and co-ordination between the two levels of government in order to achieve harmony in establishing goals, priorities and policies. During the past year there has been substantial evidence of a favourable development in federal-provincial relations: the acceleration of the trend toward more consultation and co-operative study. Ontario representatives have participated in no fewer than 11 ministerial conferences and 90 meetings of officials at the federal-provincial level.

Although co-operation has been enhanced by this process, reservations have been expressed about its consequences on the functioning of the parliamentary system. Yet, the process of consultation is far from adequate in view of the substantial areas of overlapping responsibility and concern. Policies initiated by the federal government frequently have serious implications for provincial priorities, resources and policies. This is particularly contentious where the jurisdiction involved is a provincial one. Even policies planned for areas of federal jurisdiction can have significant consequences for the provinces. For example, the free trade agreement with the United States concerning motor vehicles and parts was a welcome development, but Ontario manpower policy appropriate to the new development could have been initiated at a much earlier stage through collaboration in the general lines of the agreement.

I believe that the most encouraging indication of progress is to be found in the recent meeting of the Ministers of Finance and Treasurers of all 11 governments. This was certainly a step in the right direction, particularly when it was backed up by the research work that is being done by all governments in concert for the tax structure committee. We would urge the federal government to exercise leadership in the development of machinery, methods and procedures for ensuring full exchange of information and for working toward adequate co-operation and co-ordination in policy formulation and implementation.

If this leadership is exercised by the federal government, then the federal and provincial governments can be in a position to make satisfactory judgments on overall prospects and on appropriate long-run and short-run fiscal policies within the areas of their responsibilities. We will then be able to fit our efforts to improve our economic potential into a framework of national priorities and policies.

These are major objectives of the Ontario government in federal-provincial relations. If we endeavour to achieve these objectives earnestly and in good faith, we can deal successfully with our economic problems, greatly enhance our endeavours to create a strong, independent and prosperous country, and provide the wider opportunities that our people need and must have.

Before submitting our plans for the coming fiscal year, I would like to present an interim statement of the financial operations of the province for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1966. This statement, which is based on eight months' actual and four months' forecast, will provide the hon. members with a current picture of provincial finances and of the overall trends that are taking place in expenditures and revenues.

Included in the expenditures for the current fiscal year are supplementary estimates which we are presenting for your consideration and approval. The special grants which we propose to meet from this year's revenue total \$5,436,600 and are as follows:

The Department of Energy and Resources Management: provision for payment to the Ontario Northland transportation commission to compensate for losses on operations for the year ended December 31, 1964, \$861,600.

The Department of Health: special grants to public hospitals under the authority of The Public Hospitals Act and the regulations thereunder, \$4,075,000; special grants for teaching hospitals, \$500,000.

Inclusive of the supplementary estimates, the combined net expenditures on ordinary and capital accounts are estimated before providing for sinking fund at \$1,494.2 million. Net ordinary expenditure before providing \$41.5 million for sinking fund and \$159 million for financing capital payments out of ordinary revenue amounts to \$1,195.8 million, and net capital expenditure on physical assets is estimated at \$298.4 million. Overall, our net expenditures represent an increase of \$228.7 million or 18 per cent over the actual costs incurred in the preceding fiscal year.

While the growth in expenditures reflects higher outlays in many areas of responsibility, the major increases are for education and university affairs. These two departments account for \$103.3 million or 45 per cent of the total increase in expenditures. Other significant increases include \$37.8 million for highways, \$16.4 million for public welfare, and \$13.7 million for health.

Net ordinary revenue and net capital receipts are estimated at \$1,398.5 million. This is an increase of \$159.5 million or 13 per cent over the actual revenues received in the preceding fiscal year. The personal income tax, which produces about one-fifth of this year's revenues, accounts for three-fifths of the overall increase. The yield from this tax is estimated to rise by \$94.4 million or 48 per cent of \$290.3 million. The substantial increase in yield reflects not only the additional three percentage points made available to us, but also the high productivity of this tax field in a period of sharply rising incomes. All other sources, which contribute nearly 80 per cent of our revenues, are expected to produce an additional \$65.1 million, an increase of six per cent over the preceding fiscal year.

On the basis of these interim estimates, we will end the current fiscal year in a more favourable position than I forecast a year ago. While we will have carried out a huge capital programme of \$298.4 million, the increase in our net capital debt will be held to an estimated \$98.8 million. Our net capital debt as of March 31 next is thus expected to total \$1,464.1 million.

I turn now to a summary of the major programmes for the coming fiscal year, commencing with highways and roads.

The demand for further expansion and improvement of our highway and road system remains strong. We are experiencing a rapid growth in motor vehicle registrations which can be expected to continue as increasing numbers of our young people enter the labour force. The sharply rising traffic

volume in Ontario necessitates placing greater emphasis on multi-lane and controlled access highways. Our increasing expenditures are a reflection of the relatively higher cost of providing these modern facilities, as well as of maintaining an expanded road system. In the coming fiscal year, the net ordinary and capital expenditures of The Department of Highways will be increased by \$36.5 million to \$373.3 million.

Our freeways and expressways are of tremendous economic value. They allow the free flow of people and goods so essential to the efficient functioning of an urban, industrialized society. Moreover, they represent assets which will continue to benefit our people and our economy for years to come. For these reasons, it is our policy to finance highways and roads partly from the general revenues of the province and the remainder through judicious use of our borrowing capacity. In this way we are able to avoid the imposition of highway tolls.

Construction and reconstruction of highways and roads during 1965 continued at an accelerated pace, resulting in the completion of 553 miles of paved highways and 61 new structures. The Macdonald-Cartier freeway was completed as a four-lane facility over an additional 31 miles and, in Metropolitan Toronto, four miles were widened to 12 lanes, and 23 bridges were completed. New sections were opened on Highways 403 and 406, and substantial work was done on the Brantford by-pass. In Ottawa, the approaches to the Macdonald-Cartier bridge and a new section of the Queensway were opened.

Progress on the trans-Canada highway routes in Ontario moved forward substantially with work on some 89 miles, including Highway 15 near Bell's Corners, by-passes at Madoc and Beaverton, three sections of Highway 17 in northern Ontario, and Highway 103. Elsewhere construction highlights included work on 51 miles of the Red Lake road, 73 miles of the Atikokan highway, the Sudbury-Timmins highway, the Welland canal tunnel, and virtual completion of road-work under the roads-to-resources programme which expires on March 31.

Expenditures by municipalities on their road systems during 1965 continued to reflect rising costs and increased mileage. A number of cities have undertaken unprecedented construction programmes, while the completion of needs studies of county road systems will undoubtedly also result in a marked increase in construction activities.

The emphasis in our highway construction programme in the coming fiscal year will be

on construction of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway between Gananoque and Brockville and around Metropolitan Toronto, on the Welland canal tunnels and the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway. In northern Ontario, work will continue on the major projects such as the Sudbury-Timmins highway, Highway 105, Highway 101 from Foley to Wawa, and on the new expressway at the Lakehead.

Of the \$373.3 million to be appropriated for highways and roads in the coming year, \$265.4 million will be for construction and \$107.9 million will be for maintenance. The total includes \$119.8 million for municipal road subsidies and assistance for roads in unincorporated townships. Thus we will be providing for a combined provincial and municipal road programme of almost \$500 million.

A fundamental and important responsibility of the government is the conservation and development of Ontario's rich natural resources for our economic and recreational benefits, both now and in future years. To support the wide-ranging activities of the various departments concerned, we are requesting appropriations totalling \$92.1 million for the coming fiscal year. This is an increase of \$8.7 million over the interim estimate of expenditures for the fiscal year 1965-66.

The Department of Agriculture is playing an intimate role in the progressive development of Ontario's vital agricultural industry. During 1965, two new federal-provincial agreements were signed: One, a five-year agreement under the agricultural rehabilitation and development programme which is placing more emphasis on farm adjustment programmes in low-income rural areas; and the other, a new farm labour agreement providing for cost-sharing in the procurement of qualified farm labour. Under the ARDA programme, financial assistance was provided last year to 246 rural municipalities to carry out water conservation and land-use adjustment projects.

In the coming fiscal year, the ARDA programme will include, among other projects, the inauguration of an orderly land consolidation programme in eastern and northern Ontario. A new comprehensive programme to assure adequate veterinary services, at reasonable cost, to livestock and poultry owners will be introduced in northern Ontario. In co-operation with labour agencies and farm organizations, special emphasis will be placed on determining and fulfilling farm labour needs. A new research farm will be established to continue, on an expanded basis, the research formerly carried out in facilities

which were vacated to provide for the development of the University of Guelph. The expenditures of the department are forecast at \$25.7 million for the coming fiscal year.

Through The Department of Lands and Forests, we are making a vital contribution both to the conservation of our forest, fish and wildlife resources, and to the development of Ontario's great recreational potential. Despite adverse weather conditions in 1965, the department made important strides in the construction of access roads, tree planting, forest inventory and other forest management programmes. Extensive improvements to a number of parks were also carried out, including the provision of new and improved roads, sewage and parking facilities, beach development, and many hundreds of additional campsites.

In the coming fiscal year, construction of 152 miles of forest access road, together with improvement of 75 miles of existing road, is planned. Forest regeneration will be stepped up and new measures to assist private owners in forest management will be introduced. Major improvements in five existing parks and development work in ten new park areas are also planned. The programme to restore the original Crown survey fabric of the province will be expanded. Total combined expenditures of The Department of Lands and Forests will reach an estimated \$39 million in 1966-67.

The Department of Mines is assisting, through its services and programmes the exploration and development of the province's mineral resources. Work commenced last year under a renewed federal-provincial agreement to complete the aeromagnetic survey of the province. This final three-year phase of the survey is proceeding as planned, with approximately one-third of the remaining area of the province surveyed in 1965 and a further one-third scheduled to be surveyed in 1966. Progress is being made under the department's programme to build mining access roads in participation with industry. Recent experiments in the servicing of geological parties by helicopter have proven successful. The work of four geological parties will be greatly speeded up through helicopter servicing in 1966. The net appropriations for The Department of Mines are forecast at \$3.5 million for the coming fiscal year.

Ontario's programmes for the management of our water resources are expanding rapidly. With the announcement last July of the availability of government financing for water and sewage treatment facilities throughout the province, the Ontario water resources com-

mission embarked upon a new phase of water and sewage works construction. Under the regular programme for the development of water and sewage works, 340 projects were completed up to last October at an estimated cost of \$133 million. Construction on the water pipeline to serve the London area is continuing, a further pipeline has been approved for the St. Thomas area, and feasibility studies are being made in six other regions of the province. Further new developments in the field of water resources management include an enlarged programme to combat industrial waste pollution. In addition, co-operation in the international joint commission investigation of pollution in the Great Lakes is being continued, and we are assuming a major role in the long-term federal-provincial study of Ontario's northern water resources.

The Department of Energy and Resources Management is continuing its programme of assistance to conservation authorities for the construction of small reservoirs and dams. Structures under construction or completed number 33, with another 39 in the planning stages. Extensive work is also planned under the federal-provincial flood control programme. Net ordinary and capital expenditures of The Department of Energy and Resources Management are forecast at \$23.9 million for the coming fiscal year.

The government's programme of industrial and trade expansion, being carried out by The Department of Economics and Development, is aimed at encouraging a satisfactory rate of industrial growth. Through international fairs, trade missions, local exhibits, and investment promotion, the department is actively engaged in advancing our economic progress.

Varied trade programmes are contributing to a marked expansion in Ontario's exports of secondary manufactured goods which, in 1965, approached nearly \$800 million. Last year, 18 sales missions to foreign markets were arranged, raising to 58 the total number of export trips since late 1962. Some 140 foreign buyers were brought to Ontario and put in touch with local manufacturers. In 1966, these programmes will be extended. Trade missions will be continued, not only in established market areas, but also in regions unfamiliar with Ontario products.

The drive to attract new investment and stimulate local industry throughout the province has been both energetic and effective. New branch plants, licensing agreements, and joint ventures, most involving foreign participation, contributed greatly to increased On-

tario manufacturing production in 1965. A concerted drive to encourage replacement of foreign-produced components with made-in-Canada products is under way and will continue in 1966.

Ontario's immigration policy continues to be a major contributor to the provincial economy. With the demand for skilled and professional workers exceeding the supply available in Canada, the department has increased its efforts to attract immigrants. Some 170 employers requested assistance in 1965.

The Ontario development agency has stepped up its programme of advisory services to small businesses in Ontario. In 1965, more than 300 companies with combined annual sales exceeding \$35 million took advantage of these services. Since its inception, the agency has counselled more than 4,000 small businesses in the province. In addition to making provincial guarantees of \$5 million available, the agency has been instrumental in obtaining \$15 million in additional financing from the regular lenders without government financial participation.

In the year following the establishment of the Ontario housing corporation, more than 100 municipalities requested housing, representing a potential programme of 9,500 units. I am pleased to report that 1,350 units were purchased or completed during 1965, 1,000 units are in the course of purchase or construction, and a further 1,300 units are at the stage of final design or tender call.

In order to achieve an immediate impact and to ensure assembly of a significant number of dwelling units in a relatively short period of time, the corporation has introduced a high degree of flexibility into its development programme. Techniques such as "builder proposals" and the purchase of existing properties have been used to supplement the more traditional method of tendering on the basis of plans and specifications.

In addition to its rental housing programme the corporation has continued the federal-provincial land assembly programme in conjunction with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation, has undertaken a community improvement project in northern Ontario, and has carried out studies in connection with Indian housing.

The Ontario housing corporation's 1966 programme in association with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation will involve nearly \$100 million. Rental accommodation will continue to be assembled through a variety of techniques, using the method or methods appropriate to each municipality

involved. In addition, other facets of development which appear possible under existing legislation will be carefully explored with Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation.

There is an obvious connection between the provision of public housing, the alleviation of poverty, and the provision of a physical and social environment that will permit families to move into the mainstream of the social and economic life of the community. To date, the Ontario housing corporation's activities have been concentrated on specific areas. In the future, we believe that through new approaches our housing operation will become an even more active agent in community development.

In The Department of Labour, during the past two years, both the range of services available and the department's capability for responding rapidly to the needs of the province have increased significantly. This is particularly evident in the new industrial training branch, where the on-the-job training programme, launched less than six months ago, is already making a notable contribution to industry's skill requirements and is, at the same time, opening broader employment and earnings opportunities for individuals.

Through a variety of incentives, the department is assisting firms throughout the province to set up and carry out both short-term occupational and long-term apprentice training programmes. More than 50 short-term projects are training almost 4,000 persons in occupations ranging from sewing machine operator to hard-rock miner. The number of projects is increasing each week, and the field officers of the training branch are discussing arrangements with more than 500 firms that have signified an interest and a need for assistance. At the same time, the registration of apprentices in formal trade programmes is mounting rapidly. The estimates for the department provide a substantial increase in funds and staff to carry forward into the next fiscal year, the objectives of the new programme: To provide for large-scale promotion of the services now available; to facilitate continued modernization of apprenticeship programmes; and, in the final analysis, to help build a highly skilled labour force enjoying stable and rewarding employment.

Coupled with these human resource development programmes are new initiatives being undertaken by the department in co-operation with industry and labour, to improve the working environment throughout the province. A balanced programme for the vital

field of safety and accident prevention, covering enforcement of safety standards, research into the causes of accidents and accident-prevention education, has been inaugurated.

To provide for our welfare services, the net ordinary expenditure of The Department of Public Welfare is forecast at \$90.2 million for the coming year. This is an increase of \$4.7 million over the interim estimate for the current year. The estimates include \$8.9 million to be paid to the Ontario medical services insurance division for the provision of medical services to welfare recipients and their dependants. Under new legislation, which will combine several welfare maintenance programmes, additional benefits will also be extended to many thousands of persons in the form of increased services and allowances and in supplementary aid to pensioners.

A comprehensive federal-provincial agreement has been signed by this government respecting welfare maintenance and community services to our Indian population. A new branch of The Department of Public Welfare will co-ordinate the efforts of several departments toward the betterment of economic conditions, education, housing and employment in Indian communities, as well as the provision of welfare, health and recreation services.

Development of rest homes as a new type of institution under the management of counties and cities is a progressive step. The rest homes augment present facilities offering care and a measure of nursing services to long-term residents. There will probably be less need for expansion in the larger homes for the aged, and the rest homes can be more widely distributed in local communities.

In the coming fiscal year, the rate of capital payment to adult charitable institutions will be doubled to the amount of \$5,000 a bed. This is further encouragement to the construction of private homes for the aged in a continually expanding system of residential care for elderly persons.

During 1965, legislation was passed to provide for important improvements in child welfare services. The government has accepted the total expense of the care of children of unmarried mothers. Children who have experienced parental neglect and require help in the way of protection, wardship or adoption, will benefit from these measures. The appropriation for the child welfare branch is forecast at \$14.4 million for the coming fiscal year and includes \$5 million to meet the additional cost of implementing the new legislation. The year 1959 marked a milestone

in the history of Ontario's health services programme, with the introduction of the hospital care insurance plan. The year 1966 will signal another important and logical step forward with the inception of the province's medical services insurance plan. Cost of the plan in the coming fiscal year is estimated at \$58.9 million, of which \$50 million will be provided through The Department of Health and \$8.9 million through The Department of Public Welfare. Together with increased appropriations for other health services, the new plan will raise the net expenditures of The Department of Health in the coming fiscal year to \$244.1 million. This is an increase of \$75.8 million over the estimated net expenditures in the current fiscal year.

The new medical services insurance plan is voluntary and offers benefits in the form of comprehensive physicians' services wherever they are rendered. These benefits are available to all residents of Ontario regardless of age, state of health or financial circumstances. Effective April 1, 1966, benefits will automatically be extended to those receiving assistance under welfare legislation. During the period March 1 to May 1 next, enrolment will be open with general coverage effective July 1.

Those in low income tax categories—namely, with taxable income of \$500 and under for single persons, \$1,000 and under for couples and \$1,300 and under for families of three or more—will receive assistance in the form of reduced premiums. Where it is established that a person had no taxable income in the previous year, applications will be accepted and a contract provided by the province without payment of a premium. Apart from this assistance to low income groups, the plan will make medical services insurance available to individual residents who wish to participate. It will be a particular boon to citizens who because of age, health or ineligibility to participate in a group contract have found it difficult to secure medical insurance.

The number of insured persons under the hospital care insurance plan now exceeds 6.7 million and represents 99.4 per cent of the estimated eligible population of Ontario. Extension of the plan last September to include as dependants under the family coverage all those, up to age 21 years, attending educational or training institutions where they do not receive wages or salary is estimated to cost the plan \$3.5 million in lost premiums. In accordance with the policy that I announced a year ago whereby there would be no increase in premium rates over the succeeding three years, we are again including in the Budget for the coming fiscal

year an amount of \$50 million to subsidize the costs of the plan.

The provincial grants for hospital construction will be increased by \$11.2 million to \$23.6 million. A substantial part of the increase consists of \$6.3 million for the special accelerated programme of grants for schools of nursing. In addition, hospital construction is being encouraged through low interest loans which are estimated at \$9.6 million for 1965-66, and forecast to rise to \$13 million for the coming fiscal year.

The expenditure of the mental health branch, including the cost of operating the Ontario hospitals, is forecast for the coming fiscal year at \$87.8 million, an increase of \$12.6 million over the current fiscal year. The higher level of expenditure now being incurred under the mental health programme reflects not only the increased activity and facilities relating to the treatment of patients but also the recent action of the government to adjust salaries commensurate with the duties and responsibilities of the hospital staffs.

One of the primary objectives of the mental health programme is to effect an appropriate distribution of services such as psychiatric units and outpatients services in general hospitals. Twenty-four such units are in the planning stage or under construction. These services will make available psychiatric treatment for short-term care; and outpatient services on the local level. The newest of such facilities is the C. K. Clarke institute of psychiatry, which will replace the Toronto psychiatric hospital with considerably expanded inpatient, outpatient and research facilities.

The remarkable decrease in the incidence of tuberculosis has reduced the need for treatment facilities to a fraction of those in use a few years ago. Some of these facilities have been procured by the government for use in its expanding mental health programme. Fourteen hundred beds have been converted to other uses such as chronic care, care of retarded children, general hospital accommodation or the treatment of psychiatric disorders. In the field of tuberculosis prevention, the government is now directing its programme at finding and examining those ex-patients whose disease has apparently been cured but who, either through reactivation or by infecting others, are responsible for one-third of those people who are found in need of treatment.

The homes for special care programme has progressed most favourably. To date more than 1,700 patients have been moved from

Ontario hospitals to "homes" and it is anticipated that this number will be substantially increased in the coming year. The estimates for this programme totalling \$5.3 million have been increased from \$2.5 million.

It is proposed that in 1966-67 bursaries now provided for medical and dental undergraduate students will be extended to include graduate training for health personnel in a variety of situations which are critical to the development of comprehensive health services in Ontario. The demand for such personnel will be accentuated by the medical insurance programme.

In its second annual report, the economic council of Canada recommended that "advancement of education at all levels be given a high place in public policy, and that investment in education be accorded the highest rank in the scale of priorities." With this, we are in full agreement. In this fast-moving technological age, education represents an essential investment of great economic consequence.

This economic factor is exercising a marked influence on the educational programme. The importance of basic skills is being emphasized in the elementary grades; a wide range of courses suited to varying interests and aptitudes is being offered in the secondary schools; facilities for technical education are being encouraged by federal-provincial grants; the unemployed are being trained or retrained for specific jobs; Ryerson polytechnical institute, the technical institutes, and the vocational centres have record enrolments; and career counselling becomes daily more important at both student and adult levels.

A rapidly expanding school system raises new questions and sharpens the importance of others that have been with us for some time. In this situation the value of educational research is increasingly recognized. The combining of three organizations in the newly established Ontario institute for studies in education unites the former department of educational research of the Ontario college of education, the graduate school of the same college, and the Ontario curriculum institute in an integrated effort designed to discover answers to these questions.

New attention is being given to the provision of adequate opportunities for education in thinly populated regions. Nearly 1,000 students in northern and northwestern Ontario are now assisted financially in meeting transportation costs to university and technical institute centres. Under recent legislation, elementary school boards in terri-

torial districts are assisted financially in reimbursing parents up to \$3 a day for board and transportation payments made on behalf of pupils attending a distant secondary school. Study is being given to further steps designed to improve educational opportunities in the north.

A beginning in provincially sponsored educational television was made in January of this year when two series of broadcasts were initiated, one dealing with the new mathematics at the grade 7 level and the other with the new grade 13 course in physics. Long-term plans include broadcasts at a number of levels—elementary, secondary, university, and in the field of adult education for persons no longer at school.

Three new provincial educational institutions opened their doors last September: Althouse college of education in London, in affiliation with the University of Western Ontario; the St. Catharines teachers college on the campus of Brock University; and a vocational centre at Sault Ste. Marie. Each of these projects has made a promising beginning that augurs well for its future contribution to education in Ontario.

Development of the recently proposed colleges of applied arts and technology is receiving active attention. Among the early colleges established will be some created through integration and adoption of existing institutes of technology and the vocational centres. The colleges will provide academic courses, as well as some vocational courses of a type not presently available in secondary schools and universities. An appropriation of \$12.4 million will be required in the coming fiscal year to enable the department to proceed with the development of these colleges.

An outstanding feature of Ontario's developing educational system has been the recent expansion of facilities and programmes in the technical and vocational field. Despite the emphasis that has been placed on providing vocational facilities, the demand for additional ones remains strong. To keep pace with modern industry's growing emphasis on skills, the province will triple the provision for grants to school boards under federal-provincial agreements for the construction and equipment of vocational education facilities from \$20 million in the current fiscal year to \$60 million in the coming fiscal year.

Legislative grants to school boards constitute by far the largest item of educational expenditure. Our financial assistance to these boards is increasing very rapidly—the inevitable result of rising enrolment, new and greater demands for technical training, and

higher unit costs. In the coming fiscal year, the amount available for school grants will be increased by \$52.4 million to \$383.4 million. Thus, the introduction of the Ontario foundation tax plan will have raised the level of school grants by \$149.7 million or 64 per cent over the first three years of its operation. Clearly, the plan is having a tremendous impact on Ontario's educational system. It is not only providing funds to expand and improve educational opportunities, but it is also making a very significant contribution to the relief of local taxpayers.

Substantial additional appropriations are also required for various other essential educational services and programmes. As a result, the total net expenditure of The Department of Education is forecast at \$575.5 million for the coming fiscal year—an increase of \$124 million over the interim estimate for the current fiscal year. This continuing and growing investment in our young people represents one of our best hopes for ensuring Ontario's future prosperity and progress.

During the past year a massive expansion of our facilities for higher education took place. A source of great satisfaction is that it has been possible to accomplish this expansion of facilities while maintaining the quality of the programmes offered. The result is that more than 52,000 students are this year enrolled in the provincially assisted universities and colleges of Ontario with more than 17,000 of these in the first year of their courses. More than 6,000 students are doing graduate work and the proportional increase in this area exceeds the growth in undergraduate years. Of those engaged in post-graduate studies, more than 1,500 benefit from province of Ontario graduate fellowships.

In the fiscal year 1965-66, the sum of \$64.6 million is being paid to assist the universities. Recently, the federal government announced an increase in its per capita grant from \$2 to \$5, but instead of using a straight per student amount for its distribution among the universities of the province, it has proposed a weighted formula based on actual enrolments in the academic session 1966-1967. Consequently, while the total federal funds to be made available to universities in Ontario for the fiscal year 1966-67 can be estimated, there is no way of knowing at the present time the amount to be allocated to each university.

On the recommendation of the committee on university affairs, it has been decided that the amount required by the universities and colleges of Ontario from the federal govern-

ment and this government together for 1966-1967 is \$122 million. The portion of this being provided in our estimates is \$91.4 million, an increase of \$26.8 million or 41 per cent over the present year. Because of the uncertainty referred to previously, the amount of the provincial grant to be allocated to each university has not yet been determined. However, the specific amount that each university can expect to receive from the two governments combined will be announced in the near future and in adequate time to permit planning for 1966-67.

The estimates of the current fiscal year included \$100 million for the continuation of capital expansion to provide for an average increased enrolment of 10,000 students per year for the next five years. The amount being provided in 1966-67 for this purpose is \$150 million. While first consideration must always be the opportunity afforded each individual by the provision of higher education, the potential benefits of our society inherent in a university population in excess of 100,000 by 1970-71 is cause for the greatest optimism for this province and for Canada.

Ontario's municipalities are facing challenges which are similar, in many respects, to those confronting the province. They have an important contribution to make to our economic and social progress. At the same time, they rely heavily upon property taxes which are not sufficiently productive to meet their requirements. Recognizing this, the province annually appropriates huge sums to ease the burden of rising costs on property owners. In the last five years we have provided an average of \$500 million a year in assistance to municipalities, school boards, and other local authorities.

Our financial assistance has already doubled in this decade, rising from \$309.6 million in 1959-60 to an estimated \$645 million this fiscal year. In this period, it has risen substantially faster than our overall revenues and this has occurred despite buoyant economic conditions, improvements in federal-provincial fiscal arrangements, and various measures taken to expand our revenues.

Aid to local authorities is obviously placing a heavy strain on our resources. At the same time, we simply cannot fail to fulfil our responsibility for aiding local ratepayers in financing essential local services. We are therefore planning to increase our total municipal assistance by an unprecedented \$127.1 million to \$772.1 million in the coming fiscal year. This increase is more than double the

average annual increase of \$61 million in the last three fiscal years.

A primary reason for the rising level of local assistance is the need to help local taxpayers in meeting education costs. Payments under the Ontario foundation tax plan will again be increased sharply, by \$52.4 million to \$383.4 million, in the coming fiscal year. This increase brings to \$149.7 million the total increase in general legislative grants in the first three years of the operation of the plan. In the field of construction of vocational education facilities, the amount provided will be tripled, rising from \$20 million to \$60 million. These expenditures indicate the vast extent of the province's partnership with local authorities in working together to meet the educational challenge.

Our participation in the provision of municipal roads and streets is also very extensive. The cost of the road building programmes of some larger municipalities is greater than ever before. To assist in these developmental works, we are providing for an increase of \$11.3 million to \$119.8 million in municipal road subsidies and assistance for roads in unincorporated townships in northern Ontario.

Local authorities receive important benefits from a wide variety of provincial programmes in the health and welfare fields. In the coming fiscal year, local hospital authorities will benefit from estimated expenditures totalling \$44.8 million for maintenance, construction and other hospital purposes. These expenditures provide for a sharp increase in hospital construction grants of \$11.2 million to \$23.6 million next fiscal year. In the welfare field, an appropriation of \$19.9 million will be made for general welfare assistance. The estimates for the coming fiscal year also provide increased aid for homes for the aged, and funds to expand the benefits available in the field of child welfare.

These various assistance programmes are designed to promote the development of essential services at the municipal level throughout the province. In addition, to provide flexibility, Ontario has developed per capita unconditional grants which in the coming fiscal year will reach an estimated \$28.3 million. We will continue to revise and expand our aid to local authorities in keeping with the growing responsibilities and financial needs of our municipalities and local boards.

The Canada pension plan consists of a two-stage operation. First, it creates the machinery to receive contributions, to pay benefits, and to provide for the expenses of administra-

tion. These transactions will be handled through an account to be called the Canada pension plan account, the operation of which is to be a strictly federal function. Second, it provides for an account to be known as the Canada pension plan investment fund from which funds are to be channelled back into the economy through the medium of the provincial governments. After allowance has been made for three months operating requirements, the balance of the funds will be available for the purchase of securities of the provinces, including provincially guaranteed securities.

The provinces may borrow from the Canada pension plan investment fund in exchange for provincial securities. These securities must be issued to the Canada pension plan investment fund and are not negotiable or transferable. The term will be 20 years "or such lesser period as may from time to time be fixed by the Minister of Finance on the recommendation of the chief actuary of The Department of Insurance." In addition, the securities are subject to call in whole or in part, at any time, on six months notice at the option of the Minister of Finance. These provisions are designed to ensure that the fund will always be in a position to meet its commitments. The amount of Canada pension plan funds available for Ontario, assuming that we take up our full entitlement, is expected to average \$267 million a year over the first 10 years. Present forecasts indicate that the funds available annually to Ontario after 1975 will diminish each year until 1986 when no further funds will be available.

I wish to emphasize that the responsibility for the operation of the Canada pension plan is vested in the federal government. As far as this province is concerned, the Canada pension plan investment fund provides an assured source of capital funds to the extent and in the manner indicated above. We believe, however, that these funds should be used primarily to provide facilities for the development of our human resources, especially the young people of our province. We recognize that large amounts of money will be required for the construction of educational facilities for elementary and secondary schools and universities. In addition, we believe that if these funds are made available to municipalities and school boards, then they will be able to plan their capital programmes in a more effective manner.

We propose, therefore, to make the funds available for the purchase of debentures issued by municipalities and school boards

for the construction of schools, and through the Ontario universities capital aid corporation for the purchase of debentures from the universities. The rate of interest will be based on the cost to the province of the funds available under the Canada Pension Plan.

Having dealt with the programmes of specific departments, I would now like to summarize the overall expenditure programme of the government for the coming fiscal year. Net ordinary expenditure, before providing \$42 million for sinking fund and \$198 million for capital payments to be financed out of ordinary revenue, is forecast at \$1,486.2 million. Net capital expenditure on physical assets is forecast at \$326.7 million. We are thus planning a budget of \$1,812.9 million, or \$318.8 million more than our estimated expenditures in the current fiscal year. This is a very large increase and indicates vividly the growing cost of meeting our responsibilities.

In acting to strengthen the foundations of future growth, we have placed paramount importance on programmes for social and human betterment. In the coming fiscal year, 73 per cent of the increase in expenditures has been allocated for education and health services. The Departments of Education and University Affairs alone will receive \$157.9 million, or 50 per cent of the increased funds to be made available in the coming fiscal year. While emphasizing the development of programmes for social and human betterment, this budget also provides for an expanded capital programme to create assets necessary to maintain economic efficiency.

In formulating our budgetary plans, we have given the most careful consideration to the needs of our local authorities. Of the total increase in our budget next fiscal year, \$127 million represents additional funds to be paid to local authorities. Thus our expenditure programme will not only enable the government to carry out its own responsibilities but takes important steps to safeguard the financial strength of our local authorities.

The expenditure programme that I have outlined for the coming fiscal year is indicative of the growing obligations that the province must assume in meeting the requirements of an expanding economy. It is evident that a continuation of the upward trend in expenditures is unavoidable, as increasingly greater emphasis is placed upon the responsibilities that fall within provincial jurisdiction. Coupled with the larger appropriations that will be required for the creation of necessary physical assets, and the development of natural resources, will be the need for

greatly increased investments in human resources especially for education, health and job training programmes. It is widely acknowledged that the pace of our economic progress depends to a large extent upon the provision of these services and the availability of an educated and well-trained labour force.

If the province is to play its full role in sustaining economic and social advancement, it must have a revenue system which is capable of producing sufficient funds to discharge its responsibilities. One of the anomalies of public finance in Canada is that while the problems of growth and development fall largely upon provincial and municipal authorities, the tax systems of these levels of government do not have the revenue-producing capacity that characterizes the tax system of the federal government. The combined expenditures of all provincial and municipal governments now account for one-half of the total government expenditures in Canada and are increasing more rapidly than those of the federal government. Yet, despite the improvements that have been made in the provincial share of the personal income tax, the major direct tax fields which are most productive in reflecting economic expansion and rising incomes are heavily occupied by the federal government.

Thus, while the provinces and their municipalities have the more rapidly rising expenditure responsibilities, the federal government has the more productive revenue system. With their limited tax systems, the provinces are finding it increasingly difficult to obtain the necessary revenues. They are currently receiving about one-fifth of the total revenue derived in Canada from personal and corporate income taxes. While this proportion will rise somewhat in the coming fiscal year, with the additional three percentage points being made available in the personal income tax field, it will still fall far short of providing the provinces with an adequate share of these tax fields. A provincial tax system, which is limited to such a small proportion of the progressive tax fields, simply will not produce the growing revenues that are required in a highly urbanized and industrialized province such as Ontario.

As we are all aware, the entire field of taxation and public finance in Canada is under exhaustive study. For some time, various government committees and commissions have been working in this field. Through the tax structure committee, the federal and provincial governments themselves are engaged in a comprehensive review and examination of the responsibilities, revenues, expenditures and

future requirements of all levels of government in Canada. As a result of these studies and investigations, we anticipate that the tax structure can, in the long run, be adapted to provide a more equitable allocation of revenue resources relative to expenditure responsibilities. It is with this thought that we shall approach the federal-provincial financial negotiations, which will demand much attention in the coming year.

The province, however, is confronted now with the task of financing a substantial increase in expenditures. On the basis of present taxation the income from ordinary revenue and capital receipts, adjusted for the anticipated economic growth in the provincial economy, would be such that the proposed programme of expenditure which I have outlined for the coming fiscal year would result in a shortfall of revenue of \$281 million. In the following year the shortfall could be expected to increase by a further \$200 million, if we are to carry out the present programme and those which are being initiated. Present economic and fiscal conditions do not warrant planned deficits of this magnitude, nor would the government be fulfilling its obligations to the people of Ontario and to Canada as a whole, if we were to proceed on this basis. I am, therefore, proposing that steps be taken to bring the revenue position more in line with the anticipated expenditure.

The fiscal needs of the province, as just outlined, have been given very careful study. Obviously, funds must be provided for the expansion and development of our province.

Having in mind the policy of the government to keep the finances of Ontario in a sound condition, we have concluded that our financing should be along the same general lines as in the past. That is, we should finance some capital expansion from current revenues and provide for the remainder of our capital funds from borrowing.

We will, therefore, introduce legislation to provide changes in taxation necessary to meet our requirements, yet which will not be detrimental to the growth of our economy. Rather than apply excessive rates of taxation in any one area, we have decided to utilize several fields.

The retail sales tax of three per cent will be increased to five per cent and the tax will be extended to charges for long distance calls and telegrams. By April, seven of the ten provinces will have a rate of five per cent or more.

The tax on gasoline will be increased by one cent a gallon to 16 cents. Only the three far western provinces will then have tax at

less than 16 cents. Refunds for off-highway use will be 16 cents for farmers and commercial fishermen and 13 cents for others.

The tax on diesel fuel for highway use will be increased by one and one-half cents to 22 cents per gallon, maintaining the approximate relationship with the tax on gasoline.

The tax on cigarettes will be increased to one-tenth of a cent per cigarette, which increase amounts to one cent on a package of 20—or one and one-quarter cents on a package of 25—with adjusted increases on other tobaccos. The new rates will still be much below those of our neighbouring provinces. It is interesting to note that federal taxes on a package of 25 cigarettes are about 25 cents compared with the revised Ontario tax of two and one-half cents.

Tax on land transfers will be increased from one-fifth to two-fifths of one per cent.

Since 1962, the federal government has collected Ontario individual income tax. The federal tax has been abated by rates commencing at 16 per cent for 1962 and reaching 24 per cent for 1966. We have followed the policy of keeping our rate at the same figure as the federal abatement. During these years, some provinces have found it necessary to set their provincial rates at more than the federal abatement and this has been completely in accord with the federal-provincial arrangements. For the 1966 year, the Ontario rate will continue at 24 per cent, the same as the federal abatement.

We do not know at this time what arrangements will be made with the federal government to share the tax fields with the provinces after the present five-year collection agreement expires with the end of the 1966 taxation year. We expect that similar arrangements, or not less than equivalent provisions, adjusted upwards to meet the rapidly expanding needs of Ontario and the other provinces, will extend into the period subsequent to 1966, or at least until the recommendations of the several taxation commissions can be studied for implementation.

For the 1967 taxation year, Ontario will need at least the equivalent of an additional four percentage points of tax. If the federal abatement is similarly increased, there would be no net increase in the individual income tax paid by Ontario residents.

The government of Ontario will seek an increase in its share of tax revenues of at least this amount in the forthcoming federal-provincial negotiations. Without such further abatement or its equivalent, we will have no alternative to the setting of an income tax

rate to produce an additional yield of four percentage points.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to ever present a budget without some good news in it: The exemptions under The Succession Duty Act will be increased from \$60,000 to \$75,000 for widows and certain widowers, from \$10,000 to \$15,000 for a dependent child, and from \$15,000 to \$25,000 for a dependent orphan.

The above tax changes, except income tax, will become effective on April 1, next.

Finally, I should like to state that the liquor control board of Ontario will be announcing increases in the price of liquor at an early date.

Inclusive of the additional revenue we can expect from the tax changes I have proposed, net ordinary revenue and net capital receipts are forecast at \$1,728 million. Yields from our four major sources of revenue are forecast as follows: retail sales tax, \$383 million; personal income tax, \$362.5 million; corporations tax, \$258 million; and gasoline tax, \$257 million.

Increased revenue from the retail sales tax of \$167 million is expected to account for more than half of the total increase in our revenue. The increase in the province's share of the personal income tax field from 21 to 24 per cent of federal rates of tax together with economic growth is expected to raise our revenue from this field by \$72.2 million. The yield of the gasoline tax will rise by \$25 million and revenues from corporations tax and the liquor control board by \$14 million each.

While we can expect considerable expansion in our revenues as a result of the tax measures proposed in this Budget, the expected improvement is the minimum necessary to maintain the financial strength of the province. Despite adjustments in our revenues, we anticipate total revenue will fall short of meeting overall requirements by \$84.9 million in the fiscal year 1966-67. The extent to which we will be required to rely upon our credit in the coming fiscal year is reasonable in view of the expanded revenue base and the expenditure programme to be undertaken. Nevertheless, we have reached no long-term solution. Appropriate measures must therefore be planned now to ensure that the province can fulfil its responsibilities and still maintain a strong credit position.

As Treasurer of the government of this province, I am fully aware of the present complexity of our financial and economic problems and of the sensitive relationship

between government and the provincial economy. In the past few years, we have witnessed a telescoping of heavy demands for social and economic development; in the years that lie immediately ahead, such heavy demands will continue to be felt. In turn, the steady growth of government expenditures has broadened the direct impact of government on the economy and made the provincial budget a delicate instrument of economic and fiscal policy.

In addition to providing a wide range of services, in which our objectives must be ones of efficiency and effectiveness, our provincial Budget contributes directly to the character of aggregate demand in the provincial economy and to the economic productivity of our people and institutions. To be successful in these objectives, however, we must avoid taxation becoming a burden on the progress of economic growth which we seek to foster.

With the rapid accumulation of demands for government services and social capital on the one hand and the objective of contributing to economic growth and productivity on the other hand, the government must follow four broad principles of economic and financial policy.

In the first place, we believe that it is essential for the government to establish policy priorities to assure that expenditures will make the greatest contribution to the development of the province. It is patently obvious that our expenditures are outpacing our revenues—a condition that is likely to continue. In such circumstances, a government must examine ruthlessly which policies should assume priority in the broad spectrum of economic and social application. Nor is this a mere arithmetical ordering of expenditures. Rather, the priorities must be designed with a view to those policies which will have the greatest impact on growth and productivity, such as education and research; from such growth, the tax revenues will be self-generating and our Budget maintained in some order.

The second principle follows from the first—that the government must plan its financial and economic activity to achieve maximum effectiveness. Both in ordinary expenditures and in public capital investment, there must be careful long-range planning to create the most favourable climate for provincial growth. In particular, each element of proposed public investment must be carefully assessed for its contribution to economic growth and for its effect in counteracting movements in the business cycle.

The third principle is the means of long-range planning—the careful co-ordination of government policies and programmes such as those designed to contribute to the economic development of all regions of the province. Our economic and financial research is now being developed in a manner that will contribute to the greater success of priorities and planning in an applied sense—through overall government co-ordination.

Finally, when we have established our own priorities, planning and co-ordination, we must view this actively in the broader context of federal, provincial, and municipal requirements. In this trinity of forces, the provincial government occupies the position of fulcrum—balancing its own demands on the federal government with the needs of the municipalities. Through the exercise of the tax structure committee, we not only have a sobering view of what is in store but we also have guidelines to the fiscal requirements of each level of government. Consequently our policies must be formulated with a view to possible redistribution of tax revenues commensurate with future requirements for provincial expenditures.

To assist the government in observing these principles, we are establishing a co-ordinating committee of financial and economic advisers. This committee will consist of senior officials concerned with revenues, expenditures, economic policy and federal-provincial affairs—the Deputy Provincial Treasurer, the secretary of the Treasury board, and the chief economist. These officials, through a continuing review of financial and economic affairs, would achieve an important measure of co-ordination among the key areas which they represent as well as serving the government in pursuit of the four principles that I have set out above. They will be concerned with long-range planning, for example the application of capital funds. This government, through its capital projects and its capital advances, is a major source of overall capital investment. Care must be taken to ensure that the disposition and timing of this activity is designed to serve the needs of the provincial economy in the most effective manner.

Such are the guidelines which we believe must be observed under the exacting but significant financial and economic problems facing this government in the days that lie ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the days that lie ahead this Budget will be remembered as a development Budget.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, in the midst of these deepening shadows I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Fifth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

(continued)

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, that is a particularly difficult act to follow. I suspect, after that development-sunshine-election Budget which the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) just delivered, so generous in its dispensations to the citizens of the province of Ontario, that perhaps before the afternoon is out the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) will rise in his seat, dissolve the proceedings, and call a very short and appropriate campaign.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to rise on the Medicare bill, so-called, immediately in the wake of this Budget presentation because I think that the two are very strongly related. It is singularly appropriate that one should follow the other.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, if I can venture the thought before getting into the bill itself, the cumulative effect of tax increases—I think there were seven tax increases just announced by this government, plus a pending liquor tax, plus the possibility of a four-percentage-point income tax next year; the tax increases that this government has had to impose in an era of prosperity and are therefore totally inexcusable in the context of the economic development of this province—are partly accounted for by the uneconomic principles of the bill we have before us now.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, we would not need this kind of retrogressive budget—not a development budget, but a retrogressive budget—if it were not that this government insisted on bringing uneconomic bills and uneconomic principles to the floor of this Legislature. This Bill No. 6 is so uneconomic in principle that the government cannot carry on and implement it with present revenue, so uneconomic in principle that premiums are fully three times what they might well be, so uneconomic in principle that we will have a

continued cost of medical services in Ontario amounting to a higher percentage of the gross provincial product than public plans in other countries, and so limited in application, Mr. Speaker, that we may not even be eligible for the federal subsidy.

In other words, when the hon. Provincial Treasurer analyzes his shortfall he should not put it in the context of the pressures of other things, he should take a look at that shortfall in the context of the uneconomic pieces of legislation which are put before this House—this being the most dramatic thus far in the session, to be complemented later I am sure by welfare projects of a similar kind. This is what fragments the economics of this government and what continues to foist debate on the House that relates to uneconomic programmes and uneconomic measures. Indeed it is characteristic and ironic of Conservative governments that they are the senior technicians of an uneconomic budget.

As it is characteristic of Toryism to present uneconomic measures, such as those in this bill, so it is—if I can return to the points I was making yesterday—characteristic that we never engage in the substance of the bill, so it is that the government never justifies the arguments it makes.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is basically a lack of conviction on the part of the government which accounts for the lack of justification. And it is a lack of conviction on the part of the government which accounts for the attitude in debate.

If I may recapitulate what others on these benches have said in the last few days, we have not as yet seen the hon. Prime Minister enter the debate, we have not had the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), we have not had any inkling of any other hon. Cabinet Minister and we have had precisely the same backbenchers—not a single different speaker from the back-benchers of the Conservative Party than we had on this same bill last year.

Again, one is forced to ask, when will the government confront the arguments made by the Opposition? When will the government meet the contentions we have put forward; when will it either honourably attempt to invalidate them, or at least develop some sense of confrontation in the Legislature so that we do not consistently speak into a vacuum?

Let me outline the various principles and proposals that my party and the Liberal Party have put before the Legislature on second reading of this bill during the last several days, without a single answer forthcoming from the government.

In the early period of this debate, we took issue with the hon. Minister of Health's varied statements on compulsion. We pointed out that the principles of the bill before us are inconsistent with the principles of the Ontario hospital services plan handed down by this same government, and we asked why the departure from principle. The hon. Minister of Health has not had the courtesy to respond, indeed not a single hon. member of the government has had the courtesy to respond.

We pointed out that whereas the hon. Minister of Health is on record as opposing compulsion, in fact the exclusion of groups in this plan constitutes a very serious compulsion, commits the government to the principle of compulsion, and we asked why it could not be applied to a similar universal scheme across the province? Not a single hon. member of the Cabinet has deigned to reply; not a single hon. member of the government has deigned to reply.

The hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells) ventured yesterday the fanciful wish that the civil service plan could be brought into the medical plan embraced by Bill No. 6, but everybody knows that that is an irrelevant design, that it is an impossible objective, that in fact the groups are effectively excluded from the principles of this bill as we see it before us. Therefore the government applies compulsion where it wishes in a discriminatory fashion, arbitrating against the needy in this province, and exclusively for certain groups in this province. Yet, not a soul on the benches of the government has bothered to reply to the arguments we have made.

In another avenue, we on this side of the House have attempted to document, point by point, what we believe to have been collusion between the insurance companies and the doctors in the development of this plan—collusion in the context of its definition with the government—and we have given a history of the development of this scheme. We have challenged the hon. Minister of Health to reveal in this Legislature every step in that development and we repeat the challenge today. Let him spell out the meetings with the medical profession. Let him spell out the meetings with the insurance companies. Let him state on the floor of the Legislature those factors which influenced his decision. But not a word has come from the government benches—just a singular contempt for the arguments that are made.

It is not so much that we are absolutely certain of our arguments in themselves, Mr.

Speaker, as we are certain of what one must say in the absence of any reply. Why does not the government have the intellectual integrity to answer the Opposition charges in this regard? Why does not the government say, if it honestly believes it, that all other sectors of society should be excluded from discussions on a medical care plan, that in fact the rest of society is irrelevant, that in the context of Tory thinking only doctors and insurance companies should be consulted? Indeed, if the government took the time to say that, one would have a great deal more respect for it than is fostered by its absence of participation on these points. The debate, Mr. Speaker, is thus reduced to a travesty, such as when the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) extols the fact that insurance companies pay taxes and no one replies to the arguments put.

The hon. leader of my party (Mr. MacDonald) placed before this Legislature a financial formula which we believe could apply to everyone in the province—\$20 a single person, \$40 a couple and \$50 a family—to finance universal Medicare across the province of Ontario. No one, but no one has deflated those figures in this House. The hon. Minister of Health sits mute, that combination of Scottish, oriental inscrutability which characterizes his presence. There has not been a sound from the government benches. No one contends that the figures are wrong. Never do we get an engagement of debate on the fundamental financing of this plan. The government refuses to say anything.

One must admit, Mr. Speaker, as a departure, that the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) challenged our figures on the ratio of doctors. I suppose I should make an aside and say in this House that on the basis of the tax statistics for 1965, there were 5,825 doctors practising in the province of Ontario, making an average annual income of \$21,000. The hon. member for Forest Hill suggested that there were 7,600 doctors practising in the province of Ontario. Somewhere there is a 2,000-doctor discrepancy. I hesitate to say that 2,000 members of the medical profession have decided not to pay taxes, but I suggest to him strongly that the discrepancy is of his own making and the tax statistics are obviously the authoritative source.

But even though the hon. member for Forest Hill made an effort to come to grips with that aspect of the figures, no one on the government benches, not the hon. Provincial Treasurer who just presented his Budget and is supposedly advised of financial factors; not the hon. Minister of Economics and Develop-

ment (Mr. Randall); not any of the other Cabinet members—entered to suggest why the 20-40-50-dollar formula was invalid. I suggest that no one objected because in fact it is a perfectly plausible method of financing medical care, and our hon. leader set it out in very close form in the opening of this debate.

Let me repeat the arguments just for a moment to remind the hon. members of the House. The total cost of coverage on the government's own figures of \$40 per capita would equal \$260 million. The federal subsidy, which is 50 per cent of the \$34 figure on a national average, would introduce \$110 million. This would leave \$150 million to be raised in Ontario. The government is already committed to \$70 million financing for this plan and that would leave \$80 million to be raised from all of Ontario, to finance a universal comprehensive plan on our \$20, \$40, \$50 formula.

Again, Mr. Speaker, we challenge the government benches—the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Health huddled together in discussion—to answer those figures, to explain to this Legislature and the people of Ontario why they are imposing fully three times the desirable rate of premium. Let them do something else, Mr. Minister. We ask the government to justify the \$40 per capita figure, a figure which is fully \$15.90 above the \$24.91 per capita figure given by the Hall commission in its estimate of per capita costs in 1966.

What does the government think it can get away with and why does it degrade the debating process of this chamber by refusing to confront honestly and straightforwardly the arguments put by the Opposition? We do not say that those arguments are infallible of themselves. We reach out for some kind of response from government and all we receive is an arrogant, contemptuous disdain, never the spark of a reply, never even the participation of large measures of Cabinet front-benchers in debate which surely is of great social significance. I suppose "large measures" is not an appropriate term to describe the Cabinet, but one thinks of them as a musical score.

This party spelled out the priorities for this bill. We made no mistake about it. We said we considered medical care of fundamental importance in the province and of first priority. The hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) said we could not afford the un-economic plan which is being foisted upon us. But only one government member in this House, and not a Cabinet member, talked about priorities—that was the hon. member

for Forest Hill. He named higher education, he named medical manpower, he named manpower generally, but none of them were given any heed—not a single Cabinet Minister entered the debate to indicate the government's conception of priority and certainly not the hon. Minister of Health. At least last year, the hon. Minister of Health was provocative in his opening statement on first reading. Now there is—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! I would not like to see the debate get into personalities and directed to persons. The Minister of Health will have an opportunity to enter the debate, but it is his own choice when he wishes to enter such a debate. I would rather the member devote himself to the principles of this bill.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I do not mind saying to the Speaker and to the House through the Speaker, that members of the Opposition should not be asked to debate the principles of this kind of bill without a full opening second-reading statement from an hon. member of the Cabinet. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that no one in this House would have raised serious objections to the hon. Minister of Health speaking twice in this debate if he felt it was necessary, because he is the man who is responsible for this bill in his department. His action is an abdication of responsibility.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me say that my hon. colleagues have raised, and hon. members of the Liberal Party have raised with equal vigour, the question of federal-provincial conferences which impinge directly on the principles of this bill. We have no idea whatsoever whether it will ultimately fall in with the federal plan or whether the federal plan will in fact contribute to this plan as it now stands.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I say that before we got into the full debate on second reading, someone in the Cabinet, preferably the hon. Minister of Health, should have spelled out the position of the government, precisely what went on at the federal-provincial conference in Ottawa; precisely what the Cabinet said, and precisely what transpired behind the closed doors, rather than stealing silently away and demonstrating again, a complete indifference for the processes on the floor of this Legislature. I suggest it is basically a lack of understanding as to the possibilities inherent in a democratic exchange.

It is on all those grounds, that we are opposing the principle of this bill. We have not received a single answer to the funda-

mental criticisms raised. We will continue to oppose this bill, clause by clause, and year by year, until the answers are forthcoming and genuine debate is resurrected.

There is another and final point that I wish to make. Fundamental to the principles of Bill No. 6 is the attitude of the medical profession as a profession and the attitude of its statutory bodies. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that many of the principles herein enshrined will be further withered away by the attitude of that profession. It is obvious that the Ontario medical association has taken an entirely discredited stand. It has become the laughing stock of serious-minded people. This society is too sophisticated to buy the antiquated arguments of medical letter writers to the *Sudbury Star* and those who intoned the sentiments that apply to feudal times, sentiments that are now several hundred years out of date.

Similarly, Mr. Speaker, we in this party are concerned about the rigidity and the inflexibility of the college of physicians and surgeons in the province of Ontario, because its stand on medical matters, some of which have come before this House and many more of which will come in the future, is of exceeding anxiety. The doctors' behaviour and their attitude bespeaks a completely rigid frame of mind and that will have to change if the principles of this bill are to be adhered to.

The hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) discussed on second reading, at close to half an hour's length, the question of the Asian doctors and the doctor shortage. I want to dissociate myself for a moment, Mr. Speaker, from the relationship between the two, because I think we make a fundamental mistake—I think we leave the door open for this government. I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, and federal Liberals have pointed it out, that there are a great many countries in the world which have national health schemes and have much worse doctor-to-population ratios than the province of Ontario. So let us not be deflected. We could carry out a complete medical care plan in this province with the doctors we now have.

I do not deny that the—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I do not want to interrupt but I did not say Asian doctors, I was referring to foreign doctors. I want to make that distinction. One of the papers keeps referring to the fact I said Asian doctors; I look on it as a much broader area than that.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. leader of the Opposition is right; I stand corrected. He said foreign doctors. I would agree that in the context of the future development of this plan on the extension of services—of the paramedical aspects—something will have to be done about the shortage of doctors and the expansion in the doctor-to-population ratio.

But let it not be thought for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have the medical personnel now sufficient to carry on a universal comprehensive plan in the province of Ontario. Let us not be deflected. And let it also be said that the rigidity of the college of physicians and surgeons in respect to the foreign doctors is one of the things which begs the question, and is one of the things which causes us very great concern.

I say this with all the seriousness that I can muster—some of us are greatly concerned that one of the criteria established to pronounce on the availability of doctors in the province will be the colour of a man's skin. We are driven irresistibly to that conclusion. For whatever reason—and it has not yet been defined on the floor of this Legislature—no explanation has been given for the practices of the college of physicians and surgeons in that regard, no explanation has been given to explain why the tremendous postgraduate qualifications of so many members of the medical profession are not sufficient to compensate for the supposed deficiencies in undergraduate education. No one has explained why the certification in one province and one jurisdiction after another, across the world, is not sufficient to enable those men to practise in the province of Ontario.

So the college of physicians and surgeons stands suspect in the eyes of many in this party, and, I suspect, many in this House. It is an attitude of mind that cannot be tolerated when discussing the principles of a medical plan.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are our basic arguments.

We again ask of the government, we plead of the government, that it reply to the fundamental contentions made, and that on its reply the government allow this debate to rest, rather than an attack on the periphery and on partisanship and on all the incidental measures. If, in fact, the reply is made to the fundamentals, as they have been laid out by the Opposition, then we will have had a reasonable dialogue and we can move to clause-by-clause discussion. Until then we have all been participating in a façade rather than a debate.

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills): The hon. Minister of Health has outlined his proposals and the basic changes to be made in the Ontario medical services insurance bill and these are set out in the explanatory note on its face. Despite natural and sometimes long argument, I think most of us in this House agree with the changes, but nevertheless I know that there are some who think we have not made sufficient changes.

All parties agree that medical insurance should be made available and as soon as possible. The main and the key difference between us is that we believe it should be voluntary, others believe it should be compulsory. A large percentage of the employed persons in this province are today covered by medical or health insurance and usually the families are covered as well. In the last ten years, the percentage of Canadians within this group has nearly doubled. Today nearly 12 million Canadians are included, 2.5 million within this province itself.

The medical insurance coverage is in no way uniform and frequently life insurance and accident and other benefits are included as well. The important point, however, is that when a person suffers a serious or prolonged illness, he should have his medical bills met and they should not have to be paid for out of his savings or other assets or by putting him into serious debt.

I realize there are many people in this province today who cannot obtain coverage and these are our primary concern. In considering any medical insurance scheme we must be sure that insurance will be available to those who require it and wish it, first, at a reasonable level and, second, that they should not be penalized or refused by reason of health or age or ability to pay. Since a great proportion of the people in Ontario are now covered, then the government must, and in fairness, want to make sure that medical insurance is available to those who otherwise could not obtain it or afford it.

Under the changes in the legislation as now proposed, anyone in Ontario may purchase a standard contract through the government agency without restriction as to age, state of health or financial ability to pay. This is a change from a year ago and I think a good one, because in this group are bound to be included people where public money is used for payment of premiums. That being the case those premiums should not properly be paid to private agencies.

The hon. Minister has set out the cost of the insurance at \$60 for a single person, double that for a family of two, and \$150 for

a family of three or more persons. The government is making a commitment to begin this programme effective July 1, and three months earlier for those who are receiving welfare assistance. This means that the programme will begin this year and in fact in the next few months.

I am sure there will be many administration difficulties and adjustments needed before the programme comes to its final form, but nevertheless basically this should be a sound and workable scheme. The estimated cost is \$70 million to the province. This again should be somewhat higher than last year by the reason that the level of subsidies has been raised, albeit slightly. If changes are needed in these rates or the administrative arrangements I am sure the government will make them.

In the changes proposed under Bill No. 6, certain procedures or operations by dental surgeons normally performed in hospitals will now be covered, whereas formerly these same procedures were only covered if performed by doctors. This is an age of specialists and it is wise to extend coverage in this type of situation to operations performed by the dentist.

Coming back to the principle of voluntary as against compulsory coverage, in my view the individual should retain the freedom of choice as to coverage. The important thing is that coverage is available to him and at a reasonable rate, either through a government agency, an insurance company or other type of insurer.

The argument is made that we should not have a separate provincial scheme but rather one national in scope. Only last July the federal government set out its proposals as to the contributions and terms of participation. I am sure there will be changes made in the definition and interpretation of the conditions and also in the terms of contributions. The federal proposals set out certain basic conditions before a province can qualify for grants, and these have largely, but not entirely, been met by this Ontario scheme.

The basic exception and difference is that the federal government stipulates that the provincial scheme must be universal, whereas the provincial scheme now is voluntary. The fact that the Ontario scheme starts this year will in no way bar the door to any further negotiations between this province or other provinces and the federal government.

Last June, during the debate on the medical insurance bill, it was made clear the objective of the government was that through

that legislation, assistance would be provided for those in the province who needed it most. Also, recognizing the difficulty and limitations in any new social legislation, it was made clear that if changes were needed they would be introduced. The government has obviously given careful consideration to the details of the plan during these ensuing months and changes have now been proposed. These make good sense and will provide a workable scheme that is to be put into force almost at once.

We listened for a long time this afternoon to a very detailed budget. It is quite clear that there is going to be much money spent in a great many fields, but medical insurance is only one programme to be brought forward by the government that will require substantial funds. Every year education must claim a larger share of the total budget and this year is no exception. These extra moneys are needed and must be provided so that the young people may remain in school longer and have the more extensive training needed for today's and tomorrow's jobs.

There are new and extended programmes needed in many fields, not only in education but in training of medical personnel, in the care and training of the retarded, in the field of penal reform, in construction of highways and especially in research. These needs are endless but the money supply to either the federal or the provincial government is not, and in the final analysis the public must pay for the programmes that are provided.

The government must keep in mind the priorities of all these fields in the normal development and expansion of its programmes. The government must endeavour to keep all of them in balance. No one begrudges the money for good programmes or the taxes required, but the government cannot provide unlimited funds for any one field, even Medicare, at the expense of other valid claims.

For these and other reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support this bill.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, if I appear to be a little breathless it is because the life of an MPP is sometimes breathless.

I have just been engaged in talking to the press, television, radio and others about the Budget that was introduced this afternoon. With my normal penchant for understatement, I described it as a confused, disorganized, timorous and ultra-conservative response to the dynamic challenges of the 1960's. Now I have to direct my attention, without any

opportunity for reorientation, toward the confused, disorganized, timorous and ultra-conservative response of the hon. Minister of Health to the urgent needs of the people of Ontario for medical care insurance.

By way of preface to my remarks in summing up the position of this group on the principle of this bill, I would like to eliminate a little confusion that seems to have risen in the minds of some people who are perhaps prone to confusion. More specifically I would like to refer to a headline that appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* in the night edition of February 7, which I believe was the day before yesterday. The headline reads, "NDP on Roberts' Side of Medicare." The next day this headline was altered a little bit to say, "NDP to Help Defeat Thompson on Medicare."

Mr. Speaker, if it should be that a prize is given in the journalistic world for perverse misrepresentation of facts, I would suggest these two headlines together, or either of them separately, would easily qualify for the prize for this decade. As a matter of fact, when I saw the headline I checked back on what my hon. leader had said in case there had conceivably been some point he had failed to make clear, but what he said was crystal clear. He said this group would vote against the second reading of this bill. How anyone could interpret that as meaning we are on the government's side is a little more than I can comprehend, and I am sure, sir, more than you can comprehend, too.

We will vote against the second reading of this bill.

My hon. leader also went on to say that we do not support the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition. Under the announcement on procedure that Mr. Speaker made last year with regard to votes on second reading, in which he indicated he would return to the traditional and I think logical way of putting the vote on second reading where an amendment is involved, it is quite possible for us to vote against second reading without having to vote in favour of the amendment. It is not necessary at all for us to vote in favour of the amendment in order to vote against second reading. This is absolutely clear under the traditional procedure which Mr. Speaker, in his wisdom, has seen fit to restore in this House.

If the opportunity should arise—and I would not recommend to any of my hon. friends that they should place any bets that it will arise—but if it should arise for us to vote on the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition after the question

of second reading has been voted on, we will vote against his amendment and we will propose an amendment of our own.

I think it may be worthwhile, Mr. Speaker, to review why we will vote against that amendment. The amendment proposes that the bill be referred to the standing—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): This is worse than the explanation.

Mr. Bryden: I really do not know what Rasputin over here is growing about, Mr. Speaker. It is probably something he had for lunch; I am sure it could not have been anything I have said or plan to say.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Pain and suffering.

Mr. Bryden: The amendment proposed is that the bill be referred to the standing committee on health and welfare, to which representatives of farmers, trade unions, the business community, the medical profession and the public should be invited. I ask you Mr. Speaker, in the name of heaven, what for? As the hon. leader of the Opposition himself said, everybody knows where the trade unions stand; everybody knows where the farmers stand; everybody knows where the business community stands; everybody knows where the medical profession stands—and if I may say so, with deference to my hon. friend from Scarborough North who does not happen to be here today—everybody except him knows where the United Church of Canada stands. The United Church of Canada stands in favour of full Medicare as declared by its general conference.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): It is not my church.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): There is the hon. member's second one.

Mr. Bryden: Everybody knows where it stands. I would quite agree that the general conference of the United Church of Canada does not necessarily speak for every single member of the United Church any more than any general conference speaks for every single member of any organization. This is nevertheless the official policy of the United Church of Canada, just as it is the official policy of the trade union movement of Canada, the farm movement in Canada, and all the progressive people's organizations. The only people who are against it are the doctors and the insurance companies.

An hon. member: And the Tory party.

Mr. Bryden: And the Tory party. These are the only people who are against a full, complete, universal Medicare programme. So why do we have to go to a committee to find out what we already know?

This amendment, if it were adopted, would merely be a device for stalling any action in this field, stalling it once more. Let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party of Canada first proposed comprehensive universal Medicare—in those days it used to be called comprehensive health insurance—back in 1919. That is when it first proposed it.

When our hon. friend from Sudbury last night was talking about certain events that occurred in the year “nineteen and forty-five,” as he described it, he somehow omitted to tell us what happened to the health insurance bill of the federal Liberal government of the year nineteen and forty-five. That is 21 years ago. The Liberals had a bill in then. They still have not got on with it and what I am desperately afraid of, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to have one more stall—the twentieth in the last half century by the federal government—a great promise at election time and a waffle after the election. I am only too much afraid that this proposed amendment put forward by the Liberal group in this House represents a preparation by the federal government at Ottawa for further waffling; for further delay.

It is a great pity, Mr. Speaker, that the group in this House which had the opportunity to move an amendment on second reading did not take advantage of that opportunity to create a clear-cut issue between phony Robartscare on the one hand and comprehensive universal Medicare on the other. It is a great pity that they were so inept in the performance of their duty as an Opposition and in loyalty to the principles that they now claim they adhere to—although that is a very recent conversion—that they did not take advantage of their opportunity to put the issue on a straight “either/or” basis.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Why does the hon. member abuse us when we stand together in principle?

Mr. Bryden: The problem is, Mr. Speaker, when I look at their amendment I am not sure that we stand together on principle. I can remember being blasted from stem to gudgeon in this House as a Marxist and I do not know what all else by the hon. leader of the Opposition. He did not occupy the position at the time but he was a member

of this House. Because I proposed what?—a universal compulsory medical care insurance programme. So with these fellows you never know where you are between Monday and Tuesday or Tuesday and Thursday.

Mr. Sopha: That is the enemy; that is the enemy over there.

Mr. Bryden: I trust, but I have some trepidation, that the amendment they have proposed is not a preparation for another shift in position on this matter.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make it absolutely clear that we will neither vote for second reading nor for the amendment. If the opportunity should ever arise we will put the amendment in the form in which we think it should be put, as a clear-cut alternative between two contradictory policies, and they are indeed contradictory policies, Mr. Speaker.

Let us not be misled by the dulcet tones of some of the kind hon. gentlemen on the Conservative benches who try to say to us, “This bill is a step forward, a step in the right direction; now just let us do it a stage at a time, one inch a century and in time we will make the mile.” This is the suggestion they are putting forward. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, one never knows whether they are stepping forward or stepping back; they are so flexible that most of the time they are going around in circles.

They gave us a bill last year; it was passed in this House, I believe in June, 1965, about eight months ago. I took the trouble to take the new bill now before us and find out how it affected the bill we had before us just eight short months ago. We were told at the time it was the last word, for the day at any rate; it was a desirable step forward, the most that we could do at the time; this was the perfect embodiment of the sense of the people of this period.

I took a look at this bill, and for my own convenience I stroked out the portions of the bill that had been replaced or are to be replaced by the bill now before us. This bill—it is an Act now, of last year—is slightly less than 16 pages long. I do not imagine the hon. members can see my strokings out but if any of them would care to look at close range they will find that slightly more than eight pages or those slightly less than 16 pages are going to be struck out by the bill now before us. Approximately more than half of the bill is being struck out altogether and approximately half of the balance is being changed.

This is what one calls policy formulation, Tory style. They never know where they are at and I do not think anybody else knows where they are at. They gave us a bill last year; eight months later they tear it to pieces. They would have done a service to the House and to the people if they had scrapped the whole bill of last year and brought in a new one. It would be much easier to follow. Bring in a totally new Act, repeal this old one. It obviously was an abortion before it started, an abortion presided over by a medical doctor at that.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Abortion is against the Criminal Code.

Mr. Bryden: I hate to see the hon. Minister of Health in violation of the Criminal Code, but this indeed is what has happened. Why did he not just wipe the whole thing out and start with a new bill?

Some changes have been made and they were changes that we on this side proposed in committee stage last year. But I want to make it abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that in proposing those changes in committee stage, we certainly did not regard them as in any sense satisfactory. We stated our position in the debate on principle last year, and in the debate on principle we stated our total opposition to the bill as not a step forward and as not a satisfactory solution, but as a step backward, a move to stop the development in Canada of an adequate Medicare programme.

We regard the bill of this year, even though it proposes some changes, as in exactly the same category. One cannot patch an inherently bad bill. One has to start completely from scratch with new principles and with a totally new piece of legislation. That is what we should have before us in this House this year. The government admitted it was wrong last year, even though last year it told us how wrong we were. Now it should just admit how totally wrong it was and come in with proper legislation. But instead, it comes in with a bill and it is really driving that bill forward now.

Two years ago, when we discussed our first medical care insurance bill—if one could abuse terminology to describe it as that—it was introduced, I think, about two days before the adjournment of the House, just in time for a provincial election—shoved in here two days before adjournment. It was not passed, but it was obviously pushed in at the last minute so there could be a minimum of comment on it.

Last year the government brought in its

bill at what I think it believed was the tail end of the session. The only thing was that it discovered the bill was so controversial that the session went on for about six weeks longer than had been anticipated, so it was not quite at the tail end of the session. But it still was an attempt to get the thing in late to restrict discussion as much as possible.

Now we seem to find a reversal, Mr. Speaker, a very interesting reversal. This bill was brought in very early in the session and priority has been given to it, to the point where the traditional debate on the Speech from the Throne has simply been thrown into cold storage. We got started on the debate on the Speech from the Throne and we now received the Budget today; so the Budget debate will be starting one of these days, and we hardly even have got more than started on the Throne speech debate. Why? Because almost all of our time has been taken up with the proposed amendments to the bill that was passed last year.

It is interesting to consider why this should be, why we get it in so early and why there is such a drive on to get it right through. Mr. Speaker, I do not think one has to have any great perspicacity to see the reasons. The hon. Minister of Health already has his literature prepared to send out to the people of the province with regard to a bill that has not even had second reading. He has prepared literature on the basis of its passing as is. His contempt for this House is so great, that he is not even prepared to contemplate the possibility that his bill might have to be changed, even though the last one was ripped to pieces. He is going to have his safe majority over there steamroller this thing through, so that he will not have to scrap any of the literature that he has prepared. That is all ready to go out.

And why is there such an all-fired hurry about the literature going out and the bill going through? Because, the hon. Minister says, on April 1 of this year he wants to bring into force that section of the legislation—actually it is not in the legislation; it will be, I presume, in regulations, but he cannot make the regulations until the bill passes—under which people receiving assistance under old age assistance, mothers' allowances, general welfare assistance and other assistance programmes, as well as certain people under old age security, will receive full coverage for their medical bills without cost to themselves. And by implication he suggests that naturally the House would not wish to delay by even one second benefits that could be given to this very worthy group.

The only catch, Mr. Speaker, is that this very worthy group will not get any benefit at all under that premature coming-into-force of that portion of the legislation. This group that he is talking about already has its medical bills covered under the medical welfare programme that has been in effect in this province for, I believe, about 20 years. They are receiving no new benefits. There is no need to rush this bill through now in order that these people can receive benefits by April 1, because they already get any benefits they need.

But there is, nevertheless, a group that will get benefits by having this bill come into effect on April 1, and lo and behold, of whom does this group consist? Why the poor, starving, struggling, ragged medical profession. They are the people who will get a benefit. And that is why this bill is being shoved through now—to give a great big bonanza to the medical profession. I do not know if it was necessary to do this in order to buy their support, but if it was it is certainly a disgraceful state of affairs.

Under the medical welfare plan as it now stands, the doctors receive about 30 per cent of their scale of fees for welfare cases, and this after all is really gravy to them, because they have always assured us that they would normally provide services free to these people. They get 30 per cent of their scale of fees under the medicare welfare plan. Under this bill they will get 90 per cent of their scale of fees. So this bill is being steamrollered through this House now, to the exclusion of the Throne speech debate and to the exclusion of almost anything else, just to provide a great big melon to the medical profession.

I listened as far as I was able, in the face of many interruptions from the gentlemen of the fourth estate, to the cries of woe from the hon. Provincial Treasurer this afternoon. I would like to apologize to him here, Mr. Speaker, for not having been able to be present during the whole of his statement, but I was in the unfortunate position where I was expected to make some statements of my own and they required some preparation. It also was necessary to take some time to make them. I regret that I was not able to listen to the whole of his address, although I had the opportunity through his courtesy of reading it all, so I think I am fairly familiar with it.

I am also familiar, as I said, with his tears of woe at the extreme financial burden being placed on the province. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if our benign Provincial Treasurer really means these heartfelt

cries we hear from him about his great financial problems. Here he is, part of the government, which as of right now is coolly refusing approximately \$110 million from the federal government, and he tells us that he—whom we love so much and are so little loved by him—has to stick the knife into us to get more money. Yet on the other hand he is turning down—or his government is turning down—and he has to take responsibility for it along with the rest—approximately \$110 million which could be available for the people of Ontario if the federal government can be induced to go ahead with its announced plan.

The hon. Minister without Portfolio (Mr. Gomme) asked me, "When?"—at least I think it was the hon. Minister without Portfolio. This is a very important question and I think the government should be concerned about "when" too, because it had better be concerned that it does not lose the money altogether. That is what I think we have to be afraid about.

Hon. G. E. Gomme (Minister without Portfolio): The hon. member would like to make the people think it is available now.

Mr. Bryden: If Ontario would now declare without equivocation that it was prepared to go ahead with a complete medical care insurance programme—universal, available to everyone on equal terms, equal treatment of equals, and so on—there is no question in the world that the federal government would be pinned right to the mast. It could not then weasel, in any sense, on its announcements.

An hon. member: Call their bluff.

Mr. Bryden: The provinces of Saskatchewan, New Brunswick and Newfoundland have already declared without any question that they are ready to participate in the federal plan if the federal government would only get cracking. The province of Quebec has left little doubt that it is prepared to do the same. There is little doubt that the province of British Columbia will do so. If now the most populous province of Canada joined the ranks the federal government would have no option whatever, except to carry out its election commitments, in total.

One of the hon. members here last night referred to the fact that the former Premier of this province—hon. Mr. Frost—nailed the federal government to the mast back around 1957 on the matter of hospital insurance. The hon. gentleman failed to note, of course, that Mr. Frost was about 11 years behind the times. A better hospital insurance plan has

been in effect in Saskatchewan since 1946. But it is indeed true that Saskatchewan by itself—Saskatchewan and British Columbia by themselves—could not make the federal government move in this field; but when the big populous province of Ontario said, "We are ready to move" the federal government had no option but to carry out the promises it had been making for lo these many years. And exactly the same thing will happen now.

This is the critical period; this is the period when we can go forward to the kind of medical care programme the people of Canada clearly want, that the Hall commission has recommended, that will be of tremendous advantage to the people of Canada. We can go forward now. But this government stands there hesitating, trembling, shrinking, pulling back a little, moving an inch forward and two inches back, and is not able to make up its mind.

Why does it not now make up its mind? Let us go ahead, let us get this done, let us get the \$110 million that the federal government is ready to give us. If I were the Provincial Treasurer, I would never turn down \$110 million from an honourable source: I would take it as fast as I would get it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Imagine a Scottish Minister turning it down, too.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, the hon. Minister of Health turning down \$110 million.

Mr. MacDonald: Incredible! His ancestors must be turning over in their graves.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, this is a critical period in the development of medical insurance programmes in Canada. We all know that, a few years ago, a universal comprehensive programme was pioneered in the province of Saskatchewan. It led to a terrible battle. I may say that the Liberal Party of the province joined in the battle on the side of the forces of reaction. It associated itself with all the dark crypto-fascist, racist elements in the lunatic fringe of the far right in the province to try to destroy this bill. It did not shrink even at suggesting that the province should be reduced to a state of anarchy; and, indeed, it was reduced to a state of partial anarchy.

An hon. member: Who is the hon. member talking about the Premier?

Mr. Bryden: I am talking about what happened in the province of Saskatchewan when a comprehensive medical care insur-

ance programme was proposed in that province, and what the Liberal Party did in that province at that time.

Mr. Thompson: What government is administering the medical insurance plan now?

Mr. Bryden: I am just coming to that. And I will go further and say, Mr. Speaker, that the tensions created in that terrible controversy, in which the medical profession itself was decryied by representatives of the medical profession almost all over the world, as well as by almost all the press throughout the world, resulted in the government of Saskatchewan being brought down. I do not think there is any doubt at all. And I am proud that I belong to the same party as a government which had the courage to stick to principle, even if it meant defeat.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): That is what brought them down.

Mr. Bryden: And the interesting phenomenon, Mr. Speaker, is the rightness of their stand, even though they have not as yet received credit for it. What they received as their reward was defeat. As so often happens in human affairs, those who stand for principles suffer personal defeat, but the principle carries on; and that bill remains in the province of Saskatchewan without any significant change at all under the administration of the party that fought it tooth-and-nail and was prepared to reduce the province to anarchy in order to defeat it. And if anything ever proved the value of legislation, then I say that record proves it.

But of course our timorous friends on the Tory benches say to the government, "Don't do it, don't do that sort of thing." One of them last night said, "Don't do that sort of thing, don't bring in a bill like that. It brought down the government of Saskatchewan, it might bring you people down too, and naturally we would never risk defeat; we would not want to be defeated over a mere principle." This was the argument that was put forward by one of the hon. Conservative speakers last night.

I say to the government of Ontario, timorous though it is, hesitant though it is, that it need have no fear. The battle on principle was fought and won in the province of Saskatchewan, and they can now go ahead without any fear of untoward consequences at all. In fact, they can fear untoward consequences if they do not get moving, get into step with the times, and go ahead with a programme such as is now in effect in Saskatchewan.

Do we need any more eloquent testimony of the correctness of that programme as a means of meeting the needs of the people than the report of the Hall commission—a commission set up by a Tory government in Ottawa unquestionably for the purpose of recommending against comprehensive Medicare?

All the people who were on it would, on the basis of their past record of performance and beliefs, have been expected to recommend against universal Medicare—and I will give these gentlemen credit, they looked at the facts, they studied them at great length and they acted in accordance with the facts. The facts, as they discovered them and proclaimed them to the whole world, showed that the comprehensive plan of Saskatchewan is the kind of plan and the only kind of plan that will meet the needs of the people; and that the plan that was then and still is in effect in Alberta, and which we are more or less imitating here, was simply inadequate to the situation, and was not a step forward; it made no contribution to the situation at all.

Mr. Speaker, I do not really think one has to make any further argument than that. There is no longer any debate on principle; there are simply some pig-headed Tories who refuse to face facts. Unlike the eminent Mr. Justice Hall, whose political record before he was on the bench was one of consistent conservatism; they refuse to let the facts speak to them. They stick in a pig-headed way, defending the privileged interests of the medical profession and the insurance companies to the exclusion of the need of the people of the province.

I call upon the government to move now, to get in touch with the times. They are no longer living in the middle of the 19th century, even though many of them do not realize it. They might as well face the fact they are in the 20th century; let them deal with 20th century problems by 20th century methods. If they do it, I personally will be happy in the next election to give them full credit for it, even though it has certainly taken an inordinate amount of pushing to get them to do even the little bit they are proposing now.

I will tell them that if they will do that they will win the next election in Ontario. Their chances otherwise, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, are very remote indeed. Their inability to face problems, to come up with dynamic solutions, to meet dynamic challenges of the 20th century is more and more getting across to the people and, in particular in relation to this whole medical care insurance programme.

There is an old saying that you can fool some of the people some of the time but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. These fellows over here have been trying to maximize the procedure of fooling some of the people some of the time, but I am telling them that that approach has lost its effectiveness altogether. They are not fooling any of the people now, and I would suggest that they either get in tune with the needs and desires of the people, or give up the ghost and resign. Let this be decided by an election. Let us appeal to the people. This is one of the most important issues before this House in 20 years, so let us have it settled; let us go directly to the people on this specific issue.

Mr. Singer: I am waiting for the hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Speaker: I have the Minister's name here on my list as the last speaker.

Mr. Singer: I am waiting for the hon. Minister of Health. If he does not wish to speak I will not speak.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, are we going to go through with this childish jockeying? The Whips agreed on lists of speakers. As a matter of fact, I was supposed to have been the second last speaker and I was changed to the third last speaker. It seemed reasonable to me that the larger parties should have a chance after me; and I would say on the same basis that the government surely should have the opportunity to wind up the debate. We have been through this childishness before. I suggest to the hon. member for Downsview that it does not really gain him any tactical advantage. If he wants to speak I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that he should proceed to speak now.

Mr. Speaker: The Whips arranged the speaking order and, according to my list, the member for Downsview follows the member who has just spoken, and then the Minister is to wind up the debate.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order. I am quite prepared not to participate in this debate unless a Cabinet Minister has spoken.

Mr. Bryden: I move the previous question.

Mr. S. Lewis: I second the motion.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, speaking on a point of order. The Whips did agree on this list, and for the

first time probably in my life I am in complete accord with the hon. member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I made a motion which I believe is in order.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, getting a piece in here; on a point of order, everybody is getting a piece in here.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, no point of order is at twice.

Mr. Cowling: Well, I will speak to the motion. Speaking to the motion, as much as I like to agree with the hon. member for Downsview, I think he is quite within his rights if he wants to speak at any time in the debate, whether it has been prearranged or not, he can do so. If he wants to sit tight and let someone else speak I think that is his privilege as a member; and if he cares to speak then or not to speak I think he has a perfect right to do so. That would be my thought, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Bryden: Well, if I may comment on this so-called point of order, Mr. Speaker, it now appears—

Mr. Cowling: I was not speaking on a point of order; I was speaking to your motion.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I do not think the motion is debatable. However, I will not make a point of that. I would point out that there are apparently now no speakers prepared to speak on the motion before the House, so the only reasonable thing is to put the question, and I submit that we should put it immediately.

Mr. Speaker: We have a motion before the House by the member for Woodbine that the question be now put. All those in favour? All those opposed? I declare the nays have it. Call on the members.

As many as are in favour of the motion please rise. by the member for Woodbine called out. As many as are opposed, will please rise. In my opinion the "nays" have it.

As many as are in favour of the motion will please rise.

As many as are opposed will please rise.

AYES

Bryden	Allan
Davison	Apps
Freeman	Auld
Gibson	Bales
Lowie	Bekett
(Scarborough West)	Ben
MacDonald	Boyer
Renwick 7.	Braithwaite

AYES

NAYS

Brunelle
Bukator
Connell
Cowling
Davis
Downer
Dymond
Edwards
Evans
Gaunt
Comme
Grossman
Hamilton
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
(Scarborough East)
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Kerr
Knox
Letherby
Morningstar
McKeough
McNeil
Newman
Nixon
Noden
Olde
Oliver
Paterson
Pittock
Price
Racine
Randall
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Rowntree
Sandercock
Sargent
Simonett
Singer
Smith
Sopha
Spence
Spooner
Thompson
Thrasher
Villeneuve
Walker
Wardrobe
Whicher
White
Whitney
Wishart
Worton
Yaremko—67.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 7, the "nays" are 67.

Mr. Speaker: I declare the motion lost.

Mr. White: May I point out to the hon. members of the House, sir, that this tactic is obstructionist in the extreme; and, more than that, it destroys the trust that we Whips have in one another in arriving at lists and other arrangements for the orderly carrying out of the business of the province in this Legislature. If this type of tactic were adopted with some frequency, and if the mutual trust that has been developed between the Whips is thereby destroyed, it can only be to the detriment of the status of this Legislature and it can only be to the detriment of the people of this province.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, speaking on a point of order, may I say, sir, that there are several principles attached to the point of order. I think the first thing is that a bill is introduced by a Minister with absolutely no explanation for the Opposition to debate on, while the executive council sits quietly and silently wanting us to debate in a vacuum. That is the first point.

The second point, sir, is that because of this lack of Cabinet Ministers to participate in the debate, we decided that we would hold back one of our members and may I say that if it is going to be based on the note which we have here from the government Whip on the selection of speakers, which was sent to my hon. friend from Downsview, it says: "Who is next?" and underneath: "Vern Singer." Then at the end it has—and this is the list of speakers he has: Sopha, Yakabuski, Lewis, Bales, Bryden and, at the same level, Singer, Dymond—

Mr. White: On a point of personal privilege, sir—

Mr. Speaker: No, it must be a point of order.

Mr. Thompson: —so that we, sir, were maintaining very firmly what we were going to do: We were waiting for the hon. Minister responsible for the bill to give some statement so that after that we would be able to make some comment with greater knowledge. That is a basic principle for intelligent debate. As well as that, from the point of view of organization of the Whips, we never stated that our member, the hon. member for Downsview, would concede to not come at the end of this debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, speaking on a point of order. We have already expressed

our condemnation of a procedure in which no member of the Cabinet will speak to the principle of a bill. Indeed the hon. member for Scarborough West dealt with it in very forthright and forceful terms. That is not the issue at stake at the moment. The issue at stake at the moment is that, in accordance with the procedures in this House, the Whips agreed on a procedure for speakers and the Liberal Party has now repudiated its own Whip.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we are in the position where henceforth we can place no confidence in agreements that are made; and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am in a position to say to you that henceforth we are not going to be bound by any agreement, if this is the kind of conduct that is going to emerge. The government Whip is correct. This is going to introduce chaos. This party has botched the debate so far, and now it wants to reduce it to chaos.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, being the subject of this debate on order, let me speak to a point of order. Point number one, there was no such agreement. There was a list of speakers from the various parties. Point number two, I sat in my place prepared to give up my opportunity to speak unless at least one Cabinet Minister spoke. If they all choose to sit, they can sit until the debate is over, and I will not rise either. They have got as many as they want; they have got 77, we only have 23, and they can run as many speakers as they want. Surely from among that whole gathering they can produce two or three or five Cabinet Ministers to justify their stand.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important point of principle and on this point of order there was no such an agreement. I refuse to accept the rather ridiculous statement that emanated from the hon. member for London South and came from him in a form of arrogance that has typified his role in this House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): May I just speak to this point of order?

I think in the first place it is fair to say that we will direct the debating from this side of the House and the Opposition members direct it from their side; if they wish to make any comment about it, that is their privilege. This debate is not complete and the hon. Minister has every right to speak last if he feels so inclined.

Hon. members will recall that on first reading—and this is a principle developed in this

House at the request of the Opposition—if a Minister introduces a bill and does not give a full explanation of it on first reading, the first thing is that somebody in the Opposition stands up and says, “Are you going to introduce this and not tell us what it is all about?”

On first reading the hon. Minister came in and he set out very clearly the principles in this bill. He went through the bill completely and related what the principles in it were. Had he spoken first on second reading, no doubt he would have said precisely the same thing as he said on first reading.

This is a principle, as I say, that was developed in this House at the request of the Opposition and it is that on first reading the Minister makes a full statement on the bill. This is what he did. Having done that, I think that his procedure, if I have to justify what the government is doing, is quite correct. His position is there, and then he waits—and he has the right, as he would have in any Parliament, and nobody in this House can deny the right of the Minister who introduces the bill to be the final speaker.

It is my intention to enter this debate myself. However, we do not have to list the order of our government debaters; we have given the list that was there.

I think the point of order concerning the relationship of the Whips speaks for itself and I will have no comment about that. But I will justify the position.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. There seem to be rules to govern any occasion when the government wants to take over and arbitrarily rule the affairs of this House. Last year when the predecessor of this bill was on, the same sort of discussion took place. The way the debate ran was that eventually the hon. Minister of Health was shamed into taking part, then there was an Opposition statement and then the hon. Prime Minister got into it.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness if this bill is worth defending, we have a right to hear from a Cabinet Minister.

Mr. Speaker: Does the Minister wish to speak to the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I wish to speak on the point of order, sir. The hon. member who has just spoken imputes to me ulterior motives. I was not shamed into speaking on my bill. I am proud of very piece of legislation I have brought into this House and I would never

be shamed into speaking on it at all. I will tell this House, sir, through you, that when my time comes, I will explain why I have followed the tactic I have in this present case.

Mr. Speaker: It has been the practice of this House that Whips have always arranged the speaking order and until this time the House has always followed the order that has been submitted to the Speaker. The list which has been submitted to me indicates the member for Downsview would follow the member for Woodbine and then the debate was to be concluded by the Minister.

I must say this, that the rules do set up that a mover of any motion can speak either at the beginning of the motion that he has moved or he can speak at the end of an ancillary motion, such as the moving the second reading of a bill.

In the British House, the custom has been, as I have read on many an occasion, that sometimes the Minister, at the beginning of moving second reading of the bill, simply tips his hat, which is the assent to the Speaker that he has moved second reading of the bill and then he may or may not conclude with a speech at the end of the bill.

It has always been my thoughts that the Minister had the right to conclude the debate on second reading, or even the third reading, if any debate did take place on a bill at that time which he had presented to the House.

In view of that, the debate is open and I shall rule that if the Minister now starts to debate the bill, that will be the concluding debate on this bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on that ruling. I would like your authority for saying that if the hon. Minister speaks, there can be no speeches further than that, if he speaks at the end of the debate. I think this is a most important ruling, which in effect, if this ruling is correct, means it is closure.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: The chair is ready for a speaker on this debate.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, we have gone through, as usual, a great deal of sound and fury and we have heard some learned arguments and some ridiculous arguments. We have witnessed some extremely childish behaviour, sir, and I say that in all kindness.

Mr. Sopha: Is the hon. Minister looking at anybody?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I am looking at the Speaker. Yes, sir, we have seen some very childish behaviour in the last few minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I said to you a few minutes ago, sir, I would tell you why I had adopted this tactic. When Bill No. 163 was introduced in 1963, the then leader of the official Opposition jumped out of his seat when the hon. Prime Minister moved second reading, before I had a chance to get on my feet, and I am not usually accused of being slow. But before I had time, sir, to get on my feet, he was up.

When I moved second reading of Bill No. 136 last year, the same action was followed by the present hon. leader of the Opposition, sir. They jumped out of their seat and made one think of that missile which recently the United States fired, I think they called it the Atlas Agena. You will remember, sir, that that is the one that flopped like a lead balloon.

According to my understanding of parliamentary procedure, and I am delighted to hear you from the depths of your knowledge and experience confirm this, the mover of a bill—or the mover on second reading of his bill has the right, if he so chooses, to speak last and this was what I had expected to do. It is quite impossible, sir, to—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sopha: What is he complaining about the hon. leader of the Opposition standing up for then?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I was complaining—I thought it was patently clear—I was complaining because there have been so many complaints emanating from those two little groups that I had not yet spoken.

Now it is impossible, sir, to cover the broad range of topics that have been injected into this bill. Never, in the 11 years I have sat in this Legislature do I believe I have heard the principles of a bill so loosely interpreted as has been the case in this Bill No. 6 now before the House. Indeed, we have taken the opportunity—

Mr. Thompson: You said that last year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —in this debate, sir, to cover practically every topic that has any faint relationship to health whatsoever.

We have talked about the Ontario medical association. We have talked about the college of physicians and surgeons. We have talked about the powers of licensing. We have listened to talk about all these things. We have listened to talk about the rigidity of the examinations and about the reasons for turning down this and that applicant for licence to practice. We have talked about all kinds of things. The churches have been injected into it.

Mr. Sopha: By a Tory; by a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The only thing I have not heard them talking about is the Lions Club.

Just this afternoon, sir, the hon. member for Woodbine got tremendously upset because I, an Aberdonian was turning down \$110 million. We are not turning down \$110 million. We have not even seen the colour of the federal government's money yet. And we have not heard too much about it, other than a general type of proposal that was made to the Prime Ministers of the provinces last July.

As I have stated in this House and as is obviously patent in this Bill No. 6, there is no relationship whatsoever between this bill and the proposals put before the provincial Prime Ministers by the Prime Minister of Canada. This bill is an entirely different matter, but I hope to point out that the dire prophecies that the hon. members opposite have put forward concerning it cannot come to pass.

Then another member of the socialist group, I believe the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), said yesterday in his booming pulpit voice, all Canada wants this. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could not help but think that was hardly consistent with fact and those two little groups are always talking about consistency.

Indeed, I can recall—is it two elections, or is it three federal elections ago—the only party which put forward in the Dominion election Medicare as a plank in the platform—

Mr. Thompson: The Liberal Party.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It was not the Liberal Party—the Liberal Party put it forward in 1919—it was Tommy Douglas of the socialist party in Canada. And what happened to him? Mr. Speaker, if I recall rightly, he was defeated in his own riding; he the Prime Minister of the province, who had represented his people in that riding all of his 20-odd years in political life. He was defeated in his own riding and his party and

the Dominion of Canada sent back the puny little few, as they always have done.

Mr. Thompson: Well, he had a lot of other things that were wrong.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Now, Mr. Speaker, if this is consistent—the beliefs of these few people here that all Canada wants this—then I do not understand what consistency is.

Mr. MacDonald: Seventy-eight per cent wanted it in 1945.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You know, as I listened to the socialist members this afternoon, I could not escape the feeling that they are very anxious to keep us in power and this is very nice to know, because I know that a lot of the people whom they think vote for them, vote for me. But it would seem to me, sir, that they are most anxious to keep this party in power and this is most pleasing. If they are so sure we are wrong, sir, then why do they not defeat us and then they would have the opportunity to put their philosophies into work?

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister should say what the principle of the bill is before he finishes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am coming to the principles of the bill, but I am claiming the same poetic or political license, or parliamentary license, sir, that you have been indulgent enough to extend to them over the last two or three days.

As I stated, sir, at the outset, they have completely lost sight of the bill. The hon. member for Riverdale indulged in the greatest flight of fancy I ever heard. I am quite certain he has been reading Ian Fleming, 007. Perhaps he is now 007½, I am not sure. He indulged in great flights of fancy and in conjecture and in speculation about what has happened, what is happening and what will happen.

They have expressed fears. The hon. leader of the Opposition was dreadfully fearful and so suspicious, sir. Indeed, when he spoke about my being schizoid, I got the opinion because of his persecution and suspicion complex, that he was suffering from paranoia.

Mr. Thompson: I think the hon. Minister was catatonic.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Atomic. And then we were told by the hon. member for Woodbine about the province of Saskatchewan—I am sorry he has left his seat—and the dynamic programme for the 20th century that was

originated there. But Mr. Speaker, it did not become successful. It really hurts me to say this—but I must give credit where credit is due—that it took a Grit government to make the plan successful. It took a Grit government in Saskatchewan to put the province on the rollers to success. The economy of Saskatchewan has boomed since. That is the last kindly thing I am going to say about the Liberals.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to—

Mr. MacDonald: The people will put it to pasture next year.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, I must not look directly at the hon. member.

In trying to get back to the principles of the bill, sir, which are clear-cut and quite readily understood, as I suggested the other day—and the hon. member for Sudbury reminded me that I occasionally use biblical terms—the principles are so simple that a wayfaring man, even though he be a fool, may not err therein. I still maintain the same. The principles are clear-cut and simple and easily understood.

But I want to divide my presentation into two parts. First I want to deal specifically with the amendments to Bill 136 and then I shall try to sort out, although this will be very difficult, the various points raised by the hon. members during the debate.

The prime purpose for Bill No. 136, as was clearly outlined in this House a year ago by the hon. Prime Minister and by myself, was to ensure that through the Ontario medical services insurance plan adequate medical care will be available to all the people of Ontario wherever they reside, whatever the state of their health and whatever their financial status or resources may be.

To achieve this primary objective we introduced these amendments to Bill No. 136. All of these amendments, we are quite convinced in our mind, will further enhance our ability to provide a medical services insurance plan for all of the residents of Ontario, at reasonable cost and covering a comprehensive range of physicians' services.

The amendments to Bill No. 136 fit into three categories. I shall try to explain to this House why they are proposed.

First of all, looking at the extent of the population covered, you will recall, sir, that in the original bill a division of The Department of Health was to be created to provide a standard medical services insurance contract which was to be available to people receiving benefits under the various social

assistance Acts, and this group would automatically be covered and would not be required to pay any premium.

Then it was proposed that persons with income not sufficient to be subject to income tax will also be eligible for coverage at no cost to them; all they will have to do is apply to the division for a contract. They will differ somewhat from the first group in that we already have the first group on record and it will simply be a matter of receiving those records from The Department of Public Welfare and issuing a contract to those people.

May I inject here, sir, a misapprehension, and I am bound to say in a little sadness that I think that this is a deliberate misinterpretation or misrepresentation, because the hon. members who speak about these people who are in receipt of social assistance now getting medical services coverage, know perfectly well this is not right. They are covered under the present plan for a minimum of medical services coverage. It provides the doctors' services in the home or in the office only—it provides nothing else. It was never intended to be and it was never represented as a comprehensive coverage.

And then partial support will be provided for other groups in low income categories, and the amount of assistance will be noted later, and indeed it is already on the record, Mr. Speaker.

In addition to this, because of further study—and I am very sorry here, Mr. Speaker, that I have to disillusion these hon. members over here, because while I am quite prepared to admit that they did say a great deal about the things that we have embodied in our bill, I cannot in honesty, sir, leave them dreaming that they were responsible for the changes.

I would like to say to you that when my own people studied this matter of medical services insurance I think they have studied—indeed I am sure they have studied—every conceivable plan, every plan that is in operation in any nation, in any state in this whole world. And indeed they themselves conceived many plans.

In addition to this I can name many hon. members on this side of the House, sir, who put forward the proposals which are embodied in the bill. I suppose the immediate reaction will be: Well, why did you not listen to them? Mr. Speaker, we did last year what we believed the province could do.

We believe we did what we stated at that time and what I still believe to be true in the light of our experience at that time,

we put forward what we believed was a good first step. We now see that we can go further, we can take a bigger step. I think you will recall, and every hon. member in this House will recall, that at no time has this party ever suggested that our proposal was the final or the perfect plan. And we will not suggest that even when we have the fully rounded programme of which so many of the hon. members opposite speak.

Let me say to you, Mr. Speaker, that these socialists do not have a corner on the milk of human kindness, and I often have had occasion to say this before. We are concerned about people and about their welfare. I think more than that we are imbued with a far deeper sense of responsibility because we know from experience, past and present, that we have the responsibility of making these provisions and being sure that they will work and being sure that they are good and that they are sound.

It is awfully easy to talk, sir, and I think you will find it recorded in *Hansard* that I have said time and time again that these hon. friends of ours can talk as much as they like about these things because they know that within the span of most of us here they will never be called upon to assume the responsibility to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the—

Mr. MacDonald: Famous last words!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: After the Oshawa deal I will be using those words a lot longer. The hon. member did me a great deal of good down there.

One of the chief amendments we have made in this bill then, is that the government now proposes to make the standard medical services insurance contract available on a voluntary basis to all residents on an individual and family basis. These changes will mean that private carriers will not participate in the government plan but will continue to provide coverage for groups and any individual who elects to join the private carrier.

We believe now that medical services insurance will be universally available to all of the people of Ontario, and therefore certain of the amendments which are placed before this House, repeal or amend those sections of the Act referring to private carriers or to the corporation. They would no longer provide insurance within the terms of the Act.

It is our intention to provide a plan which provides benefits covering practically all

services provided by physicians. It has been decided to remove the limitations originally contained in the benefits set out in schedule A of the original Act.

In addition, benefits have been extended to provide payments under certain circumstances to dentists for certain surgical procedures when they are carried out in a hospital. These procedures have been identified by the Royal college of dental surgeons and the college of physicians and surgeons as procedures which might be performed either by a dental surgeon or a physician.

With these changes exclusions will now be limited to two circumstances only. Physicians' services are already provided under certain federal, provincial or other enactments such as national defence, The Workmen's Compensation Act. In appropriate circumstances individuals will receive benefits under these other Acts rather than through the Ontario medical services insurance plan. This does not represent a gap, it just avoids duplicate payment.

Certain limited services are excluded from the plan including examination for the purposes of application for insurance, for employment, for admission to a school or university, camp or association; group inoculations, examinations of the eyes by refraction.

May I inject here sir, because the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) was concerned about this, it is no oversight nor is it any deliberate discrimination whatsoever, it was decided, as I explained last year, that because of the very great number of complexities and difficulties in this field at this time we were not providing as a benefit examination of the eyes by refraction, but this does not mean that the optometrists are excluded for some sinister or peculiar reason. The optometrists have been told very clearly on many occasions, both by myself and by the hon. Prime Minister why they were being left out at this time, and the same thing goes for chiropractors. It is not that we have anything against them, or that there is any discrimination; it is simply because of the fact that the benefits are not included as yet.

Let me remind the hon. members, sir, when they are talking about all of these things, and in the same breath talking about the federal proposal or the federal plan: There is no federal plan. There cannot be a federal plan, because health is a provincial responsibility under the Constitution of this

nation. But in the federal proposal, sir, it is specifically stated, and it was emphasized by the Prime Minister of the nation, that it covered all physicians' services. The one other exclusion is services for which no charge would be made in the absence of insurance. That would apply to cases in an institution, where the medical care is provided, the doctor being paid on a salary basis.

Mr. Thompson: Does that include mental hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not at the present time, but I hope to say something more about them later on.

Mr. Thompson: In this debate?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In this debate.

It is proposed, Mr. Speaker, to remove the special waiting period for maternity benefits, and we do this with a great deal of hesitation because we still believe that this is a costly service and might well cause us a little bit of difficulty.

Mr. Speaker: I do not like to interrupt the Minister but I take it that he has a considerable amount of material that he wishes to give us yet.

Hon. Mr. Dymond moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to continue with this debate and then I would like to go to Order No. 1, the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) would tell us when he intends to proceed to the committee stage of this bill.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I will have to wait until it receives second reading, but I will give the hon. members notice. It will be my intention to proceed rather rapidly, but I will give the hon. member notice so that he will know beforehand when we are going to proceed. In other words, it will not go into the committee stage immediately after we complete second reading.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Prime Minister if there will be a private members' period tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, I thought I made it clear that we will deal with the private members' resolutions and bills on Tuesdays and Thursdays. That will come; and then, of course, there is a night session; and, while I am on my feet, let me say we will meet every Monday, Tuesday and Thursday night, and we will set 10.30 p.m. as a target for completion of these night sittings. I do not want rigidity on this because sometimes, as the

hon. members know, the debate just naturally continues longer, but I would like to sit on a regular three-nights-a-week basis and attempt to be finished at 10.30.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Will we start at two o'clock?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, three o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, February 10, 1966
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

CONTENTS

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Presenting reports, Mr. Yarenko ..	378
Medical Services Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, on second reading, continued ..	385
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Singer, agreed to ..	397
On notice of motion No. 5, Mr. Nixon, Mr. L. M. Hodgson, Mr. Bryden ..	397
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Trotter, agreed to ..	407
Recess, 6 o'clock ..	407
Erratum ..	407

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have, as guests in the Legislature today in the west gallery, students from St. Peter's separate school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting Huntington University;

Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Charlotteville;

Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the town of Thorold.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr24, An Act respecting the Ganaouque high school district.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a report to the hon. members of this House with respect to the labour-management dispute at the Oshawa *Times*. I have just come from a meeting where a memorandum of agreement was signed by both parties at about a quarter to three this afternoon.

This agreement will be taken to the membership of the guild later today and, until it is ratified, no statement will be made by the parties with respect to the terms of the settlement.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): If I could add to the hon. Minister of Labour's statement, I would like to say

that, from our side, we feel a sense of relief that negotiations are now taking place; and it looks as though it may be the end of the strike.

But I would like to say sir, that on this—

Mr. Speaker: Order! There can be no comments on ministerial statements. You can ask the Minister a question; if he cares to answer it is all right but the member cannot make a statement himself.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask a question of the hon. Minister then, sir?

Mr. Speaker: Yes, but you cannot make statements yourself.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister if we could have a guarantee that, when any group, big labour or big business, takes it on its own right to abuse the law of the land, even though we may consider it is a bad law, they must recognize they must keep to law and order; and recognize that the precedent set by having this strike settled is not a precedent, which is going to mean that we could have lawlessness in our society?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, the position of the government has been stated by the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) in this House during this current week.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, I should like to reply to a question which was addressed to me yesterday when, regretfully, I was unable to be in my seat.

The question asked by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) was: In view of the latest in a series of fatal accidents at the intersection of Highways 5, 24 and 99, what is The Department of Highways prepared to do to eliminate the serious safety hazards at this point?

The answer is that, while it has been established that the latest in the series of fatal accidents referred to by the hon. member was the result of driver failure—in that the driver of the vehicle on Highway 5 failed to observe the stop condition, in spite of the fact

that a flashing beacon is operating on the stop sign at this location—nonetheless I share the concern of the hon. member, and I have directed that a further and even more intensive examination of the intersection be undertaken. All aspects, including signs, protective and warning devices, channelization, pavement markings, sight distance factors, and so on, will be gone into thoroughly by the appropriate people in The Department of Highways.

I have also requested the assistance of the hon. Attorney General in making available to us traffic safety officers from the Ontario provincial police for the purpose of our investigation; and the good offices of the hon. member who is particularly familiar with the intersection, and who helped with the previous investigation, are again solicited.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), of which I have already given him notice.

The question is as follows: Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer inform this House what progress the civil service commission has made in negotiating increased wages for the highway employees in Essex, Kent and Lambton?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that, by mutual agreement—that is, by agreement of the management side, the civil service commission, and the civil service association—this matter will be placed on the agenda of the joint council and will be discussed at a meeting to be held on Monday next, that is February 14.

Mr. Spence: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer give us some assurance that this matter will be settled within a few days?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that the hon. member understands that, when wages are being negotiated, I am not able to look into a crystal ball and assure the hon. member at what time a settlement will be reached. I can only assure him that everything that can be done is being done to hasten the negotiations.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner). Would the hon. Minister inform this House in reference to Reeve James Service's brief to the provincial government regarding a code of ethics for municipal officials and

employees? Does he intend to take action this session with this regulation?

Question 2: If so, would it be for all municipalities in Ontario?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member I am not aware whether or not Reeve Service has communicated with the hon. Prime Minister of the province (Mr. Robarts), in connection with this matter. But I can say this: The Minister of Municipal Affairs has not received a brief from Reeve Service regarding a code of ethics for municipal officials and employees. Therefore, being unaware of the contents of the brief, I am unable to comment at this time.

However, in the hope that I might be of greater assistance to the hon. member in answering his question, I had a member of my staff communicate with the office of his worship, the reeve, but unfortunately that person could not reach the reeve. However, a person at the reeve's office advised the member of my staff that the reeve's code of ethics has not been circulated, and will not be circulated, until it has been submitted to the board of control and the council of the township of North York.

In light of this answer, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to make any further comments with respect to part 2 of the question of the hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, if I may? Would it not be good business for the hon. Minister to consider such a code for all municipalities in the province? And if so, would he not consider it in this session?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I would bring to the attention of the hon. member that there is already a section of The Municipal Act dealing with this very important matter. And furthermore, I believe I did make a statement during this present session of the Legislature that parts of The Municipal Act were being—or rather, amendments were being—studied in light of the report of the legislative committee which reported towards the end of the last session; and that it was my hope that part 2 of The Municipal Act, which deals with this question of conflict of interest and relevant matters, would no doubt be coming to the House for amendment later on during this session.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to finish questions before any points of order. The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question in two parts for the hon. Attorney General.

In light of the statement by the hon. Minister of Labour, and the denials by the hon. Attorney General yesterday of statements attributed to him, will he now advise the House if there is any need to his knowledge, or in his opinion, for him to consider intervention in Oshawa by the Ontario provincial police to maintain public order? And, second, did any discussion take place at the meeting on February 7 about the place of injunctions in labour disputes in Ontario?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, in light of the statement made by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Labour, and also in light of the fact that this question is framed as a request for an opinion, I would advise the hon. member that I do not feel I should be expressing opinions at this time.

He does ask as to my knowledge, and I would simply say this: I have not received any request from the head of the municipality, the mayor of Oshawa, for assistance. I think I have previously informed this House that I met the mayor some few days ago and assured him that if a request for assistance was received, it would be at once forthcoming, for the maintenance of law and order.

The answer to the second part of the question is "No."

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General permit a supplementary question?

Will the hon. Attorney General remove the pressure of the threat of intervention by the Ontario provincial police from the possible ratification of the memorandum of agreement announced by the hon. Minister of Labour, by assuring the House, the citizens of Oshawa and the people of Ontario that so long as the citizens of Oshawa continue to conduct themselves in the same peaceful manner as they have since the dispute began—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the member is out of order on his supplementary question; as he is making a statement with it; and as any question is not supposed to express an opinion or be argumentative in any way, I think perhaps the same applies to

supplementary questions. I am of the opinion that the supplementary question goes beyond the form that a question should take.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister, notice of which has been given. The question is in two parts:

Did the provincial government make representation to the federal board of transport commissioners when hearings were held by them in regard to the cancellation of the CPR Dominion?

And second, in the light of the board of transport commissioners' statement, does the government intend to make representations to the federal Minister of Transport?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in each case the answer to the question is "No."

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Prime Minister allow a supplementary question?

Does this indicate that the government is in accord with the decision of the board of transport commissioners?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it does not so indicate. As far as this government is concerned, the whole question of this transcontinental train is purely a matter for the federal government. There are a great many elements to be taken into consideration in regard to service in other parts of the country and it was the feeling of this government that the board of transport commissioners might very well deal with this problem in the national context in which it exists, and therefore we did not make any representations.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile).

Could the hon. Minister inform this House what steps the government will take to help alleviate the problems existing regarding the budgeting for child welfare in Metropolitan Toronto?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that the metropolitan children's aid society nor the Catholic children's aid society are finding any financial difficulties in maintaining their programmes. I have no advice as to whether the corporation of Metropolitan Toronto will accept the budgets proposed by these societies. It would appear that from January

1 of this year the province will be assuming 67 per cent of the total cost of child welfare in Metropolitan Toronto as compared with slightly over 40 per cent in former years.

As I have previously indicated, the province will continue to advance its share of children's aid budget.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question?

Could he advise this House whether other children's aid societies have encountered the same problem as the Toronto society?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The answer is "No," Mr. Speaker.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Does the hon. Minister consider that the action of the medical officer of health in Pittsburgh township, in the Kingston area, is justified in instructing milk receiving plants to refrain from picking up milk from those farm families subject to quarantine because of scarlet fever among school age children?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to pass judgment on the actions of the medical officer of health. He is charged with certain responsibilities embodying concern for all aspects of the public health so long as he works within The Public Health Act. I can say that under certain stated conditions, however, milk may be removed from any premises on which a carrier, patient or contact of scarlet fever and other diseases named in the communicable disease regulations resides.

These are briefly: (1) That the medical officer of health prescribes the precautions to be taken by the carrier, patient or contact to prevent the spread of the disease and is satisfied that the precautions will be observed; (2) That the milk will be delivered to a dairy which also includes a creamery and pasteurization plant; (3) That the operator of the dairy undertakes to pasteurize all the milk, or heat it to a temperature of 161 degrees Fahrenheit for not less than 16 seconds and cool it immediately thereafter to a temperature not higher than 50 degrees Fahrenheit.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask a supplementary question.

Would the hon. Minister look into the matter, because in neighbouring counties delivery is permitted; and second, even within this township there is an inconsistency in

that delivery is permitted if the child happens to be below school age?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have already asked that a thorough investigation be carried out and that we get the specific reasons why this action was taken.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the following reports:

1. The annual report of The Department of Highways for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1965.

2. The Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario 1964 annual report.

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, and I refer to some implications made last night to the effect there is some confusion and a lack of proper understanding between Whips.

I would like to take exception to any such references. There was no misunderstanding. As the Whip of my party, I have always submitted the order of our speakers and I have always held to this unless there was some special circumstance which I had previously discussed and clarified with the government Whip. As long as I am Whip, this will always be the situation.

This order was followed by my party in this particular debate. The hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) was the last speaker for my party and he made the decision that he would only speak if a Cabinet Minister preceded him, which was his privilege.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Farquhar: My responsibility is to provide the government with the order of speakers from my party and it is the government's responsibility to then provide their order of speakers. I have kept faith with that and I am sure the government Whip knows that has been the case in every circumstance so far.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): May I ask the hon. member a question, Mr. Speaker? May I ask the hon. member who has just spoken if he advised the other Whips of the decision unilaterally made by the hon. member for Downsview that he would deign to speak only if a Cabinet Minister preceded him? Did the other Whips know about this? If so, I have something to take up with my own Whip, because he did not tell me anything about it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That was my decision.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that arrangements are practically impossible if there are mental reservations about them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Are there any other points of order on the subject? If so, I would like them expressed now, since it has been opened.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, let me join in this just for a moment on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: On a point or order?

Mr. Singer: Yes, on a point of order.

Point No. 1: I confirm completely what the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin has said.

I would say to this House, sir, that if he made a commitment in my name, which I knew about or which I did not know about, I have sufficient faith in the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin that I would abide by that commitment. In this case, the only commitment that was made was that I was one of the speakers in the order given for our party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in case there is any doubt in the minds of some of the hon. members on the government side, let me quote just a phrase or two spoken by the hon. Prime Minister yesterday, which confirms this position. After saying: "It is my intention to enter this debate myself"—and the hon. Prime Minister said that yesterday afternoon—he said, "We do not have to list the order of government debaters. We gave you the list that was there."

That is the point! Now, Mr. Speaker, if it applies to the government, and who better could be an authority for the government than the hon. Prime Minister, surely it applies to every member of this House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If I may speak to this point of order, my intent in making that remark was simply this, we would not list whether a Cabinet Minister or a non-Cabinet Minister would be the next speaker. All we do from this side of the House is list those members who are going to speak and the order in which they are going to speak.

We do not say to hon. members opposite, "We want to hear from the member over there, before we will follow, or the member over here." We just list members from our side of the House who are going to speak; and this is what I meant by that remark. It is not up to us to confer with

the Opposition in deciding on the basis of where a member is from or what position he may hold, when he speaks in the debate. We just give them a list of members as we choose them, in the order in which they will enter the debate.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, last night before the hon. Minister of Health began to speak you ruled that he would be the last speaker in the debate. Quite frankly, I hoped that this ruling would stand without having to be subject to revision because of pressures in the House.

However, Mr. Speaker, if for whatever reason this debate is going to be open now, once again I have to inform you that we have two further speakers to take part in the debate. We are willing to abide by your ruling if your ruling remains, but if it is not going to stand I am hereby informing you that we have two further speakers. Furthermore, I think it is only fair that we should know how many more speakers there are going to be, and from which party, and that our two speakers will then be put in an appropriate order instead of being bunched at one point.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order I would like to state very emphatically that if you suggested, which I think you did last night, that a Minister, in the introduction of a motion or a bill, is the last speaker, and the member of the socialist party said that he would concur with that, to me this would be one of the most dangerous rulings that you could make. I could see a situation where a Minister may introduce a bill, one of the government members may get up and speak on it and then the Minister might speak next and close off all debate and stifle the Opposition. And for that reason, sir—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: That could happen under the ruling which you are suggesting. We are going to stand, sir, on guard for the rights of the Opposition if others would deny us that right.

Mr. MacDonald: There are ten Opposition speakers in the debate.

Mr. Speaker: I have expressed an opinion on the particular debate that took place yesterday. I expressed my opinion on that particular debate.

Now if everyone has raised the points of order that they wish to raise, I would like to—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if you are going to make a ruling—

Mr. Speaker: Do not anticipate what I am going to say, because I had occasion to look at the transcript of *Hansard* this morning and I spent some time on our rules, as well as the authorities to which you refer, and I am going to make this statement now.

As the mover of an order of the day, such as a motion for second reading of a bill which is an ancillary motion and not a substantive motion, unlike the mover of a substantive motion the mover may only speak once, it is the custom and practice of the House that he may choose his time to speak. That is, he may speak at the time he moves the order or may simply indicate that he moves second reading and reserve his speech for a later stage of the debate. If you look at May, 17th edition, page 446, this is the way May reads:

The only exception to the rule that the mover may only speak once is when by the indulgence of the House the Minister may be given an opportunity to reply.

Which quite often happens here, Ministers often rise on an ancillary motion like moving second reading of a bill and then have some further remarks to make later after others have spoken. If he secures the indulgence of the House he may speak again at the end of the debate. Lewis, on page 29, has this to say:

In the Ontario House it has become the custom to expect a member, in moving an order of the day, such as the second reading of a bill or similar order, to make his argument in favour of his motion when the order is called.

But he calls attention to the custom in the British House which allows him to reserve his speech until later in the debate. This has also been the custom in the Ontario House in my time and was in fact followed several times last session, as I have mentioned.

The whole question of the order of speaking in the House is governed by custom and practice, you cannot hang your hat on any particular rule in any rule book; or in any of the authorities I have read I have not found it.

The mover of an order of the day has by custom and practice the right to choose his own time of participation in a debate in exactly the same way as custom and practice dictates that the official Opposition has the right to speak before the third party in the House on matters. On all major debates, including the Throne and Budget debates, the

order of speaking is arranged by the party Whips, and if this is not to be followed by the members it would mean that a member for the third party could, by getting the Speaker's eye, rise in his place and speak before the leader of the Opposition in a debate.

So therefore, my understanding of parliamentary practice is that it is based on mutual consideration and good manners. This is the foundation for the arrangement of the list of the order of speeches furnished to me by the Whips. If this is not to be followed, and it is my wish that it continue to be followed, it will seriously affect the orderly conduct of debate and place the chair in a very difficult position. For these reasons I am of the opinion that the hon. member for Downsview—now I am stating an opinion—having been given every opportunity to speak at the time arranged by the Whips as I understand it, by the list that I received, and having declined to do so, has forfeited his right to speak in the debate.

Now the alternative is to scrap the whole practice for the arrangement of orderly debate. I would be pleased to have the guidance of the House in this matter before I make any ruling and I am going to ask for that guidance now. Have any members of the House anything to offer to resolve this particular situation? I ask for the guidance of the House at this time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would like to make a comment or two in this regard. I had proposed taking part in this debate myself and my name did not appear on the list of speakers that our Whip had, so I suppose I might be considered to be in breach of the Whips' arrangement, although I do not think that I am because I do not think anyone can deny that it is the right of the leader of the government to have the last word on any piece of legislation for which he inevitably and eventually must take full responsibility. So I do not worry too much about that from a technical point of view; but what does concern me in this present situation is that we can see a breakdown in what has been, through the years, a very satisfactory system. Despite the efforts of the hon. leader of the Opposition to insinuate otherwise, as long as I have led this government and as long as I have had the responsibility of leading this House, there is not a single man who has ever had anything to say on any subject who has not had an opportunity to say it.

If we start from that—

Mr. Thompson: May I just remind—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, Mr. Speaker!

An hon. member: The height of rudeness!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. leader of the Opposition has a thousand opportunities to make comments on the matter.

Mr. Thompson: Why did I not get my resolution last year?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But certainly he must take the opportunity he has in the House to make comments and I will only say that he had many opportunities last year to say anything he wanted in that regard.

Now the other point I want to make is that if we do not have some order in the conduct of affairs here today we are not going to be able to get on with the business of the House, because we are wasting time at the moment in what is fundamentally, in my opinion, a rather ridiculous argument, and we will have to resolve this point.

That is the general aspect—not to get back to the specifics. We all want everybody to have an opportunity to express their opinion, if we are to function as a Legislature.

We are here to debate the issues of the day, and those who want to speak must have an opportunity to speak, but they must have that opportunity within certain rules, or we will have no order and we will find it completely impossible to do the business of the province, because we will spend all our time in procedural wrangles such as we are in at the moment. I might say that this has been the situation in the Parliament of Canada, and because they have been able to get their rules straightened out in the last two or three months, there is some semblance of order now appearing in the conduct of business there.

That, as far as I am concerned, is the general aspect of this question. To get to the particular point here, I want to speak in this debate. I honestly do not know whether the hon. member for Downsview wants to speak or not, but the hon. leader of the third party has indicated that he has two people who might like to speak.

Mr. Bryden: This is in the light of the new development.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, of course. I would make this suggestion: Let the hon. Minister finish his remarks, and let us arrange some order of speaking upon which we can agree. I will finish the debate for the government side and I will do this on the condition that we are not—

This is no opinion on the ruling that you have made, Mr. Speaker. But before this House expresses itself on that ruling, which I suppose eventually it must, I would ask that the leaders of the three parties meet with the Whips and find out if we could not settle this matter in a sane and civilized fashion, and get back to orderly conduct of the business here.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I am a bit puzzled at the moment. Before the hon. Prime Minister rose, I was going to say that I thought the outcry from the Liberal ranks—that we should get our rules back in order in this House—was going to be achieved by your statement, I believe it would have been achieved. The hon. Prime Minister has now indicated—and when he indicates, since there are 77 on his side of the House, I suppose that is a call for support—that the debate is now going to be opened up again, and therefore I suppose we are faced with the fact that your proposal is likely to be upset. However, Mr. Speaker, let me say this—

Mr. Speaker: I wish to say I did not make a firm ruling. I think perhaps the Prime Minister said that I had made a ruling. I expressed an opinion.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not understand it. I am only making a proposal. If it is not acceptable, it is perfectly all right.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I recognize that you have not made a ruling; you asked for some comments from the House, and the hon. Prime Minister has indicated that now he wants to get into the debate. The only way he can get into the debate is to open it all up again.

We have indicated the circumstances in which we will co-operate in some *ad hoc* arrangements to achieve this, if there is a decision to open up the debate again.

But I come back to the basic point. We have got to get some order established so we can avoid chaos. I suggest that your initial statement is the way to restore order. We have been going through this debate on a one, two, three basis, from the Conservative, to the Liberal, to ourselves. When the conclusion of the debate emerged, we should in fact, have been the last speaker before the government. This was the order in which it should have come, but we felt it was only reasonable, in order of the preference that is given to the senior Opposition party, they should have the last word before the hon. Minister of Health. Therefore, the hon. member for Woodbine agreed, because he felt

it was the reasonable thing to do, that he would speak third last. It was left for somebody from the Liberal Party to speak second last, and for the hon. Minister to conclude the debate.

I submit to you that your original statement is correct; that when the hon. member for Downsview was given an opportunity to speak, and he decided to forego it, in effect he decided to forego his opportunity to enter the debate. We are going to have chaos if each one of us can have reservations as to under what circumstances we will come in. Even when you have a sequence of people among the various parties, the result would be an Alphonse and Gaston act with everybody saying "I will not speak until you speak" and will wind up having no debate at all.

This, I suggest, is chaos. My hope would be that your suggestion to the House, by way of resolving this, will be followed. If it is not, I have indicated to you that we have two speakers and then I trust we will accept the hon. Prime Minister's suggestion of getting together in some fashion under the gallery, and deciding in what order they are going to speak, so that we can have an orderly conclusion to this debate.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I notice that the hon. Prime Minister said that in Ottawa one of the things they did was sit down and examine the rules. May I suggest, that one of the things I and my party have been asking for for two years is that the hon. Prime Minister of this Legislature do just that.

Every day we see rules broken in this House. Yesterday in the Budget debate, we saw a rule broken, but because of my respect for the hon. Provincial Treasurer I did not stand up on my feet and protest it. We are actually seeing a rule broken in the whole precedent of how this—the procedure and the business of the House—is run every day. It seems to me it is pointed up more clearly that we need to co-operate to have a look at the whole rules and procedures of this House. We must have harmony and respect for each other on this.

I have been denied—and I say this to the hon. Prime Minister and others—I have been denied last year this very resolution; it was not brought. I really should have had the resolution brought according to the rule either on a Monday or a Wednesday or a Friday, but the rule is broken and yet the hon. Prime Minister is deciding if he will bring forward a resolution or not. That is just one example.

May I say, sir, that with respect to this situation we have now, I have the deepest respect for the Whip of my party; he comes from an honourable family in politics. He has the highest record, from the point of being a man of his word, and he met with the Whip of the government. He gave him a list of speakers—

An hon. member: The hon. leader of the Opposition is missing the point again.

Mr. Thompson: He gave a list of speakers to him. The New Democratic Party leader suggests there is an order that takes place; there is a Liberal, one from the New Democratic Party, and a Conservative. On this particular occasion, quite rightly, the hon. member for Downsview was waiting, in that order, to follow and to hear from a Conservative speaker. He sat in his seat in order to hear that.

Mr. Bryden: We changed it for his benefit.

Mr. Thompson: We now find, as well, that there was an intention on the part of the government to have the hon. Prime Minister come in. As far as I am concerned, I look forward to hearing him, but he was not on the list. So if we are going to all get into a little wrangle and argument on this thing about the list, we will find that the government itself was at fault—I agree with the hon. Prime Minister—unless the three leaders get together with the Whips and sort this out.

Let us get rules in this House, get a select committee on rules and procedure, so we can have order and respect; and you, sir, when you rule, should not have to say, as you did a couple of days ago, "Well, perhaps it is rule 31-A, but the practice is that we break that rule." I think that puts you in an invidious position.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment on this. I think I am involved personally, to a certain degree. I will say that I have no objection to being played for a sucker if I am dumb enough; but when it is done on the basis of an absolute breach of faith, I object.

It is perfectly ridiculous for anyone to suggest to this House that three parties will submit lists of speakers, which are three separate lists with no meshing of the lists. How can you ever have an order of debate in that fashion? We have been following what worked out to a rule-of-thumb order. It developed that each party had about the same number of speakers, so it was going: One,

two, three—Conservative, Liberal, NDP; which was reasonable enough.

Then we came to what we were led to believe was the concluding stage of the debate and it was suggested to us that, following that order, I would come on before the hon. Minister. So I decided to come on first, ahead of the Liberal. The way it was originally lined up, the hon. member for Downsview was to come on, I was to follow, and then the hon. Minister was to wind the thing up. That was the understanding, as clear as day, but it was pointed out to me, and I agreed, that that was really unreasonable; so, for this last round, we should switch it—I should go on ahead of the hon. member for Downsview. He should then follow and the hon. Minister would wind up. I was willing to accommodate. I thought that was a gentlemanly thing to do among gentlemen, and that there was a gentlemen's agreement.

Speaking orders are never determined by rules. They are determined by gentlemen's agreement. So I did it. Of course, we all know, Mr. Speaker, that yesterday was Budget day and there was no hope that anybody speaking on Bill No. 6 would get his name in the papers. I went ahead anyway, knowing full well that my immortal words would be lost on the public. But then we found our hon. friend from Downsview, who was shocked to find that I was through at five after five, starting to jockey so that he could get on today.

Mr. Singer: I really did not pay that much attention to the hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, if this is the kind of cheap childish jockeying that is going to go on that there can be no gentlemen's agreements about anything. And if some members are to have mental reservations about what their Whips say, then we cannot have an orderly system of debate at all. What if every member sits back and says, "Well, I will not go on until you are on, and you will not go on until I am on"? We would sit here for three hours, and nobody would say anything. It would be news, I admit, but it would not make for the orderly conduct of the business of this House.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that someone suggested we get down to business—I second the motion.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Why does the hon. member not take charge of things?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, I want to mention one point. I

think the hon. leader of the Opposition has unintentionally misinformed the House; but, before I deal with that, my hon. friend from St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence) has passed me a note. "To paraphrase Gilbert and Sullivan: 'We have got him on the list but he never will be missed'."

Now, sir, I think unintentionally the hon. leader of the Opposition has misinformed the members of the House. When we went into the close of this debate yesterday, we had the following names left: Gisborn, Wells, Sopha, Yakabuski, Lewis, Bales, Bryden, Singer and Dymond.

There were two Liberals, three New Democrats and four Conservatives. Obviously we could not alternate in an exact fashion because of the small number of Liberals remaining. We did strike this list however. That was done, I think, 24 hours or maybe even 48 hours before we moved into the closing course of the debate. It certainly was accepted by all the Whips. There was no intention on either side to gain some kind of cheap political advantage, one over the other.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I think the discussion we are having is a most salutary one. The tight halo that surrounds the head of the hon. member for Woodbine—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: All right, I will not deal with him. His remarks speak for themselves.

Originally, Mr. Speaker, when this discussion started yesterday, the question revolved—and it has gotten off on a completely different tack now—on whether or not the hon. Minister, when speaking, wound up the debate. It was your opinion, sir—I do not know whether you made a ruling or not, but it was at least your opinion at that time that the hon. Minister in speaking was winding up the debate.

I pointed out to you then, and let me point out, sir, with a little more clarity now, that if that is the rule, surely we should know it; because as recently as June 1, 1965, that was not the rule, sir. On June 1, 1965, as recorded on page 3533 of *Hansard*, when the debate on the predecessor of this bill was taking place and the hon. Minister of Health was speaking, you were quoted as having said, sir:

Order, order! The Minister can state his views. There are other members left to speak who may disagree with what he has said and they will have an opportunity to reply later.

The point is, sir, that at that stage in the debate perhaps 25 or more members of the House had already spoken. The fact is, sir, that the same sort of manoeuvring behind the scenes took place and it was only by, not a confrontation, but a jockeying behind the scenes, that that was finally agreed. We were suspicious, and naturally suspicious, that there might be the sort of manoeuvring going on on the government side that has since become obvious was going on.

There was no intention, apparently, of having the hon. Minister of Health wind up the debate, or to go by the rule that you thought perhaps did exist, because the hon. Prime Minister said, and these are his own words: "It is my intention to enter the debate myself." It would seem to me, sir, that it is high time that we brought order out of this chaos, and the order is not going to come in the unilateral determination of speaking order by the government Whip. If there is going to be an order, it is going to be by common agreement of the three Whips.

I suggest, sir, that the remarks of the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin did not say that there was agreement about any order. It was merely a submission of Liberals who were going to speak; that was all it was. There was no allocation in that, and if you want to quote him further on that I am sure he can speak for himself. I checked this carefully with him. I have also checked carefully with his assistant, the hon. member for Kent East—who is not in his seat at the moment—and he said exactly the same thing. So from our Whip and our deputy Whip there was no such agreement. That is for certain.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is not what the hon. member for Woodbine said.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I do not care what the hon. member for Woodbine says, now or at any other time; I am telling you what the facts are.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He is an honourable man.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I would think that if there is going to be order brought out of this—and no one can question for a moment that the government has the right. By virtue of their 77 members, if nothing else, they have the right to speak last in any debate. But surely, sir, if they want everyone to live by the rules, at the time

these lists are being made up somebody could whisper in the ear of the government Whip that either the hon. Minister of Health or the hon. Prime Minister or the hon. Minister of Labour, or whoever it is, is going to be the last government speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the way they are jockeying now, we do not know. They take unfair advantage, and this is not the way they should be playing. They now come in and say that everyone else is in breach of faith except themselves. Here is the record, and the record indicates that it was not the government's intention to have the hon. Minister of Health speak last, it was the hon. Prime Minister's intention. Sir, that is abusing the privileges of this House.

I submit that the time has now come to clarify this and let us carry on in a way that we can carry on. And one of the first indications of being allowed to carry on in that way would be for the government to say: "On the debate on this bill that is now before us, our last speaker will be—" whoever they want. But they have to keep faith with the House and not play footsy, as they have been doing all the way through.

Mr. Speaker: Has everyone spoken who cares to speak? If so, I would like to sum up the matter in this way. First of all, I would like to thank the members for the guidance which they have given me on this matter—at least some of the members. I think perhaps what some of the members have said can be a solution to the particular problem we are faced with at the present time.

It has been suggested by, I think, all three parties, that the leaders of the three parties get together with the Whips and I would like to be present also—

An hon. member: Why don't we all go?

Mr. Speaker: —in order that I will know what agreement is finally reached; so that, when I get a list laid upon my desk, that will be the order of speaking unless there is some very important reason preventing the member from taking his place at the time he is to speak. I believe that is a very good proposal and I intend to call such a group together to see if we can work out something.

For the present, however, I think what the member for York South has said is eminently sensible; that we have to settle this on an *ad hoc* basis for today. The Prime Minister has also expressed a wish that he would like to speak on the debate.

As long as I can remember in my experience in this House, the Prime Minister has always been given the courtesy of this House to speak if he cares to and to wind up a debate.

But what we seem to confuse—and I say this in no manner to the leader of the Opposition to dispute what he said because I am not really debating—but we sometimes confuse a rule with a custom or practice of the House. As I said before, we do not have a definite rule on precedence—on order one, two, three but only on the practice that the House has determined over the years. The practice has grown that if the Minister wants to wind up on a bill that he has brought into the House that is his privilege, he can speak at that time in the debate.

Mr. Singer: But surely—

Mr. Speaker: I believe the Prime Minister should be allowed to wind up the debate on any particular important subject. On minor matters the Speaker can definitely rule this is so, or this is such and this will be the course we shall take. But on such an important discussion as is now before the House, Medicare insurance, Bill No. 6, the last thing I would want to do is to curtail or to restrict debate. In view of that fact, whenever the time arrives I am going to allow the debate to continue after the Minister has spoken.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Sixth order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion respecting second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965 (continued)

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, when the hour for adjournment arrived last night I had just lightly dealt with the preliminary matters pertinent to this bill and had got to the place where I had begun to discuss the principles inherent in the amendment. You will recall, sir, that I had stated the first principle was an amendment which would allow us to further enhance our ability to provide a medical services insurance fund to all of the residents of Ontario on an individual basis at reasonable cost and covering a comprehensive range of physicians' services. I then spoke at some length about the extent of the population covered, pointing

out that those who were presently in receipt of social assistance under one of the many Acts in vogue in this province would receive a standard comprehensive coverage contract at no cost to themselves.

I further stated that those whose income in the year 1965 was too low to be subject to income tax would also receive a comprehensive standard contract at no cost to themselves.

I pointed out also that in addition to that, sir, people in a low income bracket, although they had income subject in some degree to income tax, would be eligible for support under the terms of our bill.

In addition, I pointed out to you, sir, the government by the amendments now before the House proposes to make the standard medical services insurance contract available on a voluntary basis to residents on an individual or family basis. That means that the private carriers, I emphasize, will not participate in the government plan but will continue to provide coverage for groups and any individuals who like to join them. For that reason, of course, there are quite extensive deletions to the bill as it was passed at the last session of the Legislature.

I mentioned again the benefits which are comprehensive in scope and are extended beyond what was laid out in our programme for last year. Included in this was one important matter, of course, that maternity benefits would now carry no waiting period.

I am coming, sir, to the point of the next basic principle, and that has to do with the remuneration to physicians provided by this bill. We have carefully reviewed this subject again and it is now considered equitable to everyone to propose that payments to physicians be 90 per cent of the current Ontario medical association schedule of fees. This takes into account current practice in doctor-sponsored plans and the increased level of payments which the physicians will now receive from low-income groups and it is in keeping with what obtains in certain other provinces and jurisdictions.

These are the major changes in Bill No. 136 inherent in these amendments, Mr. Speaker. Before dealing with the Act, I would like to give some further information to the House, information which I know will be of concern and interest to every hon. member.

With reference to the starting date, the programme of those receiving assistance under various social assistance Acts is scheduled to begin on April 1, 1966. The general

programme is to start on July 1, 1966. This staged approach is considered desirable to permit efficient administration and adequate time for general enrolment. The government intends to ensure that the public will be completely informed on all details of the Ontario medical services insurance plan. It is hoped to begin the public information programmes just as quickly as possible after this bill is assented to in this House and to continue these special arrangements until the end of the open enrolment period on May 1 of this year.

In the matter of enrolment, those individuals presently receiving assistance under the various social assistance Acts will be enrolled automatically. The open enrolment period for all others will be March 1 to May 1, 1966.

Those who are receiving benefits under any of the following Acts will not be required to pay a premium: The Blind Persons' Allowances Act; The Disabled Persons' Allowances Act; The General Welfare Assistance Act; The Mothers' Allowance Act; The Old Age Assistance Act and The Rehabilitation Services Act.

In addition, the plan will automatically provide fully paid coverage for all old age security pensioners who may be eligible for such coverage.

People who have been resident in Ontario for the past 12 months and who paid no income tax on earnings in the previous calendar year will be entitled to benefits without the payment of a premium. They will only be required to make application in order to establish eligibility.

Assistance will be given to the following people provided they have been resident in Ontario for the past 12 months and make application to establish eligibility:

As stated at the first reading of the bill, Mr. Speaker, for the single person the complete cost will be \$60 per year of which the subscriber will pay \$30 and the government will pay \$30. For the family of two, the total price will be \$120 per year; the government will pay \$60 per year and the subscriber \$60 per year. For the family of three or more, covering the head of the family and all dependants, with a total taxable income in the previous calendar year of \$1,300 or less, the total cost will be \$150 per year; the government will pay \$90 per year and the subscriber \$60 per year.

I need not remind hon. members that a dependant is an Ontario resident who is the spouse of the head of a family or a child under the age of 21, unmarried and dependent on the head of the family for support.

People who find that they cannot continue to pay for all or part of any medical services insurance contract because of unemployment, illness or disability may apply to the Ontario medical services insurance council for temporary assistance towards membership in the plan.

Now provision has been made in these amendments, sir, to add a category to the group outlined in Bill No. 136 and that is the group lying outside of the income taxable groups already mentioned. There are three categories: The single person, covering only one member, the price will be \$60 per year; the family of two, covering the head of the family and one dependant, \$120 per year; and the family of three or more, covering the head of the family and all dependants, \$150 per year.

Out-of-province benefits have been provided for. When an insured person gets services available under the plan from a doctor outside the province Ontario medical services insurance will pay the fee that is authorized in Ontario or the amount of the account if this happens to be less than the Ontario rate.

On the matter of waiting periods: Benefits will start two months after the end of the first open enrolment periods. That will be on July 1, 1966. For all subsequent open enrolment periods the waiting period for benefits will be one month. That is, benefits will begin one month after the close of the open enrolment period. Applications received at other times will be subject to a waiting period of three months. The waiting period of three months, of course, is consistent with the arrangements obtaining now in hospital insurance, and in all circumstances every effort has been made to ensure that these two programmes dovetail.

There will be freedom of choice for patients and doctors. The patient is free to choose his own doctor, and this same freedom is observed for the doctor within the ethics of his own profession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated at the beginning, in the second part of this presentation I will try to deal with points raised during the debate, points which I have not already covered.

First of all, may I say, sir, that I was encouraged by the manner in which the leaders of the Opposition parties, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) and the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald), opened the debate on amendments to Bill No. 136. It was quite obvious that they had little to say in criticism of this amended bill, so that most of their remarks were personal in

character to distract attention, I fear, from the lack of substance.

Now the hon. leader of the Opposition, who unfortunately is not here to listen to what I have to say, makes a great deal of the fact that I changed my mind. And so upset did he become about this that the only thing he could think of to cure this, sir, was, "The Minister should resign." Well, you know I have never been taught to run from a fight. And I always remember the words of a former President of the United States, Harry S. Truman: "When you can't stand the heat in the kitchen, you've got to get the hell out." So I want to serve notice on my hon. friend—I do not know if that is parliamentary or not, sir; however, it is in the Bible—I want to serve notice on my friend, the hon. leader of the Opposition, that I am in the kitchen, sir, and I am still stoking the stove.

But let me look at this attitude. If that be so, has the hon. leader of the Opposition got such a short memory that he cannot remember in the year 1963 his party, of which he was then a member although not the leader, but the then leader and the party changed their mind, their collective mind on this topic, Mr. Speaker, five times in one session? I did not hear the hon. leader of the Opposition stand in his place on one occasion and say that his erstwhile leader should resign because he had changed his mind. By strange coincidence, I am reading something of the history of the Liberal Party, or it was called the Grit party then. There were two kinds of Grits, clear Grits and I do not know what the others were, dirty Grits, I suppose, by inference, but—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mostly Presbyterians then.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, grits are something to use to feed the chickens.

The party was then under George Brown. I was struck by two sentences which I read in this book and I think I would commend them to the hon. leader of the Opposition. In Brown's time it was said that: "The Grit Opposition is now a mere congeries of discordant opinions. The party is a body of men, united chiefly by the emotional warmth of their antagonisms."

All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is change the name of the leaders and we have the same situation. That was written in 1859, or about the party in 1859.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was another matter about changing minds.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker, I would not.

Forty-seven years ago, in 1919 to be exact, there was then a young man, full of vim, vigour and vitality, who came forward to lead that same Grit party; and in the ambitious programme which he presented to the people of Canada, there was one plank in the platform—health insurance. Mr. Speaker, that was in 1919, 47 years ago. And the Grit party ever since has weaved and waffled and weaseled, and I am not sure that we are much nearer health insurance as the late Mr. King envisioned it now than we were at that time.

It was rather amusing, however, Mr. Speaker—and unfortunately, too, the hon. member for York South is not here—it was rather amusing, too, to hear him accuse the hon. leader of the Opposition of speaking such a long time and burying his facts in irrelevancies. At the same time, the hon. member for York South admitted that they were also his facts and, because they lacked substance, he in turn proceeded to a personal attack upon me rather than limiting his remarks to the amendments of the bill. Well, the hon. member for York South, having some of the same roots as I have, will remember an old saying that I think all of our mothers told us: "Sticks and stones will break my bones, but names will never hurt me."

Now what did these hon. members really talk about, Mr. Speaker? They spoke about compulsion, high risk coverage and other matters which, by stretching the interpretation of the principles in this amended bill before us, they used to take up the time of this House rather than directing their attention to the passage of a measure which is of such great importance to the people of Ontario.

They spoke in such absolute terms, for example implying that 40 per cent of the population does not qualify for group coverage and therefore consists entirely of high cost cases, people who are chronically ill, elderly, or for other reasons are heavy users of medical care services. And this, of course, as every hon. member in the House knows, is nonsense.

They talked about administrative costs as if these were the major items in the cost of medical services insurance, instead of admitting that the real factor of cost is related to medical services themselves.

They spoke also of portability without realizing that the provincial programme has been designed so that portability can be an effective factor as soon as programmes are developed in other provinces, and indeed the Ministers of Health of all of the provinces have already met on this particular topic and we are quite prepared to throw into operation the required organization and procedures for portability as soon as plans are developed.

Now, this type of smokescreen I suggest to you, sir, is not in the best interests of the people of Ontario and it does not reflect any credit on the hon. leaders of the Opposition parties. I would expect something better of them, sir. I would expect that they would attempt calmly and soberly to look at the bill and point out to the people of Ontario what really is offered by it.

The hon. leader of the Opposition accused me of drawing red herrings. Well, Mr. Speaker, more and more, as I listened to him, I got the idea that the fish he was using were decayed mackerel.

The primary theme of the—

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister does better when he is quoting—

Mr. A. E. Thompson: (Leader of the Opposition): I do not even answer.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Nobody does here!

The primary theme of the hon. leader of the Opposition was compulsion. I must admit that I found it very difficult to follow this reasoning in a number of the points which he raised. However, his objective in applying compulsion appears to be universal coverage and this, of course, has been an underlying principle; universal availability has been an underlying principle in our thinking right through this piece. Bill No. 136 as amended will make medical services insurance available to everybody at reasonable cost. The government plans, when complemented by other insurance arrangements, will we believe achieve a population coverage which is generally interpreted as universal.

The hon. leader of the Opposition suggested the government was not interested in quality of health care; but I remind him, through you, sir, no insurance mechanism guarantees or provides for quality of care. It is rather concerned with availability and with paying for the services. This is a matter which becomes lost in the cloud of fog that

has been thrown around this matter at all times. However, the government has already announced a very big programme for the development of health resources in this province and it is in this way that it will be ensuring that the best possible health care will be available to the people of Ontario.

The hon. leader of the Opposition appeared to be worried about psychotherapy; I agree with him this will be one of the problem areas. We are under no illusions about this, we know it will be a difficult area. However, we prefer to deal with it within the general arrangements of claims adjudication rather than discriminate against it. It would be inconsistent, sir, if we in Ontario were to discriminate against the mentally ill when the full burden of our health theme over the last seven years at least was that the mentally disturbed patient should be looked upon as a sick person and given, as far as is humanly possible, equal treatment.

He asked for a definition of psychotherapy. I have to say to him that while I am prepared to give it to him, it is difficult to understand, and I have very grave difficulty sometimes in understanding it myself. I am quite sure the hon. leader of the Opposition knows the definition:

Psychotherapy within the practice of medicine is a psychological method of treatment in which a professional relationship is established with the patient and used for the purpose of removing, modifying or retarding a disease process, or of favourably influencing and/or preventing pathological patterns of behaviour.

Any licensed medical practitioner, by virtue of his training and experience, is qualified to use psychotherapy as a method of treatment. Those physicians qualified as specialists in psychiatry have, by virtue of training, achieved a greater competence in psychotherapy.

The distinction between the practice of psychotherapy by a psychiatrist and other physicians should, therefore, be recognized. Drugs and other methods of treatment may often be used as adjuncts to psychotherapy but do not constitute psychotherapy in themselves.

That is the end of the quote, sir, and I have to admit it is a rather involved definition.

The hon. leader of the Opposition also considered that the government—

Before leaving that, I should make it as simple as I possibly can: If a doctor practises what he believes is psychotherapy, or psychiatric treatment, on his patient that is quite

satisfactory to us and to the plan. If it is a recognized treatment given by a duly qualified and licensed person, in our opinion that is quite satisfactory.

The hon. leader of the Opposition also considered that the government programme would cover a substantial proportion of persons with chronic illness, and the elderly. I agree that this might very well be so, but because of the potential numbers eligible for this programme we expect to have a good cross-section of the population.

We have already pointed out that, potentially, 40 per cent of the population is eligible to be enrolled under this programme. Just because they cannot be enrolled in groups is no reason to believe, or no reason to suppose, that they will have any higher percentage of poor risks than will the 60 per cent who are covered under groups. Groups are not separated out by the equality of their risks definitively, but are covered as a group.

He also suggested that the premiums were not high enough. Here again I am not certain as to whether he was proposing an increase in the level of premiums. We consider that the proposed premiums are equitable and fair. It is interesting to note that the actuaries in British Columbia—a province with medical charges comparable to Ontario—have established the same level for family premiums as would apply in this province—on the advice of our actuaries, who assure us that they believe this is a fair and equitable premium.

He also suggested, in the best Ian Fleming style again, that there was a secret report, and referred both to the Ontario hospital services commission and Saskatchewan. Mr. Speaker, the facts are these—and I already submitted this information in answer to a question from an hon. member on the Opposition benches some days ago, when we introduced Bill No. 136. It was passed by the House last session, and we immediately began to set up the organization to operate this programme.

We called on that branch of government which is expert in these matters, the organization and methods section, and they carried out a study on the organization and operations for medical services insurance. During this period of investigation, the members of this task force and others carefully considered the interrelationship of medical services insurance and hospital care insurance. They obtained information on programmes, not only in Canada but in other countries. This led to the recommendation, and nothing else, sir, for an administrative pattern. When these were received a management committee

was established, charged with the responsibility of implementing the programme as laid out by the organization and methods section of government.

I want to emphasize, sir, that this section of government has nothing to do with The Department of Health. I believe it comes under the supervision or the purview of the Provincial Treasurer and is set up for the very purpose for which we use it. They are experts, I believe, in their field, and looked upon outside of government as experts in their field. I have no reason to argue with the report, and I would have been very unwise had I decided not to accept the recommendations they made.

The management committee and the various task forces have studied the arrangements in depth and this detailed appraisal led to the administrative system which we are now implementing. I am satisfied that we had the best possible advice and that the organization as established is a good one.

I am quite certain, Mr. Speaker, and I would expect that the hon. members—

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister a question? I wonder if in this report, and I am saying in the structure of the hon. Minister's plan, whether there was consideration given to using the experience of PSI. I am not saying that we would want this; but where you, as a government, would contract it for a number of the individuals who had applied to you, you could direct them over to PSI. I say this because if you had done this—with PSI you have got a whole staff there—you would not have to go to the expense of building and recruiting more staff. Was this given consideration?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it actually was. I have to record here publicly that PSI, as well as many other carriers in the field, from the start of our involvement in this field, came forward voluntarily and put at the disposal of government all the wealth of their experience—and it was great—all of the statistical information, organizational know-how and so on.

But it was early decided, of course, that any contract that was supported in any way by public moneys would not be handled by any carrier outside of government, and for this reason it could not be farmed out, as it were, or we could not contract it out to PSI under those circumstances, nor to anybody else.

It would have been very difficult, I have to point out, to select PSI as opposed to any

other carrier, because while PSI is the largest carrier, and I must admit with some prejudice one of the most experienced carriers, there are others who have done a very excellent job in this field. Other service programmes have been in existence longer, actually, and have also done a very excellent job in this field. One would be hard put to know just how to divide this up, even if it were acceptable, but I am sure the hon. leader of the Opposition will recall that it was anathema to them at least, and I admit to some of our own people, that this business would be contracted out.

I started to say that I would expect hon. members of the Opposition—indeed I would be disappointed if they did not remind me I said in this House that the programme, as we put it before you last year, was to be housed in the OHSC building and would be meshed as far as was possible with their programme. Well, we very quickly learned, after we called the organization and methods people in, that this was totally impossible from the standpoint of lack of space. I was quite staggered, I frankly admit, when told this programme would call for 67,500 sq. ft. of office space. All that PSI could give me at the most by quite extensive reorganization would be about 15,000 sq. ft. of space. There are certain procedures which are dovetailed in—

Mr. Thompson: You mean PSI—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not mean PSI, I mean OHSC, because I had said last year that it would be housed in the OHSC building, as OHSC had one floor vacant at the time and we knew they could make a little extra space available to us.

When I spoke in this House, I had not consulted any of the experts in organization and methods, and I felt that one and a half floors at the most would easily handle this. The programmes are so different in their financing and their mode of operation that they cannot dovetail at the present time.

I think the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has made it quite clear that this will be under constant study and review, having in mind the possibility of effecting further economies in the administration pattern.

The hon. members appeared to attribute increased costs primarily to administrative costs, as I have said. This is not the case, as major expenditures for non-profit medical insurance services programmes—this is well documented—are related to payment for medical services. I have just pointed out why it was that we could not dovetail the two

programmes at the present time. I did begin to say, however, that certain features of both programmes are being dovetailed—this works in certain cases—and I have just been advised today that field services, for instance, and field offices insofar as our programme will need them, will make use of the field offices which now exist and are operated by OHSC. In that way there will be no duplication and I can assure you that, wherever it is possible, duplication will be avoided scrupulously.

The hon. member for York South indulged in a one-night mathematical spree and came up with figures which were intended to confound the Legislature. Some of these figures were obvious but in other circumstances, as so often happens during a spree, he tended to become confused. I should in fairness say, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps he has studied new maths and I am still back with the old maths, so I may be doing him an injustice in questioning his mathematics. However, his figures did seem quite a bit confused to us; and it was a rather strange coincidence, I thought, that his confusion in each case resulted in the use of figures which tended to increase support for his own thesis.

I was pleased when the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) pointed out some of the inaccuracies; and I am not going to go over them again, except to point out that it could be indicated that the hon. member for York South at one point in his calculation used a per capita cost which related to 1967, population figures which were valid in 1964, and for practising physicians the figure which was valid in 1962. I am sure that the most authentic record we have of practising physicians at the present time in Ontario is 7,600.

The hon. member for York South also questioned the estimate of a per capita cost in 1967 of \$40. I want to make eminently clear that this figure has not been pulled out of the ether. We are very much concerned about this figure because it is high in relation to other figures.

I think though, Mr. Speaker, that the sooner we stop quoting the figures that are outlined in the Hall commission report the better off we are. The Hall commission report, insofar as its statistics are concerned, is obsolete. It was obsolete the day it was published.

I had the pleasure last evening of sitting on a panel with Professor Blishon, who was the director of research for that commission. One of the things he said, while recognizing that their statistics were not valid today, was that they still believe their projections were.

But I took issue with him on that, with respect to certain figures which we can prove are not applicable to Ontario.

He did in this case, however, point out that their figures were applicable to Canada. But I want to inject here that one of the things he said in answer to a question from a member of the audience was: "The big insurance companies are not making a great lot of money on this business of health insurance." And I leave it at that.

However, on the \$40 figure, we have to agree with the hon. member that per capita estimates are most complicated, particularly when they have to be made in advance of a programme. And we must try to estimate what they will be since we have to have money voted by this Legislature to meet our expenses as we go along. However, our economists have very carefully analyzed all available data referable to the province of Ontario—and let us remember that the programme I am putting before this House is concerned only with the province of Ontario, and my only interest in costs referable to other provinces in Canada is for comparison purposes alone. Our economists, I say, have carefully analyzed the available data, and on this basis the estimated cost for 1967 is \$40 per capita.

It is interesting to note that in personal conversation with federal government officials, very recently, they gave us to understand that their estimate of Ontario's cost is very close to our own. And it is passing strange that their estimate of the national average has already been changed from \$28 last June or July, which was then mooted to \$34—and I am not certain that that is the final figure they have come up with for the present time.

Mr. Singer: When was the \$28 figure?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Last July, at the federal-provincial conference they spoke of a national average of \$28 per capita when the \$14 subsidy was mooted. Now that figure is changed, according again to personal discussions with them, to more of the order of \$34 as a minimum; and Ontario's figures are very close in their estimation even, to \$40.

Several speakers spoke about priorities and phasing, and the government here agreed that it should be an essential feature of the development of comprehensive health services for the people of Ontario. However, an important question is: Who should establish these priorities in a field of provincial jurisdiction? Did the provinces, Mr. Speaker,

last July or prior to last July, agree that compulsory medical services insurance topped the priority list? Should there not be some flexibility which would allow for the different circumstances which prevail across this country?

Why did the federal government fail to place—as we insisted many times, and have insisted many times at least since I have occupied this chair—the inclusion of the patients in mental hospitals and tuberculosis sanatoria in the first place, as every province in Canada did?

It was a sight to behold, sir: Ten provinces—even our sister province, la belle province de Québec, agreed with us on this resolution that mental hospital patients, and those patients in tuberculosis sanatoria, should immediately be enrolled under the provisions of The Hospital Insurance and Diagnostic Services Act.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And yet, the federal government has consistently and persistently turned a deaf ear to all of our pleas.

An hon. member: What other pleas?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Many of them. We agree that some uniformity in development is desirable, but we also believe that a consensus was available which would have allowed for some flexibility in establishing need.

Some hon. members spoke about the federal proposals, but their remarks did not indicate that they had made any attempt at analysis. The government, with a responsibility to the people of the province of Ontario, did ask the federal government for clarification of a number of points which could have very significant financial and programme implications. And, as previously stated in this House, the hon. Minister of National Health and Welfare has assured me that he will answer the questions that we have put to him and give us every opportunity for full and frank discussion.

Mr. Singer: What are those points?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Minister: He has spoken about the fact that he needs clarification—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They are still under discussion, Mr. Speaker, and this is not the place nor time. I do not believe it is necessary to bring them to this House at the present time because this is a matter for

discussion between two levels of government. When we have reached conclusion, or if we reach a stalemate, then I think that is the time to bring them back to this House. When the government has had an opportunity, the government which will be responsible for putting into operation any programme upon which we might reach agreement.

Mr. Speaker, a most important point—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Minister: He talks about the fact that he needs clarification; may I say he may find that we are very much behind him if he wants clarification, not only to the House but to the public. My question is: What does he need clarification on? No one knows what his stand is. Could the hon. Minister list what he needs clarification on?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the government with which we are dealing knows perfectly well what our stand is.

Mr. Thompson: We do not.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, may I remind the hon. members that this is a matter for agreement between the governments, before it comes back to our Legislature. The government must have a programme to bring to the Legislature. I do not think for one moment, sir, while we appreciate the moral support of the hon. leader of the Opposition and his group, that they can help us in our immediate discussions. If they can, they can go and talk to our friends down there if they will listen to them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is nothing secret about it.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Let us know without so much prodding, then.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Does the hon. member tell us what he talks to his friends about? Certainly not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: So is yours.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: When we come to decisions we will bring them to this House and put our programme before this House, because this is governmental responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, the most important point which should be emphasized is that the On-

tario plan will be in operation this year and will provide comprehensive benefits to the people of this province now.

I hope that the hon. members in Opposition are not suggesting that we should delay medical services insurance in this province until some future time. It would indeed be a strange stand and one which would be difficult for them, I am sure, to justify to the people.

I want to make eminently clear, sir, that in presenting this bill to the House we are talking of a programme that we want to provide for the people of Ontario beginning in July, 1966. Now what happens after that is still to be determined, and with its usual sense of responsibility I can assure you, and can assure this House through you, that the government is very keenly aware of its responsibilities and is currently discussing these matters with the other level of government involved; but at the present time this bill is to provide services which we believe large numbers of people in the province of Ontario need and deserve, and they need and deserve it now.

And therefore, in conclusion, I would like to urge that this Legislature endorse The Medical Services Insurance Act at its second reading, because this legislation will provide a programme with the following advantages:

It is universally available to all residents on an individual and family basis, regardless of age, state of health or financial status.

It is comprehensive in that it provides insurance coverage for practically all physicians' services.

The financial barrier is removed by providing assistance to lower income groups and complete coverage for those who are still more in need.

It has been set up in a manner which will encourage portability and which will provide for out-of-province benefits.

Benefits will be available to social service recipients on April 1, 1966, and to the general population on July 1, 1966, instead of waiting for some time in the future.

Patients will have free choice of their doctors and doctors may practise within or outside of the plan without penalty to the subscriber.

And I repeat, sir, that it is voluntary; and in that regard I would just like to draw to the attention of the House a very little squib that I cut out of the newspaper last evening. It had reference to a lady in that fine province of Saskatchewan who appeared before the courts and was fined because she had refused

to pay her hospital premiums. She decided that she would like, rather, to do this for herself. I wonder if the hon. member for York South would have one of us go out and tell her to continue to resist, that she might well be at the "core of history."

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question—not on the last point he raised, I do not want to get into a debate on that theoretical one. Would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Mr. Speaker, accepting the estimate of the government of a \$40 per capita cost and accepting the prospect of a 50 per cent subsidy of a \$34 per capita national average, namely, \$17 per capita in Ontario, would the hon. Minister comment on the figures which I submitted to the House as to how we could divide up the remaining amount that would have to be raised in premiums in order to give coverage to everybody? I am sure that it was inadvertently that he did not deal with those particular figures that I presented to the House, and I think they are by far the most important. Would the hon. Minister care to comment on this way of giving complete coverage to everybody right now for \$20, \$40 and \$50 premiums?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can only comment, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I did not leave them out inadvertently, but because I am not prepared; our studies have not embraced this completely yet. But this is a matter that is being very much studied and is part of our discussion with the federal government.

Mr. MacDonald: I submit they are accurate.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I have a question I would like the hon. Minister to answer if he will. At the present time some of the co-ops in the province of Ontario, including the one to which I belong, the Bruce county co-op medical services, are giving this comprehensive coverage for families for \$150 per year and they pay 100 per cent to the doctors. Would the hon. Minister explain why, using the same \$150 under government service, only 90 cents would be paid on the dollar to the doctors concerned? Surely the figure of \$150 should be down to \$140 rather than \$150. If the co-ops can do it, why cannot the government do it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, while this will come up in committee meeting, I can only state briefly at the present time that my figures and my statistics are based

entirely on the advice I have been given by economists and actuaries. I have to admit I must depend upon them because they are the experts in this field and I do not pretend to be such.

I am quite certain—in fact, I know—that they have looked at the figures and the operations of the co-ops and I have to say, as the hon. member knows full well, that it has always been a source of great amazement to me that co-ops do the excellent job they do on as little money. I know of no other body that can do it. That is really the most complete answer I can give the hon. member, sir.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps we have had so many—

Mr. Thompson: He said he would answer it, sir.

Mr. Speaker: Asking questions should come during committee of the whole House. I do not think we should get into second reading questions and answers—

Mr. Thompson: It is really on the basis of what he talked about, Mr. Speaker. He has been kind enough—

Mr. Speaker: I will allow this one question and then we shall go ahead with the principle of the bill.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could the hon. Minister either refute or establish a rumour which I have heard, that a meeting they had last week with the insurance companies and doctors was called because the basis on which the hon. Minister had decided the cost of the medical insurance plan, the basis on which that decision was made, was the OMAC schedule of several years ago rather than the up-to-date OMAC schedule?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is completely without foundation. In fact, sir, we have used the most up-to-date figures because the Act lays down that the schedule in effect when the Act comes into force will be the schedule which will guide our payments for the first two years of operation.

I would only say that there are the weirdest and wildest rumours floating abroad and I would caution the hon. members not to pay any attention to them, because I can assure them, I do not like dealing behind closed doors and generating all the confidential stuff

that one hears and is paraded in this House. The confidentiality was all over when it was presented in this House, the confidentiality was all over when the bill was written and I could not care less who had it. If it had not been a case of wasting public funds I would have made a copy of it available to every hon. member. It would not have been of any interest to them. There is no attempt on our part, sir, to hide any of the negotiations we have been involved in up until the time our bill is presented to this House.

Mr. MacDonald: Twenty-four doctors and 11 insurance companies shaped your original legislation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, they did nothing of the kind.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I thought I might have a small contribution to make to this debate, but before I say what I am going to say about the government plan, let me just deal for a moment with my acrobatic friends over on the left. I would think that they should line themselves up for the contest, the appropriate contest, at the next Olympics or the British Empire Games, because they jump around and change their position so well that their role in the acrobatic affairs could be a very good one.

The hon. member for York South delivered himself of a wonderful critique of the amendment introduced by my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) at the time he spoke at the beginning of this debate.

Mr. MacDonald: He certainly got to the hon. member.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for York South had these interesting words to say, and I think it is worthwhile just referring to a few of them—whether this kind of an amendment was not suggested by the federal Liberals in order to—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: The hon. member for York South also criticized that portion of the hon. leader of the Opposition's amendment which called for covering a full drug plan:

This amendment gets them off the hook, so that we will be stuck with the government's highly unsatisfactory proposals. It is a perfect example of how the Liberals bungle their job of the official Opposition and, through their ineptitude, leave the province to suffer without any relief—and so on and so on.

Then he went through the wonderful exercise of saying:

By reason of the rules of the House, we are going to have to appear as though we are voting with the amendment but really we are not. We are really not. We are going to have to stand with the hon. Liberal members of the House and appear as though we are voting with them but I want to make it clear [he says], I want to make it abundantly clear that we are not. We disagree with it, it is the wrong thing to do.

The fact is that he knows, just as well as any hon. member of this House, that this is the only way he can express his opinion. This is the vote he is going to cast; he is going to cast one vote in this debate and he will be voting with the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege—on a point of order.

I stated, Mr. Speaker, as you know the rules of the House on second reading have been clarified; but apparently the hon. member for Downsview has not yet caught on—in the first vote the question is on the main motion—nothing to do with either amendment. Only then do we get around to the amendments. If the hon. member for Downsview has not grasped that, I should think he would go back and read my speech, because the fact of the matter is that the first vote is going to be on the main motion.

If the main motion is defeated, then we deal with the Liberal amendment. We do not have to consider the Liberal amendment at all on the first vote; we are neither voting for it nor against it on the first vote. And if this is wrong, I invite you to correct it so that we can keep the confusion from getting greater in the mind of the hon. member for Downsview.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. member should listen a little more carefully.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is painful enough to have to listen to the hon. member for York South and then read newspaper clippings, without having to go back again and read it in *Hansard*.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, we go on. He goes through all these steps, one by one, and says:

Now if by any strange circumstance, if all 77 of the hon. members over there happen not to vote for their bill, which I suggest is not very likely to happen, then

we would have another amendment. Well then we would vote against the Liberal amendment and then we would have another amendment and this is what our amendment would say.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Exactly.

Mr. Singer: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think this is very fine logic. And I am sure that all of the good socialist members, particularly the hon. member for York South, particularly his colleague from Woodbine, stand behind those remarks 100 per cent; they always said it and they always did mean it.

Mr. MacDonald: We are opposed to the principle of the bill.

Mr. Thompson: Does he stand by what he said?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I thought, Mr. Speaker, it was worth passing note at least, to go back into *Hansard* and read some of the speeches that were made last year. And I noticed, Mr. Speaker, for instance, that the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young), in the middle of his speech said: "Certainly I support the amendment"—the Liberal amendment, exactly the same as it was last year. And when the hon. member for Yorkview was finished he sat down and said, "I urge you to vote in favour of this amendment because it is a good one."

Mr. Bryden: Would the hon. member permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Thompson: No, sit down. The hon. member has muddled it up. He has slipped a bit.

Mr. Bryden: The procedure has been changed, but he does not know it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I looked on the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) and during the course of his—

Mr. MacDonald: That was early in June but the procedure was changed on June 21. The Speaker clarified the rules.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

An hon. member: There is only one party in the House that is enjoying this.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I looked on the remarks of the hon. member for Riverdale

and he said in conclusion, in his remarks: "I think the idea of referring this to a committee—which is the essence of our amendment—is a good one."

Let the committee take it away, let the committee be instructed, and let it do those things my hon. leader suggested, and this is fine. Mr. Speaker, my good friends, my jumping friends over here, are now telling us about the change in rules. Last year we had a different set of rules on this particular point. We operated in a different way. I am sure that my hon. friends will recall, Mr. Speaker, that last year this was the way the voting was done, and I am reading now from page 3555 of *Hansard* of last year, and quoting your words, sir:

When the members feel they are finished with their interjections, I shall put the amendment which is before the House.

Now the only amendment before the House, Mr. Speaker, was of course the amendment of my hon. leader. To continue quoting you, Mr. Speaker:

The amendment before the House at the present time was moved by Mr. Thompson and seconded by Mr. Oliver. I do not think I should have to read it again.

And I think, sir, just to refresh your memory and mine, the amendment I contend was almost substantially the same.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is out of date.

Mr. Singer: "Following the vote," Mr. Speaker, these are your words:

Following the vote on the amendment, we shall take a vote on the main motion. All those in favour of the amendment, as moved by Mr. Thompson, will please say "aye."

Mr. MacDonald: What date was that?

Mr. Singer: Page 3555—June 1.

Mr. MacDonald: June 1. Sure, and the ruling was on June 21. The Speaker's ruling, putting the rule back into order, was June 21.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, can you not keep him quiet, please?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Here are the dates. The hon. member is living in the past.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Once again he does not know what he is talking about because the rules have been restored—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is too bad I am not getting through to them, but I think—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: I admit they are embarrassed, Mr. Speaker, but let them keep in order.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid I will have to ask the members to stop the interjections. The member for Downsview has the floor. Whatever he may say, whether it is June 1, or 21, let the member make his speech without interruption.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To continue:

All those in favour of the amendment, as moved by Mr. Thompson will please say "aye." All those opposed will please say "nay." In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

And then there was a recorded vote. And I think it is of more than passing interest to read who voted "aye" and who voted "nay." Among those people who voted "aye" were Messrs. Bryden, Davison, Freeman, Gisborn, Lewis (Scarborough West), MacDonald, Young and Renwick.

An hon. member: A fine body of men.

Mr. Singer: All eight of them. So, Mr. Speaker, there can be very little doubt that the whole object—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious they do not want to hear, and if they think they are going to interrupt this argument just by talking loud, they can talk loud; but the argument is still going to go on. It will wait until until their noise—

Mr. MacDonald: We know it will; but it is still wrong.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious the socialist leader has come into this House determined to take a stand against this, no matter what it is—no matter what they did last year, no matter how clearly they ex-

pressed themselves. The record speaks for itself. And it is really of no importance but when, in his unctuous manner, with his halo tight around his head, he gets up and says: "This is a ridiculous amendment, it might have been written in Ottawa, we could never in a million years support it," I just suggest Mr. Speaker, that the record should show clearly that from one period to another, from June 1 of 1965 until February 10 of 1966, those eight members do not know which way they are going.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: You did not say it last Saturday.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I think that is enough.

An hon. member: We agree.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the main issue here really is what kind of a programme we are going to have. We have a programme—well, I suppose we can call this one, the latest version, Medicare '66—not to be confused with Medicare '65, not to be confused with Medicare '63.

Medicare '63, you remember, Mr. Speaker, was the great plan that allowed those imaginative gentlemen, who design the Tory advertising, to put on their ad a little box beside "Medical care for everyone in Ontario," the tick mark and the word "done." My friend, the hon. Prime Minister, is delighted at that. I think he has even shown his good sense of humour, at the imagination of these fellows. But we had the first reading of a bill in 1963—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I did what I said I would do.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Prime Minister said it was done. He said it was done.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: On a point of order.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, am I disturbing the hon. Prime Minister again?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: On a point of order. I must say in reference to this particular point—and I have had to say this about 10 times in this House—in that advertising I said I had done what I said I would do concerning Medicare, and that is quite correct.

Mr. Singer: It being almost 5 o'clock I suppose I had better move the adjournment of the debate, since there is another order.

I will have, I hope, the original ad so that we can read it to the House when this debate resumes.

Mr. Singer moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 5 by Mr. R. F. Nixon:

RESOLUTION: That this House take the appropriate action to:

1. Create a permanent system of voter registration to replace the existing enumeration of voters.

2. Amend The Election Act of Ontario to:

(a) reduce the eligible voting age from 21 to 18 years;

(b) provide for the payment of set funds from the public Treasury to cover expenses incurred by candidates in provincial general elections or by-elections;

(c) require the printing on all ballots in all provincial elections of the candidate's party affiliation.

3. Petition the federal government to permit individual contributors to political parties recognized in provincial general elections to claim the full amount of their contributions as a deduction from their taxable income per tax return year in the same manner and in addition to the deductions allowed as contributions to charities, specifying that the only contributions eligible for deduction are those made to the provincial association, the local constituency association, the official agent of the party leader or the candidate.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order! May I say, sir, that I appreciate that we are following some kind of a very flexible order in connection with private members' bills, but I just want to refer, sir, again to the fact that under rule 28 (a) it is stated that private members' bills come up on Monday, come up on Wednesday and come up on Friday. May I say, sir, that I understand through the Whip that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is now coming to an approach where there will be, as in Ottawa, two days in which we will have one hour; but one of our problems has been that we have never known, first of all when the debate will go on and

how long we will debate. I spoke on a resolution several days ago and I was not sure whether I would have an hour or whether I would be able to continue. I ask that there be clarification as soon as possible just what the rules will be on private members' bills.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I want to rise to make a few brief comments on this particular point. Basically, I think there is a need for clarification. If we are going to have only one hour's debate, and therefore get into the pattern of Ottawa where that resolution in effect goes to the bottom of the list, where it might come up again, it seems to me that the kind of debate we had the other day is rather ludicrous.

We did not have even the complete presentation on the part of the mover of the motion. There was no opportunity for anybody from this party to express his view with regard to it. There was no opportunity, whether or not there was a desire I do not know, on the part of anybody on the government side to speak to a motion. That this motion should go to the order paper, and I fear lie there and die there, it seems to me makes a travesty of the whole proposition of a debate.

If we are going to have, I submit to you Mr. Speaker, only one hour's debate, then I think we have got to consider the mover of the motion will speak only 20 minutes and that will give an opportunity at least for the others—spokesmen from the other parties—to be able to get in a comment in that one hour. But I submit, Mr. Speaker, that with your fairness, you would agree automatically, that the introduction of a motion in which the hon. leader of the Opposition speaks for the whole hour and this then goes to the order paper!—What—to die? Or are we going to come back to it?

Neither the government nor the New Democratic Party has an opportunity to talk to it. It is not an intelligent way to debate resolutions, and I would think even the hon. Prime Minister himself would be persuaded that this is no improvement over past procedures. So I wonder if we cannot get some clarification preferably now rather than later.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): I thought I had made it quite clear that it was my intention to call these resolutions on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 5 o'clock and the period would be one hour, and I think it is quite reasonable.

Now I would like to make this very clear, that the hon. leader of the Opposition, as

leader of the Opposition, put his resolution on this order paper as a private member. This I think really goes to part at least of the crux of the situation, because I really do not know how many there will be here in due course. Frankly, I think it might be at least equitable if we were to—I do not know whether this one will ever be called again because there are many more standing in the names of other private members—it may be that we should revert to the practice in other jurisdictions where they are drawn, where they are put in a hat and in the presence of the Whips are drawn to see whose resolution will in fact be called.

We have to face the prospect that it may be some will not be called, and this has been true in every jurisdiction, because we certainly cannot set aside time to deal with all private members' resolutions. It could very well be possible that the entire order paper could be loaded with resolutions on a wide variety of subjects. So this is the problem, that there will be many of these resolutions that may never be reached. This is true in Westminster; it is true in the House of Commons and in other jurisdictions. The right to have a particular bill or resolution called, may depend upon a calling by lot.

Frankly, as far as I am concerned I would be delighted to take this up with the two who raised this subject, because it is private members' business and we will arrange it in any way the private members would prefer to have it arranged. It has nothing to do with the government except that we are interested; and we may be interested in what is presented there but we are talking about the time allotted for private members.

If the limitation is 20 minutes I venture to state, as I read this, if my experience is any indicator I can tell hon. members there are certain resolutions here that will not be debated for ten minutes. In light of what has happened in fact in prior years, some of these were left on the order paper in previous years and the leader of the Opposition dragged them all out, I think to prove or attempt to prove, that this government left them on the order paper. They were left there because nobody would debate them. They were put on there and called—

An hon. member: Oh no!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Oh, they were, and other ones! I can go back over the order papers and check throughout and find where we have gone to the member who put it on the paper and he says: "Well, I had a chance to debate it but I expressed all my

points on the government bill that was here for discussion and therefore did not bother calling it." This is why some of them are left on.

I would be delighted to get rid of this disorder. These private members' bills concern all the private members in the House. I would be delighted to get together with the hon. leaders if they want a limitation of debates. I can see the situation where, if one expects one of these to be recalled he could have one man speak for four hours, but what happens to all the other hon. members of all the other parties who have their ideas?

If hon. members want to impose—and I would suggest that they give this a little thought—I would be quite happy to consider it, because as far as I am concerned the hour is there and it shall be used to the greatest convenience of the private members in the House.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is that we would be delighted to meet with the hon. Prime Minister and get ground rules. I would not have spoken for an hour if I knew this debate was only going to be for that length of time; I would have shortened it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I might say, just to carry this to its conclusion, the point of limitation of speaking on any private member's resolution to my knowledge has never been raised before in this House. It has been the accepted thing that the private member spoke as long as he liked on his resolution, and when he was finished if anybody else wanted to speak they did so; if no one wished to speak then that might be the end of it and we would proceed to the next.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, just one minute so that we can conclude this. The hon. Prime Minister has made an offer that we should get together and resolve this. I welcome it and we shall certainly co-operate to the full. I think we need to have that one ground rule clarified, that he in effect has said that there will be no more than one hour's debate on each resolution, and within that framework then whoever is appointed to go and work out procedures can operate. I hope we can do it as soon as possible.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will do these two things, Mr. Speaker, at the same time. I hope that we will be able to meet on Monday, because what I really seek is to get this

matter straightened out so that we can get on with our business.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Spence, resolution No. 5 standing in my name.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, this matter of election reform has been raised in this House, or at least on the order paper, in every year since the last provincial election in 1963. In the past, however, my resolution has called for a committee of the House to be set up to examine the various proposals that would be put to it by the chief electoral officer and by members of this House, as well as by citizens of the province. But naturally, if we were to call for a committee and this were acceded to at this time, the committee would only succeed in deliberating for a year, and would bring in its recommendations next year, 1967, which I would think will be an election year, and so it would be of no use as far as the development of our electoral law is concerned.

So I thought, this year, since my interest centres on the points raised in the resolution, I would bring them as direct recommendations rather than a call for a committee; and it is in this connection that I would like to discuss them briefly with you this afternoon.

I want to make clear at the outset that the list of recommendations in the resolution is by no means a complete one. You are aware, sir, that on the order paper under private member's business there are some bills, and perhaps a resolution further on that deals with other electoral reforms. I do not want you to get the impression, sir, that the points raised in this resolution are by any means what I would consider a full list of the improvements that we should bring about before we go to the people again.

I feel that a committee should be set up after each election to look carefully into the procedures as they were applied at the most recent date. The chief electoral officer and many others could make their recommendations, because surely in this province we have not achieved perfection in democracy nor in the electoral procedure. So, certainly, you can expect a resolution like this to appear on the order paper and be discussed in this House after each election, as I think properly it should.

I would like to say something about what has gone on in other jurisdictions. We know that committees and commissions at the provincial level, and at the state and federal level in the United States, and presently under the direction of the House of Commons of Canada, have examined carefully into elec-

toral reform and certain modern considerations that might make the system more efficient. This has resulted in recommendations that public moneys be used to subsidize bona-fide electoral candidates in any and all political parties; it has resulted in a reduction of the voting age in some cases to the age of 19 in British Columbia and Alberta, and to 18 in Saskatchewan and Quebec. We know that this recommendation has been made by many other responsible people, including the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario—and, as I read the speech by the hon. member for London South (Mr. White), by certain influential groups in his area as well.

This reference to the reduction of the voting age is only one of the recommendations in the resolution and I would like to deal with them as they are in the resolution—in a brief and, I hope, useful manner.

The first one calls for the establishment of a permanent system of voter registration in Ontario. All of us as politicians are familiar with the rat race that develops as soon as the writs are issued, because we do not have a system of permanent returning officers and we do not have a permanent voters' list. So we must appoint enumerators in urban areas, representing the government party and the party that achieves the runner-up status in the last election.

In rural areas, the government has the entire responsibility in this regard and individuals are selected to see that the lists are in order. But the cost for this is 20 cents per name put on the list and is therefore very high when we consider the size of the electoral list in this province. I maintain that a useful system, based on the municipal lists, which could be amended for our particular needs, could be co-ordinated by permanent returning officers appointed in each riding as has been done federally for some time. In this way we would save money, and we would have an up-to-date voters' list ready for the use of the candidates and the electorate on very short notice indeed.

Further in my remarks I am going to recommend that public moneys be used to assist bona-fide candidates in putting before the electorate their own ideas and the policies for which they would stand, by using these moneys in the assistance of their campaign. And the money saved in establishing a permanent system of voter registration would cover the requirements that I am going to suggest later in my remarks.

So I would submit to you, sir, that the establishment of a permanent system of voter registration is efficient and would be money-saving, and something that we should look

into and that we should establish in this province.

If you will permit me, I will leave my remarks having to do with the reduction of voting age till last, and move on to the section of my resolution which provides for the payment of some funds from the public Treasury to assist candidates in provincial elections and by-elections. It is my view—and I think all hon. members would concur in this—that the candidate or those candidates who have large funds at their disposal have an obvious advantage over their poorer brethren when they go to the people to present, not only their own personalities and vigour, but also their concept of the issues of the day.

In this way, sir, the candidate who has access to these larger sums of money has an advantage to begin with over these others.

I submit that we in Ontario should make funds available to do away with this artificial and unfair advantage. We can do this on a reasonable and democratic basis. We can do this with moneys that would be largely available from savings in the institution of a permanent voters' list.

Now, I am not here to talk in detail as to how the amount would be set and how it would be paid. Obviously, very careful safeguards would have to be worked out, and the money would be used in conjunction with careful audit and scrutiny of the financial returns; not only of the candidates, but of the political parties they support.

I think these funds could be made available, either directly to the candidate for use as he sees fit under the restrictions and limits of The Election Act, or the money could be spent by the chief electoral officer in providing the minimum requirements so that the candidates can put their case before the electorate.

The expense of a reasonable brochure, its printing and its circulation, time on local television and radio where it applies, the provision of a suitable hall for a public meeting at which candidates would have a chance under independent chairmanship to state their views and be subjected to the questions of the electorate, are all the measures that might come under the support that the Treasury of this province might very well provide.

Now, I am not saying for a moment that the support of elections has to be taken over in its entirety by the Treasury of the province, because part of the initiative that every candidate can, and does show, is his ability to marshal support of his friends and the rest

of the electorate, not only in working for him but in supporting his cause with money.

It seems to me that these contributions, which should be carefully governed under revisions in our Electoral Act, should be subject to taxation benefit so that they could be written off in much the same way as donations to charity would be considered.

I think we should remember that our friends in the NDP to the left, who do receive donations from some labour unions in the province of Ontario—

Mr. MacDonald: Open and public.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly, open and public. On a basis of a check-off, these people who make this donation actually have their tax returns made beforehand and they are tax free. Surely this should be extended to the rest of the citizens of the province.

I submit that the argument having to do with audit and scrutiny of the books of candidates and political parties is something that we will be discussing when other private members' bills are put before us. I personally will support them, and our party has in the past. There are some reservations. But they would be supported in principle. It seems to me that these donations must be tax exempt if we are going to get the citizens of Ontario to take their responsibility seriously in the support of democracy as it works through the party system we presently use.

To move on, Mr. Speaker. A further requirement of my resolution is that the printing on the ballots used in the provincial election would indicate the candidate's party affiliation. We have seen many instances, and I am sure all of us could recall cases where the party affiliation is not one that is of much value. We in the Liberal Party are proud of this affiliation and make use of it because the electors in our campaigns are persuaded that the issues that we bring before them and the stands that we take on these important issues in the province are the right ones. We certainly feel that our candidates should be identified with the party. I would think that this is something that would be agreed to by the supporters of the other parties in this House.

I can well remember occasions, however, when candidates for the Progressive-Conservative Party were very loath to have this known; they certainly did not want the name of their leader known in the last federal election in our particular area, but it is also true that the reverse applies. Back in 1963 we had some Tories who were not running as Pro-

gressive-Conservatives at all, but they were running as Roberts candidates and this, of course, was thought useful in some areas. But I am not suggesting that we would allow the candidates to put on the ballot some little three-word slogan, but it it would be useful to the electors if it clearly stated the party affiliation of the candidate—

An hon. member: And the history.

Mr. Nixon: Certainly there is a confusion in names in some cases, and this could be done away with if this small addition were made to the ballot. I sincerely and strongly advocate it to the consideration of the House.

I think that the most valuable recommendation in my resolution has to do with the reduction of the voting age in this province to the age of 18. This has been discussed in the Legislature before and, as I said at the opening of my remarks, it has been supported by the hon. Prime Minister himself.

We know that in the elections committee of the House of Commons of Canada it received unanimous support, but no action has been taken because there is a committee appointed that is looking into electoral reform which, I am told, is expected to report in the near future. I hope and trust that among the amendments placed before the House of Commons by the government now in office this reduction of the voting age to 18 will be included.

An 18-year-old who is called upon to defend his country should be given the right to vote; the fact that many of our young people are already earning sufficient money to be subject to the income taxes of our country, and if not that they pay taxes under other legislation; many of them are married and raising families. But it appears to me that the outstanding reason for the reduction of the voting age at this time is the active idealism that has developed among our youth in the past few years.

Many of us can remember political discussions in our high school and university years which were, I would submit, not nearly as informed nor active nor useful as those that are taking place now among our young people. As a teacher and as a politician I have had an opportunity to talk to a good many of these young people and not all of them had the same political affiliations of which I am so proud. But these people have been aware of the issues and they have had new ideas that surely we need, not only in this Legislature but in the community at large.

I think this active idealism has shown itself in some ways that not all hon. members of this House would support. We have seen our young people demonstrating their support or their active opposition to certain policies of this government and even governments outside of our jurisdiction entirely. I personally commend them for this and am proud of the fact that they have broken out of their shell and are taking this active part in the responsibilities of the community.

For this reason I feel that we should extend the franchise to them. I have taken every opportunity to question them myself and I must say that a good many of them, not a majority in my personal poll but a good many of them, will say: "I do not think we are mature enough." In discussing the matter I have come even more strongly to the opinion that they can discuss it so fully and with such maturity that they give the lie to their own opinions when they oppose the position that I stand for today.

I think of the way education has developed in making our young people aware of the issues of the day. My son, who is in grade 7, brought home his answers to an examination that he took at Christmas that had to do with his opinions of American policy in Viet Nam and President de Gaulle's difficulties in his election, which was underway some months ago. I was surprised and amazed, and indeed very proud of the grasp that these young people have of the important issues. Our teachers, our progressive teachers and the education system in general, I feel, has come a long way toward involving our young people in these affairs of the community.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would advocate to your active consideration the proposal that the voting age be reduced in the province of Ontario. We need the idealism more than anything else that these young people can add to the general body politic. Their opinions on the issues are valuable ones, they are opinions that would make our work here more effective than it is at the present time.

I am proud to have had this opportunity to speak in favour of the resolution and will look forward to the opinions expressed by other members.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with the hon. member for Brant in discussing this resolution. I should hope that he does not feel at this time, nor that the House feels, that I am going to debate this resolution and these many points in a

very formal fashion, because on some of them I find myself somewhat in agreement. So therefore, what I am doing here is putting forward my point of view in relation to three parts of his resolution.

The hon. member for Brant, of course, has certain areas of experience which I have not; and that is that he has children who are advancing in school age, he has been a school teacher and therefore has talked and discussed these issues with the students. I have not had those opportunities; I believe he has been elected twice and I have only been elected once. So probably he should be more satisfied with the system under which we conduct elections at this time than I should. But I should hope he will not outlive me in terms of numbers of elections in which we participate in this House from now on. We are even now.

The point of registration of voters is one that I can support. When I was a member of the select committee on municipal affairs—I joined that committee at the tag end for the fourth report—there was a great deal of agreement and I was in agreement with the committee on the basis of voter registration, a voter registration that could be used for the three levels of government—municipal, provincial and federal—and therefore cut out the cost of the enumerating we have been having about every 18 months for the last five or six years.

The registration that the hon. member for Brant proposes, I should hope, would be one of all people eligible to vote and not one based on the United States system where it becomes the responsibility of the citizen to go and register. This system of registration in the United States has caused a great deal of difficulty, and when one is approaching elections the drive to have people register from each of the parties is as expensive and arduous in some cases as the actual election campaign itself. Therefore I should hope that he is speaking of a registration system that would involve all the people and not one where the people have to use their own initiative to go and register.

The question of voting at 18 is one that has fascinated the newspapers in the province for some time, going back to the Liberal Party platform preceding the 1963 election. I have a few of the clippings and they are quite extensive expressing the views taken by the various writers and columnists in the papers of this province.

Mr. Thompson: Is that the federal or provincial party?

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Excuse me, it was the federal platform at that time. This resulted in the Commons election committee and the Liberals bringing through a proposal which we have not heard too much of since. But there does not seem to be—from a cross-section of newspaper columns—any basic agreement on voting at 18. So therefore, as I say, it is not something teenagers are clamouring for at this time.

I think probably before we consider voting at 18 we should, from this Legislature, bring about a process whereby everyone who is 21 years of age has a vote in municipal elections within the province. I think before a government calls an election, they should be careful not to disenfranchise thousands of people because they happen to be away from their constituency, as the students were in the election in November of last year.

My personal view of voting at 18 is that I am in favour of it. When I was 18 I was a member of the Royal Canadian mounted police in Canada, and I was working and taking a full role in society. I feel, looking back at that time when I was 18, I would have been competent to vote. Probably the vote would have been Conservative, but I do feel I was aware of the problems of the nation.

Mr. MacDonald: He just said "probably."

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: What is that?

Mr. Thompson: The word there.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Word where?

Mr. MacDonald: You were going to vote Conservative.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Now just a minute. We will have a couple of comments on that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: The hon. Prime Minister of Ontario has stated that, should voting become accepted at 18 in a national election, he would then encourage the Legislature to bring about amendments so there would be voting at 18 in the province of Ontario.

An hon. member: With the Liberals now, eh?

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Not necessarily so. The Liberal Party and the New Democratic

Party platforms have now carried this provision of voting at 18 for some time. I suppose they have been in Opposition so long here in the province of Ontario, that they feel the natural rebellion of youth would rise and turn the government out.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): You have that in mind.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: I do not think that would happen.

Mr. Thompson: There are others as well.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: It is not a question of—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: That is your desire, yes. The Metropolitan Toronto Conservative association, in a vote taken at the Inn on the Park, decided against the provision of voting at 18.

Mr. Nixon: Why did they do that?

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Because a majority was against it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: Gladys Taylor, writing in the *Toronto Telegram* Monday, November 7, had a number of things to say, and I would like to quote one paragraph here—

Mr. Thompson: What seat does she represent?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Are you for or against?

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: If the hon. member had been listening he would know.

Mr. Gaunt: The hon. member says he is in favour of it and then gives all the arguments against it.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson: This is a quote from Gladys Taylor:

If the Conservatives could have displayed the “for motherhood and against sin” courage of the Liberals and the New Democrats and joined the current popular youth kick which now seems aimed at giving us fuzz-faced government, they could have got on the kid vote bandwagon and, as the ballot-hungry Liberals and New Democrats have done, formulate policy that would appeal to the juvenile voter.

And she goes on to say that on one hand the Liberals and the New Democrats pretend the 18-year-old is mature enough to vote, but on the other they deny a belief in his maturity by wooing him with policies aimed at what one editorial called “youth’s fundamental irresponsibility.”

So that was the position of Gladys Taylor—opposition to this vote. If the Opposition parties felt that this vote would divide, based on the appeal and the platforms of the three political parties, I wonder would they be so anxious in order to bring the voting age to 18?

I think we should turn to youth and listen to what they have to say. The young people in a poll in *Canadian High News* returned 16,000 questionnaires—69 per cent in favour of voting at 18. But there are other articles, other editorials where polls have been taken and the students have not suggested voting at 18.

In the *Toronto Daily Star* in a questionnaire—I do not know what the random sample was—but in a questionnaire there were six students out of nine not in favour of voting, and three that were in favour of voting at 18.

So therefore, I again point out, this does not give a measure of desire by the people, the teenagers, to vote at 18.

Now before political parties thrust the responsibility of voting onto the youth of the province, I think they should consider the difficulties the youth have at this time. These young people are asked to make decisions in their teens, affecting their whole life; and yet we also say: Should they have the guidance of government, and yet not be part of it?

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I feel we should be very careful in reducing the voting age to 18. Yet I think as the teenagers express themselves, and as they become more aware and responsible, I think it should probably be given to them.

Now in speaking to the question of election funds the hon. member for Brant seemed all in favour of the public Treasury supplying the money for operating an election campaign. I believe that any public grant or any public assistance to candidates running in provincial or federal elections would only raise the total spending on elections by the amount of the grant. I think that when candidates enter their names to be elected and they wish to be elected, they will spend that money they can afford to put their point of view across to the people. I believe when we started to develop rules relative to who would be qualified for the grant we would

then start to create a situation where you may bar some legitimate independent candidate, and I do not think this should be done.

I think that public moneys provided to candidates would create a false impression of the amount of support that any one given candidate in an election campaign would have. This was exemplified in the federal election, where the polls showed that the Liberal Party running in the last national election would overwhelmingly sweep the country, and yet when the votes came in this was not the case. Moneys to all the parties, or to the candidates, could give a false impression of the general support these candidates are getting.

Candidates offer themselves and their money. They spend their money, they offer their time, and in many cases with us younger members we interrupt careers that probably will suffer because of our involvement in politics. I do not think an additional amount of money from the Treasury, or the lack of that amount from the Treasury, makes a difference whether we offer ourselves or not. I think this principle of the state giving money to political candidates, eventually will lead to the state saying who can be a candidate.

In conclusion, I would just like to mention that I am in favour of voting at 18, but I believe a great deal more consideration should be given than we have up to the present time to this connection. I think that we should not give public money to candidates who wish to become members of this Legislature.

I do appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate and I want to feel that I have made some contribution, and I hope that we can initiate a new round of discussion among the younger people in terms of their voting at age 18.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to be responsible for talking this motion out. Therefore I will try to state the position of our party on the various items referred to in it as briefly as possible. This resolution, in my opinion, raises some important questions and I think it would be desirable for the House to declare its position now.

To run through the specific items as quickly as possible, I would refer first to item No. 1 proposing that consideration should be given to the creation of a permanent system of voter registration in place of the present system of enumeration. We have some reservations on that matter.

I myself think that, notwithstanding all

the unkind things that are said about it, the present system of enumeration works out very well; and there are very few people indeed who are actually deprived of a vote because they fail to get on to the list.

There are difficulties in this system. There are difficulties also in a system of voter registration. There is no perfect system, so we do not really take a very strong position on point one. On the other hand, in order to support the general principle indicated in the resolution, we would be quite happy to go along with that part of the resolution on the understanding, of course, that these are matters only to be taken into consideration.

With regard to item 2 in the resolution, I will leave clause (b) aside for the moment and deal only with clauses (a) and (c). Clause (a) proposes that the voting age should be reduced from 21 to 18. Our party has been on record to that effect for so many years that I cannot remember how long it has been, and is still on record. We believe that the need becomes more urgent all the time.

It is an obvious fact that human beings nowadays mature more rapidly than they did even a generation ago. In fact I am always amazed when I meet teenagers to note how smart most of them are, how sophisticated, and how much they know. I would say they are a lot smarter than teenagers were back in that remote past when I was a teenager. It is only sensible that we should keep our laws up to the times and invite these young people to participate in the democratic process at the age of 18.

I understand, from a discussion held by the Metropolitan Toronto Progressive-Conservative council not long ago at the Inn on the Park, that the Progressive-Conservatives would like to exclude the people between the ages of 18 and 21 because they are afraid that those people would likely vote New Democratic. I think that their fears may be well founded, but I do not think that that is a reason for disfranchising them. The Conservatives might as well face the fact that, in the course of time, they will become 21 in any case and they will undoubtedly continue in their present impulse to vote New Democratic.

As to item (c), printing the name of the party affiliation on the ballot, this matter has been well expounded by my hon. friend from Brant. I do not want to repeat what he said. It is an obviously desirable move. It assists the elector in making his identification on

the ballot and anything that assists the elector is good.

The third item in the resolution suggests that contributions to political parties should be exempt for income tax purposes. I would agree with that, although I would suggest that there should be some upper limit contributions of up to \$100 or up to \$500. I am not concerned about the precise upper limit, but I think there should be some limit. What we are really concerned about are the small contributions made by individuals. I think we all want to encourage that type of contribution, and one way of doing it would be to permit the contributor to claim the contribution as exemptions for income tax purposes.

I was a little touched by the reference of my hon. friend from Brant to the effect that the working men who contribute 60 cents a year to our party somehow manage, by virtue of the fact that they do it through their dues, to get an income tax exemption on that 60 cents. It really must amount to a considerable sum.

Mr. Nixon: What is the overall contribution?

Mr. Bryden: Well, we have published our figures. I do not have them handy, but they are readily available. It is about the equivalent of what you get from one corporation. I think that, in the course of a year in this province, we get about 40 per cent of our total budget from contributions made one way or another from trade unions. As I say—

Mr. Nixon: Is it the usual procedure for such contributions to be paid out of the union treasury when they are not made through the check-off?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, it is.

Mr. Nixon: In that case, they are also eligible for income tax exemption.

Mr. Bryden: I am not disputing that fact, if they are ultimately made through dues. An individual can claim this 60 cents or whatever it may be, it may be a dollar in some cases, for income tax purposes, and I think that is good. I think, if a person makes a contribution of \$1 or \$10 or \$50 to the Liberal Party or the Conservative Party, he should also be able to claim that as an exemption for income tax purposes.

I have concern about the huge contributions which corporations make to some

political parties, not to ours. My hon. friend from Parkdale (Mr. Trotter), I think, said not so long ago that about 80 per cent of Liberal finances come from corporations. These are not at all in the magnitude of 60 cents or a dollar a year according to my information. I would suggest that corporations usually also contrive to obtain income tax exemptions on their contributions simply by putting them down as a business expense.

I have a bill before this House which I hope may be called for second reading some day. It would require that all such contributions be made public just as contributions to our party are already made public by voluntary decision of the party.

However, my point is that I support the principle contained in 3. If we got to the point of drafting actual legislation I would suggest that there should be an upper limit on the amount that could be claimed for income tax purposes.

I now come to the one clause that I had set aside for the moment, namely clause (b) of section 2, under which it is proposed that The Election Act of Ontario should be amended—and I am now quoting:

—to provide for the payment of set funds from the public Treasury to cover expenses incurred by candidates in provincial general elections or by-elections.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that our group here does not subscribe to the principle set forth in that clause.

Mr. Nixon: What about the hon. member's group in Ottawa?

Mr. Bryden: I was just going on to say that there are arguments both ways on this. As far as I know our group in Ottawa does not subscribe to it either—although I think that some individual members have in the past suggested that it is a matter that could be considered. I am not suggesting that it is not a matter that could be considered, I am merely saying that we, after having thought about it for a good many years—and I may say having at one time been more or less favourably disposed to the idea, back in the days when Senator Douglas in the United States was expounding and advocating it quite strongly—we tended at that time to be influenced by his arguments.

Since then we have given further consideration to the matter and we are very doubtful about its soundness. We really do not see why the public Treasury should be called upon to finance the election campaigns of individuals or parties.

What we think is desirable is something that is in another bill and I will not discuss it now. I hope I will have a chance to discuss it on another occasion, but we think it is desirable that there should be a limitation on expenditures. I think if there is a limitation, then we get into the realm of fairness without having to call on the public Treasury at all. But the danger of having election campaigns financed largely or entirely out of the public Treasury is that political parties themselves and members of the Legislature will in effect become part of the bureaucracy, there will be a merging of the public service with the political representative, and I think that is most undesirable in a democratic system.

I think they should be kept entirely separate. The elected members should not in any sense be identified with the public service. Furthermore, I would suggest that the elected representatives ought to be identified and dependent upon the people who do the voting. I think it is a good thing for a party to have to go to the people to seek its funds, as long as the total amount of money to be spent is reasonably limited so that it simply does not become a battle of plutocrats to determine who is going to win an election.

As long as we have that safeguard then I think it is very desirable for the politicians to have to go to the people for money. It will help to keep them in touch with the people. There is nothing that will make a politician remember who it is that he depends upon, better than the knowledge that he is going to have to go to these people, not only for their votes but also for the money which he hopes to use to elect him.

I would also suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the system of contributions to political parties from the public Treasury that has now been approved in the province of Quebec is an iniquitous provision. It is a conspiracy by two parties who happen now to be in power to keep themselves in power, one or the other, forever, by the use of public funds. It is so rigged that it would be very difficult for any other person wanting to challenge those parties to ever get in. A man who wants to run against the people now in there will have to contribute through his taxes to their campaign fund and then will have to finance his own campaign on the side. That can be the effect of the Quebec legislation and I think that is iniquitous.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): I would like to ask the hon. member a question on that. Is he aware of the fact

that any voter in Quebec, anyone who runs in Quebec and gets 20 per cent of the vote, is entitled to share in that participation? Is he aware of that?

Mr. Bryden: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Anybody who gets 20 per cent of the vote—if there were five candidates and three got 20 per cent, those three would be able to get 15 cents for each name on the voters' list by way of a subsidy after the event.

Mr. Bryden: I know this is a matter of great levity to the parties that now have the controlling position in Quebec, but surely it is a well-known fact that in a democratic society new ideas and new people are often unpopular in the sense that they have very little popular support to begin with. It is not easy if you are making your first try, with something new, to get 20 per cent of the vote. So that per cent effectively eliminates any challenge from somebody who is not now in the group; that is objectionable in my opinion.

If money is to be provided out of the public Treasury to candidates then it should be provided on an equal basis to all qualifying candidates. Otherwise there is a serious interference with the democratic process. Certain people are put in a preferred position by the use of public funds. They happen to now be in the position where they can control the public funds, so now they are going to divide the pie up among themselves to keep themselves there to the exclusion of others, and I say that is an anti-democratic philosophy.

However, that was as an aside. It is not implied in this resolution that there would be an undemocratic limitation of that kind if the principle proposed in clause (b) of section 2 were adopted. I do not see any suggestion there that there would be that kind of limitation. So I am not raising that objection in relation to the resolution. My objection in relation to the resolution as it now stands is as I have already stated, that it helps to keep politicians responsible to make them go to the people for their money.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we support the resolution in general with certain reservations that I have already stated with regard to section 1 and section 3, but that we cannot in any way see our way clear to supporting clause (b) of section 2. Therefore I move, seconded by Mr. Lewis, that the section be amended by striking out clause (b) of section 2 thereof.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Bryden moves, seconded by Mr. S. Lewis, that the motion be amended by striking out clause (b) of section 2 thereof.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: I would suggest the hon. member adjourn the debate; the clock indicates two minutes to six.

Mr. Trotter: One of my longer speeches, Mr. Speaker. Very well.

Mr. Trotter moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I might say that at eight o'clock we will go into the Throne debate for the whole evening and tomorrow morning we will resume the debate on Bill No. 6.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

(February 8, 1966)

<i>Page</i>	<i>Column</i>	<i>Line</i>	<i>Correction</i>
301	1	35	Change to read: stitutions); The hon. member for Sudbury has objections to that.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, February 10, 1966
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 10, 1966

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. White, Mr. Newman, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Young	411
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Young, agreed to	434
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Allan, agreed to	434

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The first order: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, some of the hon. members will recall that before I adjourned the debate last week I presented certain statistical evidence using Dominion bureau of statistics figures to indicate that the numbers of university graduates in all faculties, except medicine, had increased very substantially during the past six or eight years. I contrasted that with the situation in the medical profession, in which the number of graduates had remained more or less stagnant at 850 per year for quite some years.

This portion of my speech was very accurately reported in a headline article in the *London Free Press*, in fact I felt compelled to tell the managing editor that it was the most accurately reported news article I had seen in a very long time. As a consequence I have received a number of submissions from the medical profession, several of which I would like to read to hon. members. I do so, Mr. Speaker, primarily to point up the fact to the hon. members, and perhaps more particularly the younger or newer members, that this is without doubt the most powerful forum in which a member of the provincial Parliament can make his views known to the populace.

The first letter I have comes from a Senator, who is also a doctor, in which he says:

Dear Mr. White: As a fellow Conservative I am a little concerned—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. White: I am coming to the hon. gentlemen opposite in a minute, Mr. Speaker.

As a fellow Conservative I am a little concerned about your remarks pertaining

to the distinguished and noble profession of which I have been a member for over 35 years. Your remarks the other day sounded more like a member of the NDP, etc.

The next letter comes from a very fine woman—and by the way I must say that is the kind of insult that touches me the deepest—the letter comes from a very fine woman in Kinmount, Ontario, who says:

Dear Sir:

I certainly agree with your remarks on the front page of Thursday's *Toronto Daily Star*. We have a daughter who is attending the University of Western Ontario, etc., etc.

In this letter she makes clear that her daughter, having acquired 71 per cent average, was not admitted into the medical school, that she is completing her B.Sc. this year in the hope that she will be admitted next year.

I am going to have to tell this very fine mother that her daughter's chances are negligible because one of the statistics I did not mention last day, sir, is the fact that although there have been almost a constant 850 students graduate per year in medicine, only 70 of those were women. If I am not mistaken, if my memory serves me correctly, there was never any variation, every year 70 women graduated, no more and no less; so her chances are not very good out of a population of 20 million people.

The next letter I have comes from one of the more distinguished doctors in London, who happens to be a friend of mine, in which he says:

Dear John: It was too bad that our discussion last evening could not have been prolonged, etc.

The impression so far as the profession is concerned, following your remarks made in the House last week, is that you feel that the doctors themselves have in some way limited the number of graduates in order to maintain a high business level on their own behalf. Of course, the doctors have nothing to do with the candidates going into medicine, etc.

This brings me to the next point I would like to make. In the article on the front page of the London *Free Press* to which I have referred, the distinguished dean of the school of medicine at the University of Western Ontario said that the reason there were not more medical graduates is because there were an insufficient number of medical applicants.

I regret to say that this response is completely inaccurate. The condition described may have prevailed some years ago, it has not prevailed in recent years. At the University of Western Ontario there are 450 students in basic science courses, of that number 250 call themselves pre-med students—a designation which was done away with not very long ago, I think, perhaps to mitigate the embarrassment that the large numbers of applicants must have caused. Of that 250, 170 can be expected to complete the pre-medical course with sufficient standing to enter the medical course. Of that 170, 150 will have those personal attributes so necessary for a doctor in the service of his community.

At the University of Western Ontario medical school only 60 students have been accepted per year. We are building a \$7 million medical school in London. The number of students it will accommodate is 75 in the freshman year, so that there will be 150 applicants from the University of Western Ontario alone and in addition to that there will be large numbers applying from basic science courses at the University of Waterloo, the University of Windsor and other institutions where they provide basic science courses, but not medical courses as such. And so, sir, there will be four or five suitable applicants for every pupil place in the University of Western Ontario medical school. The explanation provided by the dean is, in my opinion, completely unsatisfactory.

I turn now to the next item on my small list. Some hon. members will remember a few years ago I criticized the limitations that had been placed on the workmen's compensation board by this Legislature whereby a man had to have an accident *per se* before he could qualify for compensation. I am very glad to say that several years ago, in an amendment to The Workmen's Compensation Board Act this provision was relaxed so that any disablement arising out of employment, in addition to accidents as such, qualified an employee for compensation.

This has gone a very long way towards solving the problem I have described before.

We continue to have difficulty with certain marginal cases that I would like to describe to the hon. members.

If a man has a little accident after a short employment, and if he is sophisticated enough, or knowledgeable enough to report that accident quickly, he will say he twisted his back while pushing a hand truck through a factory, then that accident will be compensable. If another man, who is highly sophisticated in the art of protecting himself has an accident, let us say while gardening at his home over the weekend, if he can find his way into work and on Monday pretend to have an accident, he also will find himself protected.

If a man has had a long service job in an industry involving very heavy work and if at the end of this long period of time his back gives out, he will now be protected, since the amendment to the legislation passed a few years ago.

What about the employee whose back gives out on the job after some short period of time? What do we do about him? Well, the fact of the matter is that unless he is prepared to go through rather an elaborate deception, he is not protected and I suppose in most cases he finds himself on some form of welfare.

I discussed the matter—as my hon. friend from Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis) knows because he was in my office when the conversation took place—I discussed the matter with the vice-chairman of the workmen's compensation board. He has told me that he thinks this problem cannot be solved by amending our Act here, that it is somewhat unfair to charge the employer with the full cost of looking after a man who has had chronic back trouble, that in those jurisdictions where this has been attempted the employers have required a very high standard of physical examination before admitting or retaining employees in their company. So the danger is, if we were to broaden the Act in this fashion, a number of older employees would be dismissed.

I think the problem can only be solved by a radical amendment to the disabled persons' allowance programme initiated in Ottawa; and I speak very feelingly in saying, sir, that I think this must be the most inadequate legislation now existing in Canada. In my personal experience over the past seven or eight years, a constituent has to be disabled to the point where he can scarcely flutter an eyelash, or move a finger, before he qualifies. And so a person with a chronic heart condition, who is incapable of working,

who is incapable perhaps of looking after, we will say, her own household, this person, if she is able to get up and move around in some fashion, is disqualified from the disabled persons' allowance.

I would hope that a very clear message went forth from our government and our Legislature that this inadequate legislation must be brought into the 20th century and without delay, so that these injustices which all of us have seen—as evidenced by the desk thumping which has just taken place—will be at last eliminated. The cost would be minimal because while these persons who are rejected for disabled persons' allowance end up on a form of municipal welfare, or some other form of welfare—usually municipal—they become a charge on the state, so the only thing really that is accomplished is that their own self-esteem is destroyed.

I would like to tell the hon. members about several voluntary programmes in London. For some years the law profession has carried on a legal aid society at which clinic citizens of modest means can acquire the legal advice and the legal representation that they require to satisfy their rights as citizens. I, myself, started a clinic in London five-and-a-half years ago. Every week at the YMCA in London, at an appointed hour, I attend; and in a small advertisement in the London *Free Press* I invite constituents with suggestions, queries, and problems to visit me. In the past five-and-a-half years I have had more than 2,000 citizens come to me with questions.

I am glad to inform the House that the legal aid committee sponsored by the barristers in London is broadening its services, and that they are going to include some debt counselling services. I have put the request to the chartered accountants association in London that they work with the legal profession in making this a full-blown debt counselling service, not unlike the two such services that are staffed here in Metro Toronto. I am glad to say that the president of the chartered accountants association has received this suggestion very favourably, and he is optimistic about getting the support of his membership.

I am glad to tell the House also that the chamber of commerce is considering the initiation of a consumer fund clinic. The federal member of Parliament from London, my friend and colleague Jack Irvine, is considering a complementary political clinic to my own. The reason I am telling this story, sir, is that I suspect many of the hon. members of this House could themselves initiate such a service, certainly in urban areas; and they might persuade professions like

lawyers, chartered accountants, municipal councils, and so on, to participate. My hope, I will say unabashedly, sir, is that we can have half-a-dozen clinics meeting simultaneously in some convenient location, like the library or the YMCA; that such services will be well publicized and that our citizens will be able to come and get this type of assistance.

I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that we do this because of the increased complexity and scope of government, and the encroachment that government occasionally makes into the lives of our citizens.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Would the hon. member be for an ombudsman as well as this?

Mr. White: Well, my hon. friend knows I am because I have spoken on that subject. In fact, if I am not mistaken, my friend, I was the first to speak on it although you and I were quick off the mark with that together a few years ago.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is my bill.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Surely it is the absence of government rather than the encroachment of government.

Mr. White: That is your pet. Our biases now reveal themselves.

The hon. member for York South, in speaking on the Throne debate, made some comments that I feel, Mr. Speaker, are obviously in error. Unintentional as this may be, I feel compelled to correct him.

He said on page 138 of *Hansard*:

This year, student fees across the whole of Canada represented an outlay of \$90 million to \$100 million. Now that the federal government has begun to accept its responsibilities for financing higher education, at least to some degree, I would suggest it is a fair proposition that half of that cost should be accepted by Ottawa.

I would like to make it clear I am quoting from the hon. member for York South.

That would leave \$50 million to be met by the provinces. The share for Ontario of such a provincial commitment would be in the range of one-third, roughly \$17 million. Last year, the outlay for Ontario in capital and operational grants to the universities was \$163 million. This year, it undoubtedly will be higher.

Now the argument is fallacious, sir, as I attempted to indicate in my interjection, and

that was responded to by the hon. member who said:

If the hon. gentleman thinks my analysis is completely false, I invite him to get up on his own time in the Throne debate and deal with the issue.

And here I am.

Now, sir, the reason that it is false is this: My hon. friend uses the assumption that free university education would not increase enrolment beyond its present limits. That is—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I make no such assumption.

Mr. White: Of course you do.

Mr. MacDonald: I am talking about the cost now for elimination fees.

Mr. White: Yes, I know. The hon. member is talking about the cost in terms of the people in university now and he assumes that that enrolment will not burgeon if university education is free.

Mr. MacDonald: Is the hon. member opposing it?

Mr. White: At the present time I am not opposing it philosophically, I am opposing it from an economic point of view. I think the Budget yesterday might have indicated to some of the hon. members, like my friend from York South, that there are certain economic restraints placed on all provincial governments.

He assumes that free university education would not increase enrolment. The enrolment at the present time is in the neighbourhood of 45,000 students in this province. The provincial grant, as the hon. member mentioned last year, was \$163 million, of which perhaps some \$50 million was provided by the students themselves. I suggest, sir, that if university education was free there would be tremendously increased demands on university facilities, and that the cost would not be \$17 million, but perhaps \$250 million—which is an extra four per cent on the sales tax or it is—

Mr. MacDonald: That's far-fetched.

Mr. White: Well, indeed it is. And so we find ourselves, I think, not persuaded by a philosophical point of view but by the economic realities of our provincial product, that we can go so far and no farther without—

Mr. MacDonald: Would the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. White: Indeed, I will.

Mr. MacDonald: Since it has been pointed out many times that there are by assessments of results and IQ's and so on, approximately 30 per cent of the people who are entitled and capable of absorbing university education, that would be approximately three times what we have now. Three times 17 million is 51 million—not 250 million. Would the hon. gentleman like to comment on that?

Mr. White: Well, indeed, I will. This is the silliest comment yet, Mr. Speaker, because it would not be three times \$17 million; it would be three times \$163 million. And, in point of fact, because of the very heavy initial cost, it would not be three times \$163 million but rather three times \$163 million plus several hundred million dollars.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is opposed to those capable of getting education getting it.

Mr. White: No, I am simply saying that in my experience as a university lecturer most students who have (a) the ability, (b) the vigour, and (c) the determination, can now acquire a university education. I look forward, as a matter of fact to that day.

Mr. MacDonald: The facts don't back you up.

Mr. Thompson: I just want to ask the hon. member if he feels that the economy of Newfoundland has suffered because of the one-year free university education?

Mr. White: I am glad my hon. friend asked that because, of course, that is just political hocus-pocus. The Newfoundland programme is political hocus-pocus. We now offer the equivalent of a free one-year to everyone in this jurisdiction because of the free grade 13, and that is actually what my hon. friend's colleague, Premier Smallwood, is doing.

Mr. Thompson: Is the hon. member ever correct?

Mr. White: That is political trickery at its worst. And I can give additional evidence, Mr. Speaker, of some of the other deceptions practised in that jurisdiction with respect to some of the university programmes they offer.

I move on to another statement which I feel warrants correction.

Mr. MacDonald: A privilege, not a right.

Mr. White: Another statement—oh, by the way, these interjections remind me, Mr. Speaker, of the most amazing incident that I have witnessed in the last eight or nine years in this Legislature. My friend, the hon. leader of the Opposition, was speaking last Thursday evening on the rights and the freedoms of the private members of this Legislature, and of the obvious necessity for a private MPP—

Mr. Thompson: Never an interjection during it.

Mr. White: —to ask oral questions, etc., etc. When he was part way through his oration, my hon. friend from Muskoka—my friend the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer), one of the most distinguished, moderate, sensible and intelligent men in this House, whose riding we all enjoy—rose to his feet and said: “Mr. Speaker, would the hon. leader of the Opposition permit a question?” and the answer was “No.”

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. White: No, he would not let this hon. member ask the question. So I suggest, sir, that he defeated this whole argument and cast into oblivion the high phrase that he was utilizing.

Now I turn to *Hansard*, page 139, continuing the speech given by the hon. member for York South:

For the majority of our people the problem is not a job.

That, by the way, is an interesting concession. I am glad the hon. member recognizes that employment in this jurisdiction is 97.5 per cent, in a system where 97 per cent is considered full employment.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a great government.

Mr. White: It is a great government, as my hon. friend says. Now to quote the hon. member for York South:

For the majority of our people the problem is not a job. They have that.

Quite right.

Their problem is how to make their income meet their family needs and they are facing a losing battle with rising costs of living. Every time they get a wage raise, it achieves little more than to catch up on the cost of living increases they have experienced in the last year or two. Very little gain has taken place in income.

Now, sir, that assertion is completely incorrect, as I will seek to prove, using statistics concerning Ontario per capita personal income, 1944 to 1965.

In 1944, the Ontario per capita personal income in current dollars was \$886. In 1956, the estimated amount was \$2,264. So that in current dollars the per capita personal income has nearly trebled. The Ontario per capita personal income, in constant 1949 dollars, in 1944 was \$1,188. In 1965, in constant 1949 dollars, the per capita personal income in this province was \$1,632, an increase of approximately 50 per cent.

Even more interesting, sir, is the tremendous progress that we have made since the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) assumed his heavy responsibilities. Since that new administration took over its duties in 1961 Ontario per capita personal income has increased as follows: In 1962, an increase of 4.8 per cent; in 1963, an increase of 4.6 per cent; in 1964, an increase of 5.2 per cent; and in 1966, sir, I am glad to report an increase of 6.5 per cent.

And so, sir, we find that we are making tremendous progress in aggregate in this province. And much more important than that, we are increasing the real income of all of our citizens in a very rapid fashion.

As a matter of fact, some months ago I did a little research of my own and using a growth factor of three and one-half per cent, I computed that the average household income, in real dollars, in 1965 dollars, in the city of London would increase from its present level of \$5,700 to \$20,000 by the time my four-year-old daughter is my age.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that real or inflated dollars?

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): The tax is up, too.

Mr. White: And so in closing I would like to say—yes, in real dollars, using current costs.

And so, sir, in conclusion, I would like to say this: We are going to be tremendously rich in this jurisdiction if we are able to withstand the blandishments of those opposite who would kill the goose that laid the golden egg. We are going to be tremendously rich. By the time my daughter is my age our household family income in London, Ontario, will be \$20,000 in today's purchasing power.

Mr. MacDonald: We are richer with a planned economic development.

Mr. White: I suggest, sir, that this points up several important matters for those of us who are legislators. First of all, we have to determine how we can best raise the level of those people in the lower economic strata and I feel confident that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) and those other hon. Ministers of the Crown who are conferring with their colleagues in Ottawa will keep pressing them for an end to iniquities, such as presently exist in the disabled persons' allowance programme, so that we may encourage those who are less fortunate into a higher level of performance and into a higher level of personal attainment and satisfaction.

I think, sir, the other point that must be made is that the free enterprise system to which we Conservatives are dedicated can produce all of the wealth that we can possibly use. The great danger is that we will stifle that initiative through the type of legislation that dulls the initiative of our citizens, through the expansion of government bureaucracy which thwarts and frustrates the activities of free people.

At any rate, in conclusion I would like to say that the Budget yesterday which brings forth imaginative and bold programmes of spending for new communications to increase the efficiency of our province, new educational facilities to increase productivity; and of course beyond that the cultural achievement of our people and new medical health measures which of course have not only an economic effect but which are essential to the satisfactory attainment of health and happiness of all our our people. All of these points, sir, ably financed by a bold and courageous Budget which leaves some portion of total expenditures for debt increase but which at the same time does not saddle us with an unbearable load of debt to the detriment of future generations.

So I salute the government for its many accomplishments and I express once again the confidence that we can make continuous progress under the leadership of the hon. Prime Minister and his able Cabinet colleagues.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, may I extend to you my commendation for the manner in which you are conducting the affairs of this House and my appreciation for the many courtesies you and your office have extended to me during the past year.

My congratulations and best wishes also go out to the hon. member for Eglinton

(Mr. Reilly) on his election to the office of Deputy Speaker. The choice was excellent.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not express my thanks to the people of Nipissing and Bracondale on their wise and considerate choices at the polls in sending to this honourable House two good Liberal members. I wish both of them well and know that both will make substantial contributions to the affairs of this province. May they long serve the good people of Ontario.

I would like to turn to the topic of housing. Not too many years ago the plight of the unemployed was the most serious problem confronting my home town of Windsor. From an employment index of an all-time low of 70 and with over 10,000 unemployed, Windsor has moved to a more favourable index of over 100. However, we still find substantial numbers seeking employment. In fact, as of January 31, 1966, 5,048 people were receiving unemployment insurance benefits and 5,157 were unemployed seeking employment. This, Mr. Speaker, is 8.2 per cent of Ontario's 63,000 unemployed. With less than four per cent of Ontario's population we have eight per cent of its unemployment, much too high a percentage.

Windsor is recovering but still has not recovered fully. In spite of its present booming economy, in spite of the auto trade pact, it still has 1,831 people on welfare. This, however, is a substantial drop of 803 over one year ago, December, 1964.

Probably the most serious problem is the acute shortage of housing. Even though Windsor has not been idle in its efforts to combat this housing crisis the problem grows more acute daily. The immediate outlook is bleak indeed. Even with steps taken by governments combined with private construction now in progress, or planned for the city this year, the current demand for housing will only be partially satisfied. Educated guesses indicate the need for approximately 3,000 housing units.

The Ontario housing corporation has, either under construction or scheduled to begin this year, only 379. Mr. Gordon Cole, the manager of the Windsor housing authority, says he has 762 applications on file from families desiring public housing. This number could be increased considerably, but many families do not apply because they require immediate housing; and the policy of the housing authority is to require those making application to be residents of the city for a period of six months.

It is nothing unusual today, Mr. Speaker, to find that some people must take up resi-

dence 30 to 40 miles outside of the city because of this acute housing shortage affecting the city of Windsor. One partial answer to the problem could be making senior citizens' housing available to senior citizens; their homes and apartments could in turn be made available to families.

Mr. Speaker, the shortage of serviced land for housing and for industry may prevent Windsor from benefiting fully from the present opportunities for development. The metropolitan area, the newly annexed area, has substantial blocks of land available in different sections of the community; water and sewage facilities are lacking in most, particularly in the newly annexed areas. Added to the problem is the question of sewage treatment plants. Controls by the Ontario water resources commission aggravate this problem.

On top of all of this is the capital works spending limit put on a municipality by the Ontario municipal board. Mr. Speaker, I hope the Ontario municipal board will look with favour on raising the capital works spending limit of my community to enable it to undertake many of the more needed projects, some of which will ease the acute housing shortage. Likewise I hope the Ontario water resources commission will make some temporary arrangements to enable the city to cope with the water and sewage problems brought on by annexation.

Mr. Speaker, on February 8, a resolution was submitted to my council from the city of Goderich that should command some attention from this government. That resolution requests that senior governments pay 50 per cent of the cost for operating and maintaining sewage treatment plants. Were such a policy in effect I know this could alleviate some of the shortages that confront the municipality from which I come.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, there is a temporary answer for the housing shortage that is plaguing many of the urban areas. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) that he consider an emergency housing relief authority, a body that would undertake the purchase of 10,000 mobile homes, or some number that could be accurately arrived at, and provide to each community the number needed to take care of the housing requirements of that community. Windsor could make use of at least 2,000 right now. I understand Toronto could well do with 6,000.

This method of housing relief would have many advantages. It would enable municipalities to attract and hold industry and to take advantage of the new industrial outlook.

It would enable municipalities to plan in more leisurely and economic fashion instead of being stampeded in housing developments. It would assist in partially overcoming the shortage of help, a serious problem for industry, by assuring housing to families wishing to move into an area. It could be a partial answer to the farm labour problem by providing much needed mobile housing in many rural parts of Ontario during the planting and harvesting seasons.

When the mobile homes have met the purpose for which they were intended they could be sold as summer cottages.

Mr. Speaker, there are many more advantages, too numerous for me to mention at this time, but I do hope that the hon. Prime Minister, or the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), seriously considers this suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to turn to tax relief for senior citizens. I am reading a quotation from a letter:

As we read in our papers, hear on radio and TV, strikes and rumours of more strikes impending, one questions where and when all of this will end. Only in one way: taxes, higher prices for all commodities, higher hourly wages paid out to workmen when a homeowner has any repair work to be done. In all this there is no voice lifted for the cause of the older people who, in their days when able to work, received very low wages, much less than \$1 an hour, struggled to buy their homes and to raise their children. During the bleak lean days of the depression many walked the streets looking for work. Yes, and many carried on, paid their taxes, sent their children, patched but clean, to school, never seeking or accepting relief.

Times have changed. Expensive schools equipped with latest innovations, high schools with swimming pools, gymnasiums, cafeterias, all fitted with the most modern equipment, coming out of the people's taxes, including many of us older ones with much less than \$2,000 a year income to keep up our homes, feed and clothe ourselves and pay taxes.

God help the aged poor with only \$75 to keep him, especially where the husband is 70 years of age and eligible for the paltry handout, and the wife is 60 and ineligible. There are many such cases.

Mr. Speaker, I have just read a portion of two letters printed in the letter box of my home paper. Two are sufficient. I could safely say that every hon. member in this

House has received many that pointed out the plight of our senior citizens.

To add insult to injury, Mr. Speaker, yesterday's 67 per cent rise in the sales tax has decreased the average \$75 a month pension by five per cent. Since Windsor's aging population is disproportionately large, the plight of the aged is that much more serious in my community. Forty years ago large numbers of younger people flocked into Windsor during the boom of the '20's; now Windsor has well above the provincial average of 60-year-olds and over, according to the 1961 census. The provincial average of 60-year-olds and over was 11.7 per cent of the population; Essex county's was 12.8 per cent; Windsor's was 15.9 per cent—this is 35 per cent higher than the average for the whole of the province.

In the 65-year-old-and-over category, Ontario's average, according to the 1961 census, was 8.2 per cent of the population. Essex county's was exactly the same, 8.2 per cent, while Windsor's was 10.7 per cent or 30 per cent higher than the provincial average. Because of this disproportionately large number of aged, Windsor's problems of caring for the aged is more acute, more requiring of attention than in most other Ontario centres.

Provincial averages, say, for hospital beds do not apply exactly, as the older the people and the more of them there are then the more they are likely to need hospitalization and hospital and medical services. This means institutions such as Riverview hospital, a chronic patient institution, would only naturally have its facilities strained to its limits and unable to accommodate the numbers needing its services. Huron Lodge, a home for the aged, is likewise too small to take in many who would like to seek admission to it. This above-the-provincial-average for aged means that there is a proportionately greater need for housing for senior citizens.

This also means that in spite of the more affluent economy of the day the problem of employment for the older worker is more apparent and more pronounced because of practices of many industries that put an age limit on the hiring of older workers.

Mr. Speaker, I started my remarks on the plight of our senior citizens and then I strayed to show how much more pronounced this problem is in my community. Allow me to return to the senior citizen in general. Concerned with this problem of finding a means of assisting the senior citizens on pen-

sion, the economics and political science club of the University of Windsor in 1965 proposed the following recommendation and it was presented by its president, Robert G. Sandor. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read this proposed recommendation. It is worthy of attention and worthy of implementation in some of its aspects. I am reading the recommendation:

It is time that our senior citizens received some attention from the different levels of government.

Today in the city of Windsor, 25 per cent of each municipal tax dollar is channeled into education. The average school tax levy is \$95 per household unit, but the pension is only \$75 per month.

The payment of the school levy is an extra burden upon those citizens who have lived in a home, raised a family and eventually paid their mortgage. Through the years they have contributed toward the school levy, thus when they reach the qualifying years of 65 or 70 they must still pay this levy. It is not fair for pensioners to pay this school tax, for unlike other municipal services, they receive no benefit.

The argument in regards to future generations is not applicable here. As citizens they paid for their share when their earning power and potential was realized. The present \$75 monthly pension represents a large cut in earning and consequently purchasing power. Only household units would be exempt from this levy.

The burden of an average school levy of \$95 annually means that each pensioner, even those living in apartments, is subject through high rents to this levy which automatically dissolves 10 per cent of the annual pension benefit. This main source of income is too adversely affected. It is this 10 per cent that could make the difference to the individual of either a comfortable retirement or a miserable waiting period. Currently in the city there are 12,750 people in the 65-and-over age group. If only 10,000 qualify for the pension, the result is that approximately \$950,000 is annually paid by these individuals toward education.

At this stage of life the marginal propensity to consume is higher for pensioners than for the rest of the nation. This means that pensioners spend more. If this levy was not to be paid by pensioners, their annual potential purchasing power would

be more than \$800,000, which would be spent within the city under the three per cent sales tax and the provincial government would almost immediately acquire larger revenues.

With the multiplier effect the total increase in income in the city could approach \$4 million. The increase in employment, means increased revenues to the federal government from income tax receipts.

Thus, we recommend that if both federal and provincial governments would reimburse municipal governments the sum which would have been paid out by the pensioners, not only the school system but also the pensioners would benefit.

Of course the pensioners should still pay for other municipal services received by the community as a whole. We realize that tenants might not benefit if unscrupulous landlords would not make necessary adjustments in rates, but we believe that there would be legislation to prevent unscrupulous Acts. This recommendation has been suggested with the full realization that more information would be required, but it is our contention that this proposal if implemented immediately would have the effect of raising the Canadian standard of living.

This is from the economics and political science club, Robert G. Sandor, president.

Mr. Speaker, the *London Free Press* in an editorial on April 17, 1965, said the following concerning this recommendation, and I am quoting from the editorial:

A group of Windsor students is putting forward a plan to relieve Canadian pensioners of the educational share of municipal taxes. Such ideas should be considered.

Mr. Speaker, in an attempt to provide municipal tax relief to pensioners, a Mr. Henry Gordon of Windsor proposed relief from educational taxes well over 15 years ago. He tried to get support for his idea. Through perseverance and by patience he got the ears of municipal councillor Oliver Stonehouse. Alderman Stonehouse seven years ago asked Windsor city council to endorse such a resolution but was unsuccessful. The 1965 council passed such a resolution, and here are portions of the resolution.

According to the resolution, the provincial government would adopt a system whereby on being shown a tax receipt the province would, without a means test, pay a school tax rebate to each taxpayer 65 and over.

This rebate would be to property owners in an amount equal to the lesser of one-half

of the portion levied for school purposes annually or \$75. Mr. Speaker, this motion was moved by my opponent in the last election. If the government does not consider it, they are certainly rebuffing the candidate that they put up against me.

In 1965, Alderman Cy Watson of the Riverside municipal council likewise submitted two resolutions to the Canadian federation of mayors and municipalities asking for special consideration re education taxes to pensioners occupying their own homes. Mr. Speaker, allow me to show how our neighbours to the south of us have looked upon the problem of elderly citizens' property tax relief.

States which give older property owners such a break include the following: New Jersey gives couples past 65 a deduction of \$80 from their property tax bill, provided their annual income does not exceed \$5,000. Georgia grants those past 65 with incomes under \$3,000 an exemption of \$4,000. Wisconsin grants tax relief to those with incomes under \$3,000 via state income tax credits. Massachusetts gives those past 70 a \$2,000 exemption. Two counties in Rhode Island grant those past 65 a \$1,000 exemption; this is on the assessment. Maine exempts elders from property taxes on the first \$3,500 in property value. In Maryland 15 out of 24 counties grant elders exceptions ranging from \$1,500 to \$5,000. Indiana gives elders with incomes under \$2,200 an exemption of \$1,000. Louisiana gives a \$2,000 exemption to those past 65. Alaska and Oregon offer those with incomes under \$2,500 exemptions varying with age, from 10 per cent for those between 65 and 68 to 100 per cent for those past 80 years of age.

Many other states are considering legislation to provide elders with property tax exemptions.

The *Detroit Free Press* of March 20, 1965, carried the following editorial under the title, "A race to help oldsters." I will only read one short paragraph:

Old-timers have long felt they were ignored by lawmakers but not any more. A race is on to see who can get them a property exemption first. The race is for a good cause. As school and other taxes have increased, property owners have had to dig deeper into their pockets. For the elderly on fixed incomes or limited incomes the pockets were often empty. Some relief should be given.

This is the editorial. Both Republicans and Democrats practically fell over one another to provide this relief.

On January 16, 1966, the following was carried:

TAX RELIEF FOR ELDERLY

After haggling over details the Michigan State Legislature last year approved Michigan's first tax relief plan for its elderly citizens. As a result, approximately 160,000 homeowners who have passed their 65th birthday can expect substantial reductions in their 1966 property tax bills. State tax experts estimate the cuts will average \$93. The cost to the state, which will reimburse local governments for the lost revenue, would amount to between \$15 and \$16 million a year.

Mr. Speaker, even though the American jurisdiction designates their assistance specifically for the elderly, several Canadian provinces do give tax relief to property owners.

I am reading from a Canadian Press release from Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan:

All homeowners in Saskatchewan will receive an annual grant of \$50 from the provincial Treasury starting 1966, in a scheme to reduce the tax burden on property owners. It is hoped the initial amount can be gradually increased as the finances of the province permit. When the mechanics of paying the grant have been completed, the Premier said it will be paid on only one home in the cases of persons owning more than one; persons renting homes won't be eligible.

British Columbia instituted a homeowners' grant system in 1957. Grants are paid on one house for each family unit in B.C. They range up to a maximum of \$100 a homeowner according to the size of the homeowner's municipal and school tax payments.

The Manitoba government rebates to property owners, not just homeowners, 50 per cent of the municipal school taxes up to a maximum rebate of \$50 a year on each tax bill. Thus, if a person owns more than one piece of property in Manitoba, he could receive up to \$50 for each property.

Mr. Speaker, the united senior citizens of Ontario in a convention at the University of Guelph on August 31 and September 1, 1965, passed the following resolution:

Whereas the burden of ever-increasing costs of education on fixed incomes of pensioners, Therefore be it resolved that a request go to the municipal board and the provincial government to amend the school tax structure to eliminate the education costs levied against homeowners by removing the education tax from the municipal level.

The Senator Croll report on aging, among its many recommendations, mentioned:

Greater financial assistance for older homeowners.

Mr. Speaker, surely Ontario, the wealthiest of the provinces, should live up to its slogan, "province of opportunity," and provide that opportunity to its senior citizens by granting them at least education tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to a topic of wage parity. I would like to bring to the attention of this House, and especially to the attention to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development—and I am sorry he is not here tonight, because this can have a most serious effect on everyone—this article written by Walter McCall in the *Windsor Star* in January of this year.

The effects and the impact of this article are extremely significant and should command the attention of the research staff of The Department of Economics and Development immediately, so that when the time comes the department will be fully aware of its impact. I am reading from an article in January of this year, the headline is "Reuther blasts wage disparity as injustice," by Walter McCall, datelined Detroit:

There is no further justification for disparity between the wages of the automotive industry workers in Canada and the United States, the president of the united auto workers union said here this morning. Walter P. Reuther told a Cobo Hall press conference that parity in wages between workers in the two countries would be a major topic when auto industry contracts come up for renewal in 1967. Mr. Reuther was to speak at a labour outlook luncheon at the economic club of Detroit at noon.

I am quoting here from the article:

There is no further justification for this practice now that the Canada-U.S. auto trade plan has been approved in both countries, Mr. Reuther stated. There is simply no reason why workers doing the same job for the same company, building the same cars for the same market, should not get the same wages.

Mr. Reuther said the trade pact which was a year old Sunday is just beginning to operate. It is too early to tell how it will affect the auto industry when the plan is brought to full size because there are still many problems to transition to overcome. I can say, however, that all can gain from it. The UAW has given this historic agreement its fullest support from the start.

In the same month, several days later, there was another article in the Windsor paper:

**CENTENARY PROJECT WAGE PARITY
UAW ENDORSES PLAN TO REMOVE
U.S. SALARY EDGE**

The united auto workers union will seek wage parity for Canadians in the North American auto industry as its Centennial project in 1967, George Burt, Canadian regional director of the UAW announced Sunday. Such a move, Mr. Burt said, would do away in a single swoop with the traditional 40 cents to \$1-an-hour differential in wages between auto workers in the two countries.

Canadian auto workers have earned less than their U.S. counterparts. The UAW considers the Canadian-U.S. automotive trade agreement which marked its first anniversary during the weekend as having removed the last barrier to wage parity, Mr. Burt stated. The council has approved Mr. Burt's recommendation that the union approach the auto companies to ask that joint study committees be set up immediately to consider problems of wage parity.

Then yesterday's paper, February 9, 1966:

Union takes parity bid to U.S. The united auto workers union has taken its request for parity in wages between Canada and U.S. auto workers to Washington. The UAW has estimated that closing the gap would mean an additional \$89 million for Canadian union members annually.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will take seriously the union's intentions, and study the problems arising out of such a wage parity request. Some of the contract negotiations, now taking place in my own community, have 1967 in mind and wage parity in mind; and, as a result they are causing a bit of concern.

I would like to turn my attention to a mental hospital. On March 10, 1960, the Windsor *Star* carried this item:

MENTAL HOSPITAL EVENTUALLY

Windsor should get a mental hospital eventually, Hon. M. B. Dymond, Ontario Minister of Health, told a delegation from the border city. Dr. Dymond said there was no government backing down from an earlier promise—

“earlier promise,” it says:

—that a mental institution was on schedule for Windsor.

What type of schedule, Mr. Speaker?

On June 26, 1963, the hon. Minister, speaking at the nomination rally for my opponent, Alderman Mrs. Cameron H. Montrose, announced that Windsor, and he was referring to the IODE, would get a psychiatric hospital. Since that nomination day, there were all kinds of items and headlines that would lead one to believe that everything was settled, and that this facility would be a reality. Mr. Speaker, this is 1966—over two-and-a-half years since the hon. Minister's solemn declaration of June 26, 1963 and six years since his statement of March 10, 1960. Still this government stalls.

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): He is driving people crazy.

Mr. Newman: He is driving them crazy, and there is no place to put them.

Building costs now are at least 15 per cent higher than they were during the 1963 election promise; and with building trades now in the process of negotiating wage increases, you may rest assured that costs will be substantially higher. Original plans were for a 300-bed hospital. This number was whittled down to 175, then to 80; now it is two 26-bed wards, or only 52 beds. If this type of arithmetic retrogression continues, this government's promise may end up with a tent and a hammock, or a tent and a camp cot.

What is holding up the hon. Minister's decision on accepting the bids that were submitted to him and the Ontario hospital services commission by the IODE hospitals, as required under the provisions of The Community Psychiatric Act? Let us get on with this much needed, though substantially reduced, project.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to the shortage of skilled workers. “Lack of tradesmen cited by Robarts as export hindrance,” reads this headline on a newspaper article recently:

A shortage of skilled workers is the chief hindrance to an increase in manufacturing exports from Ontario, Premier John Robarts said yesterday in London, England, speaking to a group of British and Canadian businessmen at a luncheon

Mr. Speaker, this same story of shortage of skilled workers is heard over and over again today.

Yesterday we were able to invade the skilled mills of many European countries. There was a brain drain to Canada and Ontario of the medical and para-medical professions, not too long ago. This brain drain may have been a blessing at that time, but it only

lulled us into a false sense of security so that we did not make provisions for the day when we no longer could depend upon immigration to meet the health needs of our people.

The government states there is a shortage of doctors to fully implement the federal medical scheme. Mr. Speaker, if this shortage does exist, whose fault is it? Just as they were able to drain, from Europe and from European countries, the educated minds, so our American friends are doing to us—just what we did to other nations. Our brain drain soon became a quite pronounced brain drain.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development are now engaged in a trade raid, a raid on European countries to entice, to steal, their skilled tradesmen. They may be successful for a while, but this trade raid works both ways.

There is, sir, the large industrial giant to the south of us who is always willing and, may I say, very successful in enticing or stealing our skilled people. Living in a border town, I have seen evidences of this every day for years. This trade raid is not an answer to the shortage of skilled workers. Part of the answer is the training and the developing of our own, and the hope that these numbers may be supplemented by immigration.

As Europe becomes more prosperous, more skilled, more industrialized, the numbers of skilled wishing to migrate to Canada become fewer. In fact, Mr. Speaker, one industrialist in Windsor told me just recently that his offer of a guarantee of an annual income of over five figures to selected skilled tradesmen did not get a single response from skilled tradesmen in Europe.

Mr. Speaker, this is how selective many people possessing certain skills can be, and are, today. An industrialized economy functions inefficiently when supplying a small population. What we need in Ontario, and in Canada, is more people and still more people. We need millions more people. We have the raw materials of an industrial society. We have the facilities to process them. We have the desire to produce, and we do produce surpluses in everything from wheat, butter and eggs, to nickel, iron, aluminum, copper, paper and wood. What we lack is people—people to help us continue our rate of economic growth, people to consume our production; and the best place to have our customers, and hence our markets, is right here in Canada.

We need an open-door immigration policy which would attract all the immigrants that we can draw to Canada, all the time. We should not turn immigration on and off like a tap. We should seek out, invite, encourage, and assist immigrants to come to Canada. In the long run, Canada will prosper more and our country flourish better if we bring to this country enough people to consume much of our production.

Foreign trade is but the frosting on the cake. It simply means that we are feeding, clothing or housing someone in a foreign country with certain products of our labours. Quite often foreign trade is confined to special products the foreign consumer wants at a given time and at a given price.

Domestic trade is unconfined. It supplies fellow citizens not only with one or two special items, but with everything from birth to death, including cradles and caskets. It does this year around, each year, every year, without the complication of currency problems, foreign government interference, or low wage rate competition, or anything else. Since 1945 Canada has accepted over two million immigrants. The annual expenditures on servicing these people in Canada far surpasses the value of all of Canada's foreign trade.

Canadian secondary industry today is producing, exclusive of our paper products, not much over 15 per cent of the value of our exports. Outside of the auto trade agreement, the mass market for Canada's secondary manufacturing was the domestic market, not foreign markets, and the long-term solution to most of our industries' problems is a larger Canadian population.

The province of Ontario has been subsidized to the amount of \$155 million through the immigration of skilled people during the year 1965 alone. Authorities estimate it would have cost Ontario at least that amount, plus of course a waiting period, to train as many skilled people as we have enticed to enter our province. It was all right to have been selective in our immigration approach, but now that the European and foreign skill mill has ground almost to a halt, and the trade raid is over, we must be prepared to take semi-skilled, unskilled, and to train them.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to illustrate the seriousness of the problem as far as Canada's plastics industry is concerned. A shortage of toolmakers forces cancellation of expansion plans. This hurts our exports. Mr. Peter Hedgewick, the president of International Tools Limited, the largest plastic mould manufacturer in North America, is quoted in

an issue of *Canadian Plastics* magazine, and I quote:

The rate at which we grow is limited by the number of skilled people we can hire or train.

Mr. Hedgewick's International Tools Limited plant, by the way, provides a comprehensive training programme for apprentices. International Tools Limited has spent considerable sums of money in an attempt to recruit tool-makers in Britain and continental Europe with only very moderate success. In fact, International Tools Limited has found that Germany is also facing such a severe shortage of tool and die makers that it is attempting to recruit help from Italy. Germany has placed a ban on advertisements in German papers by foreign employers.

Mr. Louis Calsavara, president of Center Tool and Mold, has suggested tapping the skilled help of the Orient and now employs two Chinese craftsmen from Hong Kong. He says:

We have enough equipment to keep a staff of 80 people busy, yet we have been only able to get 55 to 60.

Any comprehensive survey of the present position relating to mould-making shows that there is no quick and easy solution to the problem of finding or training skilled help.

However, certain points are emphasized by everybody concerned. One is that the prospect of filling vacancies with immigrants from Europe no longer offers a ready-made solution. Another is that much greater efforts must be made to attract and train young Canadians in the arts and crafts of tool-making, and some means must be found to keep them until the training is complete.

In addition to the skills shortage, Mr. Speaker, there is the problem of the American trade raid. The Ontario Department of Labour puts a limit on the number of hours the tool and die maker may work. The Ontario Department of Economics and Development goes far and wide in an attempt to drum up manufacturing opportunities for Ontario industry. The Ontario manufacturer who caters to the American market very often finds himself in the awkward and unenviable position of having to refuse business, or of not being able to meet U.S. deadlines on work orders, as a result of the shortage of skilled help, and of not being able to work his employee the number of hours overtime required to complete the job.

This procedure has two distinct drawbacks. First, the manufacturer loses out on the U.S. contracts because he cannot pro-

duce; and, second, the tool and die skilled craftsman, who would like to work many more overtime hours, becomes dissatisfied and, being in great demand, is enticed to work in the United States where he is guaranteed a fifty-hour work week and \$1 to \$1.25 hourly pay differential, plus the seven per cent bonus on his American money.

Mr. Speaker, while there is such a shortage of skilled help, and while most of the plastics industry is working on U.S. orders, I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Labour that he permit the skilled help to work more overtime hours. Such procedure might tend to keep this class of worker in Canada rather than have him go into the U.S. Mr. Speaker, I make this suggestion at this time because there are too many jobs available for the too few skilled. As soon as skilled help is more readily available, the work week should be reduced. Failure to keep our skilled help satisfied, especially in U.S. border areas, may result in Canadian plants, which gear a very large percentage of their production for the U.S. market, pulling out of Canada and basing themselves in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have used the plastics industry just as an example of one industry that is at a serious disadvantage because of the shortage of skilled workers. I would like to turn to another topic and that is post-secondary education. The following resolution was adopted by the Windsor city council in November of 1965:

That the proposal of the Windsor board of education for the establishment, on the 60-acre site acquired by the province in 1964 on Highway No. 3, of a college of applied arts and technology, which would embrace the present functions of Western Ontario institute of technology and other courses and trades training and applied arts, be strongly endorsed and that the Minister of Education be informed accordingly.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was not only approved by the Windsor city council but has the endorsement of the following bodies: the administrative management society, the American society of metals, the American society of tool and mechanical engineers, the association of professional engineers, the board of education of the city of Windsor, the board of education of the town of Riverside, the chamber of commerce, the chemical institute of Canada, the city of Windsor, the Essex-Kent purchasing association, the federal government, the Greater Windsor foundation, the industrial commission, the

materials handling society, the Ontario association of certified engineering technicians and technologists, Ontario industrial educational council, the society of automotive engineers, the Windsor *Daily Star*, the tool manufacturing association, the University of Windsor, Windsor construction association, Windsor and district labour council, and the Western Ontario institute of technology. All of these eminent bodies, Mr. Speaker, have asked this government to provide the facilities that I have mentioned.

Mr. Reaume: What is the government for?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Look in *Hansard*.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): What does the hon. member for Muskoka say about this?

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): You do not give me a chance to speak.

Mr. Thompson: You will have a chance.

Mr. Newman: I think the hon. Minister there should take care of the pollution in Lake St. Clair and Lake Huron, from the gas drilling.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, allow me to continue.

A widely representative meeting of leaders in the Windsor community—I have mentioned the numerous groups—was convened on November 17, 1965, at which time the functions and operations of the new type of college were explained. The enthusiasm and support of those present, together with repeated statements of need for the graduates of such institutions, prompts the request that immediate steps be taken to establish a college of applied arts and technology in Windsor.

We suspect the fact that the province has acquired a site of some 60 acres in Windsor suggests that the probability of such an institution coming into being was in the thinking of your department. We have welcomed the statement of intention to construct on this site facilities for housing the Western Ontario institute of technology. We believe that now is the appropriate time to take the further step which would permit a broader service to the young people in this part of the province.

Although we were firmly convinced in our own minds that the need for a college of applied arts and technology was real and

valid, we invited expressions of opinion from civic bodies, business and industrial firms, and responsible organizations. This was done by written communication, and by a convening of the general meeting referred to above. All of the responses supported the opinion we have formed. Since you have kept in close touch with the operation of the Western Ontario institute of technology—and you should see the present institute—were you to drive through the city of Windsor and take one look at it you would leave your party immediately and join our ranks. You would really be ashamed, I believe.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: The present enrolment of over 400 in the institute of technology in the technology courses, and over 150 in the first and second years of the business courses, speaks well for the contribution it is making in the course of post-secondary education, the reports said. The enrolments in both the technology and the business courses would be even higher, they believe, were it not for the present problem of accommodation:

We would like to say something about the need for post-secondary courses in the other two fields: trades training and applied arts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish you would pay real close attention to this, because it is spelled out excellently to me.

Southwestern Ontario is, as you are aware, one of the foremost industrial areas in Canada. The prominent place which it has held in the field of automotive production sometimes tends to conceal the fact that its tool and die plants, as well as other non-automotive manufacturing plants, serve industry and business throughout Canada and to an increasing degree in other parts of the world particularly the United States. Such as industrial complex needs a considerable proportion of its personnel educated in the trades.

(Applause)

I am glad I got the support of the government in that fashion; I only wish that we could stir them to some other type of action now.

It has been stated that disaster in many trades areas in Canada has been averted only because of the importation of skilled tradesmen from other countries. We are told this source of supply is rapidly drying up. It would seem therefore that if Ontario's and Canada's industrial operation is to achieve all it should, we must intensify

the programme of trades training and we submit that the very nature of the economy here suggests emphatically that a programme of trades training be established in Windsor at the earliest possible date.

The second point here, Mr. Speaker:

The need for graduates in the various fields of the applied arts is one which we believe will increase greatly over the next few years. The great demand for services of graduates in courses of applied arts from the Ryerson polytechnical institute is indicative of the present need.

The limitation in the numbers that this institution can train, and the fact that it is so distantly situated in relation to a large number of people of the province who would like to enter courses of this type, suggests the need for additional schools of applied arts in convenient locations elsewhere. The heavily populated and highly industrialized area within commuting distance of an applied arts school located in Windsor would provide without question both the enrolment and the employment opportunities for its graduates.

I see the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is back. I hope he paid particular attention to my earlier remarks, Mr. Speaker.

An hon. member: He is gone again. Here again, gone again, Finnegan.

Mr. Newman: The third point, Mr. Speaker:

We should like to report further that we have at the request of The Department of Education and because we ourselves believe in it, endeavoured to promote the four-year programme in arts and sciences. We have met with gratifying success in our Windsor secondary schools, indicating that such a programme meets a vital education need for many of our young people.

It is attended by one handicap, however, in that up to now there appear to be too few avenues of post-secondary education opening up to the graduate of this programme.

That is referring to the four-year programme.

The first graduating students will be leaving our secondary schools in June, 1965. We will certainly endeavour to guide them into appropriate post-secondary courses but it is doubtful if many of them will be in a position to take advan-

tage of courses unless they are offered within commuting distances of their homes.

One typical request came to the board only this past week. We can see a real need for an institution which will provide trades training and courses in the applied arts for young people in this area, and we would respectfully request your early consideration and appropriate action.

Mr. Speaker, particularly appropriate action.

I would like to turn to another topic, and I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) is not here because this directly concerns him. This is the grade 13 fiasco of 1965.

I am reading from an editorial, dated December 30, 1965:

LARGE MARGIN OF ERROR IN MARKING EXAMS

The Ontario Department of Education can have taken no pleasure in announcing the results of appeals on grade 13 examinations. Some 50 per cent of the appeals succeeded. Put it another way, this means the original examiners were wrong in about 50 per cent of the papers which came up for review. Were they 50 per cent wrong in all other papers where students either passed or failed?

Indeed, the margin of error was much more than 50 per cent in certain subjects, especially English and French. Of the 5,253 appeals on English, 3,317 succeeded; whereas in French, where there were fewer papers and fewer appeals, 1,844 succeeded. The high percentage of successful appeals in English appears to bear out complaints that there was something wrong with the English paper. Either it was inordinately tough or the marking of it was unduly tough. These appeals, of course, were by students who had failed certain papers by a few marks, but not all those bothered to appeal so some must suffer from the possibility they were undermarked.

Dr. T. C. White, director of education, points to another hardship. Many students going after scholarships just failed to attain them perhaps only in one subject such as English. Were the 50 per cent margin of error applied to their papers, many might have qualified for scholarships. Thus they or their parents are out of money. They, of course, had no right of appeal.

There is a third factor difficult to assess. The errors in marking may have interfered with students getting into the universities or into the courses of their choice. There is not an issue of academic interest only.

Grade 13 students are at an important juncture in their careers; their careers can be interfered with or even changed for life by success or failure at an examination. The Department of Education, if it indulges in any soul-searching, must be concerned about what the remarking of those grade 13 papers has shown; at least it should be. The marking of examination papers, except perhaps in mathematics, can never be an exact science, as different markers have different attitudes. But a 50 per cent margin of error can neither be explained nor excused.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to read from the *London Free Press* of January 24; I am reading from the press report by Dell Bell:

One principal says he had a student appeal five papers and got all five. Another school authority says he heard of one youngster who appealed three papers, all under 40, and got them. Veteran London teacher Margaret Falona said 17 students in her school, the G. A. Wheable school, flunked French with marks in the 35 per cent range and all were granted appeal passes.

Mr. W. L. Clark, in the "As We See It" column in the *Windsor Star* on December 30, has a short article that is very fitting, very apropos. It is headed:

VICTIMS OF INCOMPETENCE

Something went dreadfully askew in the marking of Ontario grade 13 examination results this summer. Many young men and women appealed their poor marks. More than half of the applicants were successful in having their grades bettered.

If half of those who appealed had been wrongfully marked, about the same average would probably have held for those who did not appeal. These just accepted the markings and let it go at that.

If this is typical of the marking efficiency in Ontario departmental examinations, then something should be done to rule out the incompetence. Many a student's future could be ruined by such incompetence of a marker. From an educational point of view, it is a disgraceful show of inefficiency; worst of all, many a young man or woman is the innocent victim of this affair.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to have a repeat performance of this this year? This is a real shame.

I can only ask the hon. Minister to straighten up this grade 13 situation; and he

can very easily straighten it up by simply eliminating grade 13 and absorbing it in the other twelve years. Let us bring Ontario's educational system in tune with the rest of Canada and have only 12 grades.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refresh your memory about a most unusual story on Wednesday, September 15:

OJIBWAY WENT WET TODAY

The town's total voting population, all two of them, voted unanimously to have liquor, beer and wine sold on licensed premises in the community.

Mr. Reaume: And both got a job after it it was all over.

An hon. member: They are the vendors, are they?

Mr. Reaume: Oh, the goings-on are something terrible.

Mr. Newman: To continue:

The vote was forced after the Windsor Raceway Holdings Limited applied for a licence in time for the opening of the multi-million-dollar racetrack in the 2,200-acre town. Ojibway has been dry since incorporation.

Mr. Speaker, another article appearing on October 22, 1965, is quite interesting:

RACEWAY GETS LIQUOR IN A HURRY

Toronto—The Ontario liquor licence board issued licences for the new Windsor raceway on Thursday afternoon with uncustomary haste.

Get that word, Mr. Speaker, "uncustomary."

The board approved and issued the necessary licence at an afternoon meeting in time for the track to be able to sell liquor at its opening Thursday night.

The board acted much more speedily on this than it usually does. The raceway application was only heard in Windsor a few weeks ago. The usual practice is for the board to get around to considering licence applications some time after they are made and then to issue an approval. This approval is conditional on the premises being satisfactory after inspection. Then a licence is issued.

The spokesman for the board said that, in the case of the track, it being completely new, from their reports the premises were satisfactory and no waiting period was needed.

Mr. Speaker, I just wonder if all applicants to the liquor licence board get such quick

service and similar treatment. How come the Maple Leaf house in the city of Windsor has been waiting for over a year for its licence?

Mr. Reaume: They are good Liberals, that is why.

An hon. member: Tell them where they got the charter.

Mr. Newman: We will not go into the charter problem.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education recently announced a wider use of television in education. This is all well and good, but if Canada is to maintain its bilingual nature, and if French is to remain as one of the official languages of the country, and if French is to be continued to be taught in some of our primary and most of our secondary schools, then, Mr. Speaker, our youth must be given more than just classroom exposure to the language.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he not only set up an educational TV network, but that he also recommend that French radio outlets be made available to various areas of the province, especially where the population numbers of the French are substantially large.

The French were the original settlers of the land bordering the Detroit river. In fact, the first French settlement in Ontario was in the Windsor-Essex county area. And, according to the 1961 census, there are 40,892 people of French extraction—out of a total population of 193,000—in Metropolitan Windsor; 21.5 per cent of the people are of French descent.

In all Canada—excluding Quebec, where 81 per cent of the population is French, and New Brunswick where 39 per cent is French—only 10 per cent of the population in the other provinces is French. My area has a French population of approximately 21.5 per cent. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the hon. Minister of Education and others look upon the teaching of French from a slightly different angle so that we could have our youngsters learn or be exposed to French by means of French radio stations. I think they should be interspersed throughout various parts of Ontario—not necessarily high-powered stations but ones that could be heard in a limited area.

I would like to bring up just one more topic, and that is a topic that is quite dear to me because of my family background. Mr. Speaker, the year 1966 is a most memorable one for the Polish people in Ontario, in Can-

ada, and throughout the world. While Canada will be in the last year of its preparation for the celebration of 100 years of existence as a nation, Poland will be commemorating the greatest and most sacred anniversary which Poles in the 20th century can celebrate—namely, 1,000 years of Christianity under the patronage of Our Lady of Czestochowa, the heavenly queen of Poland.

When Poland, under Prince Mieszko, first embraced Christianity in the year 966, the souls of the Polish people were imbued with a sacred characteristic, a new religious and supernatural element which became part and parcel of Polish life and culture. The love of God and the love of neighbour are the very essence of Christianity; and, upon this foundation, Poland's ideology, Poland's philosophy of life, and Poland's *raison d'être* as a nation were built and developed. Accepting Christianity, Poland thus pledged to remain loyal to God, to walk under the standard of Christ.

During the thousand years of its life as a Christian nation, in time of fame and glory, of misfortune and martyrdom, of heroic struggle for existence and freedom, Poland merited the title, "*Polania semper fidelis*"—"Poland ever faithful." In the annals of every European nation, beginning with pagan Rome and Greece, Christianity was indeed the turning point of that nation, but not its whole history. With Poland it was different. Poland's history begins with its acceptance of Christianity. Thus the history of Poland is the history of a Christian nation. Poland and Christianity are one.

Celebrations commemorating this holy jubilee year, the thousandth anniversary of Christianity in Poland, in union with all other Polish people throughout the world, has already started; it started on January 1 with a Mass of thanksgiving.

I am sure that each and every hon. member of this House looks forward to the day, in the not-too-distant future, when Poland, that bulwark against the forces of communism, will once again regain its freedom and walk proudly on the side of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, my speeches on the Throne debate are always lengthy, because of the problems of my community. They are many. I do not agree with the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Thrasher) who says, on page 270 in *Hansard*, that we have no problems. We have numerous problems.

Mr. Reaume: Who said that?

Mr. Newman: The hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich says on page 270 that we have no problems.

Mr. Reaume: Oh well, he does not know what it is all about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, when the estimates of the various departments are considered, I shall ask the following to be given proper consideration: A provincial public building in the area; an immediate start to the construction of the proposed E.C. road—third concession ring road; a provincial park along the south shore of Lake St. Clair in Essex county; the establishment of a seignery along the banks of the Detroit River on the same basis as Upper Canada Village was established, to promote historical culture and to attract tourists; an accelerated programme for the elimination of level crossings along 401, the Macdonald-Cartier freeway; the resurfacing of all of Highway 401 in Essex county; the elimination of discrimination because of age.

And likewise, Mr. Speaker, at this time I think I should bring up to the attention of this House the fact that commuter services have been denied to the city of Hamilton. There are 12,000 known commuters from Hamilton to the city of Toronto. Surely were these 12,000 people to use the train, rather than the highway, it would be a tremendous safety factor to our highways. As it today, the commuter services will go only to Burlington. I wonder what justification the government has for not extending services to Hamilton? After all, Hamilton is the second largest city in Ontario. Surely you should have extended commuter services between the two biggest cities, Toronto and Hamilton?

To the hon. Minister of Labour—he is not here but I would certainly ask him to look into the possibility of settling the transport strike in the province. It is having a serious effect throughout the province. Likewise, to that hon. Minister, there is a building strike that is hurting my own community as far as housing is concerned. If he could do anything to remedy or to overcome or to settle that strike, it certainly would be appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude my remarks, I would like to thank the hon. members who have stayed so patiently in the House, and it was a pleasure to deliver them.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Throne debate, I would first like to extend my very best wishes for your success in your high office, during this term of the Legislature. I would also like

to extend congratulations to your deputy, the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly).

I would also like to extend a welcome to the two new members of the House, namely, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith), who is a fellow pharmacist and no doubt will back me in defending the reputation of pharmacy as a profession that serves the people of this province; also the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben).

I would also like to extend congratulations to the mover (Mr. Knox) and seconder (Mr. Carton) of the Throne speech, which was presented by hon. W. Earl Rowe, the Lieutenant-Governor of this province.

The result of continuing government leadership and support is visible all over this province in the form of increasing industry, more public parks, more public works and services, expanding services, and the bringing of equal privileges and opportunities to all parts of this province.

This is also true in my riding of Perth, which I have the honour to represent. Perth county is possibly the most central county in western Ontario, and a very prosperous county. It has the city of Stratford in its midst, a city of some 22,000 persons, and it is a centre of culture, as many of you know. No doubt many of you have attended the Shakespearean festival, and if you have not, I would certainly suggest that you should at an early date. This year they have an enlarged programme and I am sure you would enjoy it.

Just a few weeks ago, in fact on January 19, in my own area, the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Roberts) accompanied by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), and the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), officially opened the new regional children's centre, on Highway 23 near Palmerston—for which we are very grateful. I am sure the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) will be happy this institution has been completed, because it has been a source of worry to him for several years.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The federal government started that.

Mr. Edwards: If he would come and see it some day, he would say it was well worth the time and the effort. I might say, at the present time, that there are some children already in it and more coming. It also serves as a school for the retarded children of the town of Listowel.

At this opening, which was in the afternoon, there were some 800 present, including

the hon. member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) and the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root). To show the interest of the people, at the afternoon ceremony there were 800 present, yet at the open house, in the evening, there were over 2,000 people who took the tour of that institution. And it is, I am sure, one of the finest. This project is the result of the present government's planning in building this type of institution around the province in various centres to serve retarded children.

Also in my county, plans are going forward through public works for a new teachers college replacing the ancient building, which has been there since the early 1900s. This has been authorized and approved by the Treasury board, I understand.

In view of the need for extra funds in the hon. Provincial Treasurer's (Mr. Allan's) Budget last night, we are very happy to see some of this money come back to the source where a large part of it is collected. After all, if we see something tangible it does not hurt so much to pay some of these taxes.

We should also urge that the regents appointed to examine sites for the new junior colleges take a good look at the number of students who would be available, through the established institutions that are in our county at the present time, to make a basis for sufficient students to support one of these institutions.

I would like, at this time also, to express and commend the work of the various boards who guide the education made available in the county of Perth. I, personally, have received a number of letters which indicate the type of job that is being done in improving the knowledge and increasing the earning power, as a result of the training programme 5 which takes place at North-western school in Stratford.

I have a letter, a portion of which I should like to read to you—this is not out of a newspaper, this is a real honest-to-goodness letter. I would like to show this—it is from a lad who took advantage of this training programme 5—it is a P.S. after another letter:

I would like to show you the benefit of programme 5 from my own situation. I had my grade 12 in high school and worked with my dad on the farm. For five years I rented the apple orchard from him but returns were uncertain. For four years I worked at a variety of jobs \$30 to \$60 per week. I took the first drafting course offered and graduated after 10 months in February 1964.

I started working at Stratford Machine

and Tool Company at \$63 a week and, after a year-and-a-half, I was making \$72.90 for a 45-hour week. When I left they hired another programme 5 graduate.

I left there in August to take a position as the only draftsman for the Dominion Chain Company, a new factory in Stratford which employs over 300 people. I have had a raise since Christmas and now make \$90 a week, plus a lot of fringe benefits, for 37½ hours per week.

Without the opportunity to take this course I certainly would not make this kind of money. I feel there is still opportunity for advancement in my position. I wish more people would take this training. The extra money being paid now would be quite a help. When I took the course I received \$30 a week; had a wife, three boys, and supplied free board to a 16-year-old sister-in-law. I can recommend the training to anyone with ability and the will to work.

This goes to prove the wisdom and the results of the education policy which has been carried on by this government.

Mr. Trotter: The federal government started that.

Mr. Edwards: Yes, I am quite aware, but after all we have direct contact with the people in this province. The federal government do a lot of things which they are not too happy to take credit for—the hon. member does not mention them.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is a good idea.

Mr. Edwards: I would like to bring to the attention of this House that there are, in our riding, a number of farmers who suffered greatly as a result of the weather conditions at the time of harvest last fall. But, on account of there not being a great group of them in any one location, they would not qualify for assistance that some of the farmers in eastern Ontario were eligible for when that section was declared a disaster area. I would hope that some system of crop insurance may be resolved to cover such circumstances at a very early date.

The hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) and his department have done a very fine job in my area, and I would like to congratulate the efficient staff of the Highways department in that area. However, we are hoping for some future developments which would correct a few of the bad sections of highways, which I guess every

hon. member has. A contract has already been called for a certain mileage on Highway 23 from Monkton north. A similar call is greatly needed to correct a very bad stretch, south on 23, towards Mitchell.

The city of Stratford and the area need a more direct and marked route to Highway 401. This, I think, is a must, in view of the now congested character of Highway 7, with which I am sure you are all familiar. I am sure every hon. member of the House is fully aware of the great number of tourists and visitors who go to the Shakespearean festival and I would hope, at an early date and I expect before too long, it will be available. A presentation will be made to the hon. Minister on behalf of this project.

As hon. members know, there has been a plan set for traffic in road-building in the London area; there is a study now, I believe, being made of traffic in the Stratford area and the two are being meshed together. I think they will come up with not only a direct route to London, but also a direct route to tie in with 401.

In connection with industry in our county, I might say that the department has been very helpful to agencies involved in promoting industry. They have secured some very fine industries in Stratford recently. I might say they have a very active board of trade and industrial committees there. Any of the hon. members who have been out to the boat show will have noticed the Chris Craft firm has set its Canadian plant in Stratford. I believe it has four or five boats on exhibit. It is also one of the largest firms in the States. There are several others, such as Dominion Chain; and over the past ten or twelve years some 60 or 70 industries have come in that area.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Any new trust companies?

Mr. Edwards: Yes, there is a new trust company that came in from London, and it is happy to invest the savings of the people of that area. There has been one unfortunate thing happen, which could happen to anyone, yet the people will get over that—and will, I hope, regain confidence in well-managed concerns of that kind.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): No thanks to the Liberals.

Mr. Edwards: One thing that would be of great help to our county, and the riding I represent, would be a little more assistance from both the federal and provincial govern-

ments in trying to arrive at a decentralization of industry. We have much to offer in advantages, and way of living: We have good schools; we have good hospitals; good churches; we have a teachers college. We have everything that I think could be offered to bring up a family in a good environment.

We would only hope that, in the future, more industry would settle in our part of the province and other similar parts, and get away from this lining up for an hour-and-a-half to catch a bus or street car, lining up to do pretty near everything you do in the city.

Mr. Trotter: The hon. member needs a Liberal member there.

Mr. Edwards: The boards of trade and industrial committees should be congratulated and encouraged.

An interesting meeting was held just yesterday in Mount Forest, at which my hon. colleague from Wellington-Dufferin was present. A protest has been launched and forwarded to the federal government to protest the way these low tax exempt areas are set up. Apparently some of the municipalities have lost industries to others as a result of this tax exemption available to industries. We think this is very unfair, and we think that if they are going to set up regions of that kind they should include other places where there is slow growth, as well as Owen Sound, which our hon. friend (Mr. Sargent) represents.

While we were informed today in a question that the government was planning no protest regarding the discontinuing of the CPR Dominion train, I am inclined to kind of agree with the federal Minister of Agriculture that it is about time the railroads assumed some of the responsibility for the privileges they have received in the past.

Regarding rail transportation in our area, it means a lot in the development of further industry and good services in connection with the cities of Toronto and London, and others.

For about a period of six years, Canadian National Railways in our area have been downgrading services completely. In fact, I have in my mind a copy of the presentation which has been made to all the municipalities in the affected area. This has to do with an application they have made to the board of transport commissioners to cut off passenger train service between Harriston and Owen Sound, Stratford and Listowel, and Stratford and Goderich. I think, to get an understanding of this, we should go back a period of years.

Some 95 years ago, and we have proof of this, these railroads were built by tax money in all these areas. I made a speech in the House some years ago; and I pointed out even at that time, and I have a clipping here from a Huron county paper which bears this out, that, going back 95 years ago, grants were paid by the municipalities to build these railroads in there.

The same thing happened, in the town of Listowel; it paid \$30,000. The townships of Minto, of Maryborough and Wallace, and the town of Palmerston, paid \$15,000 over 90-some years ago to build these railroads. They were built there with a team and a man at \$1 a day, but they were built. And these railroads over the years have served the people well up there, till somebody gets an idea and a new set of bookkeeping, and decides to take the express by truck instead of taking it on the rails.

As a result, they lost the mail, back six or seven years ago; the postal department decided to truck the mail. Yet I still see mail going on some of the trains out of Toronto. The trains are still running, by the way, up our way, but they do not carry mail any more. And they are running—at least half running, because six years ago, after they introduced these new Budd cars up there, they were going to give a greatly improved service; but they did not tell the people that they were going to cut half of it off shortly. Now there is one a day down in the morning, and one back at night.

In the case of the Goderich line there is one up at noon, and one back two hours after. If a man from Goderich is up on the Huron county line he has to spend two nights in Toronto to do a day's business. That is the service they are giving up in that area. It is not geared to carry the traffic.

In fact, I have had occasion to use the train quite often lately. A week ago Sunday night I came down. There was one diesel coach on the train; it had accommodation for 60 and there were 129 on it. There were 40 in the baggage car. The same evening they did not have a Budd car to come down the Southampton line, they had an old coach; there were no lights in it even. And it arrived down late; they arrived at Palmerston and had to stand up the rest of the way to Toronto. That is the service they are giving.

How often does the public have to take that kind of service? I mention this because I maintain, if they give service and the proper equipment; they would get the business; because nobody wants to drive down to Toronto this time of the year and have to park his

car. It costs you more to park your car than the fare is from Palmerston to Toronto on some days. And somebody mentioned rates, in the House just the other day, so another thing I think we should make is a presentation with regard to rates.

Back not a year ago, the minimum express rate was \$1.75; today it is \$2.75. The cheap passenger fare—and you could bring yourself and you could weigh more than 100 pounds—is \$2.50; yet the express rate is \$2.75 per 100. It would nearly pay you to come down and get it.

I mention these things because it does have a direct effect on the economy of the area. We all know that both the Canadian Pacific and CNR are subsidized federally, to a great extent, to keep the rates down on certain items. Yet I do think that if they succeed in getting their application through as they have presented it, it means that everybody north of the main line—that is, Guelph, Kitchener, Stratford, London—will all be treated as second-rate Canadians, second-rate citizens, and I do not think it is right.

I would appeal to all the areas which are affected. I have clippings here from all the papers. I do not believe in reading all the clippings I get but here is Trenton, Goderich; in both these lines, there are protests going in. I would hope that all the municipal officials and our federal members would make a strong presentation in order to keep this service going. We are in a period of expansion all through Ontario and to have trains cut off is not a good indication of the confidence they have in this part of the country.

All you have to do is take a drive through any of our smaller communities and our small cities and you can see progress and expansion right now. I think they should be trying to induce more industry to come into some of these areas and build up the different parts of the province. Nothing makes an area so good as to have employment facilities there. I think it is the duty of government and industry to try to plan productive jobs for people so that they can earn a living in that way.

As I said before, the local taxes have built up these roads. It has been said it is because of the way they show the bookkeeping that the passenger service does not pay; they do not tell you how much freight they carry. For instance, I guess in one small village I know of, it is over \$300,000 a year. I suppose in the city of Owen Sound it is over \$1 million on one railroad alone.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Edwards: There is no other business in the world that gets all the cream. There is an obligation to the people there to give the service. Nobody asked for the express to be taken off these trains. If we still had the express on the trains, then it would be possible to run them. But if they just go for the passenger business under the conditions and the way they have discouraged passengers, I do not know why some of them would run that way.

Speaking of expansion, we can take Durham—a \$1 million addition to its factories—yet there is no service provided up there at all unless they have a carload lot going up. I mentioned the rates, and I think that in order to protect ourselves from being second-class citizens north of Guelph, we should do something about it.

It was very interesting hearing what was said tonight in regard to housing for senior citizens, and general housing. I am very pleased to say that we have some housing for senior citizens in our area and there are more planned and applied for. It has done a wonderful job and there is a great need for it.

I am also very happy that the government has seen fit to say that they are going to license our nursing homes, and control nursing homes. It is one of the greatest problems we have. And there are more people coming to you regarding problems of the aged than anything else, and I speak from experience. I have been a member for some time, and I have always felt it my duty to try to help that class of person who, through no fault of their own, are in very difficult positions. I would also recommend that I think the hospital services commission should take a little different view on the number of nursing homes that they do accredit, because there are people in great need of that care.

Employment has been very good, and there have been no great labour troubles in my area, yet I suppose sometimes—and I say this is quite right when I see the enormous profits made by the car industries and different other industries—that maybe we should have more money. One of the things that I think is that, when they show that kind of profit, they are making maybe more money than they should. Maybe the cost should be reduced a bit to the consumer.

One of the most important things that we have is what the consumer has left when he gets through paying his bills, and the cost has risen to such a degree in so many things that he has not too much left. For this reason, I think capital and labour and all

merchandising should take a look at whether we are taking more than a fair profit. If there was such a thing as a fair profit, it has been said, we would not have half the troubles we do have in the world. There has been quite a bit of publicity over the years about the conduct of the legal profession and the medical profession, and it was not too long ago that somebody was raking the druggists over for the money they made—in this House.

Mr. Bryden: Not the druggist, the pharmaceutical companies.

Mr. Edwards: Thanks for the correction. I hope you mean that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): The druggists just caught on.

Mr. Edwards: I have been a practising druggist myself for 41 years, and not too many of my friends got rich; but I do want to tell you that they gave good service for a great number of years, particularly in the small municipalities in Ontario. I also say that we have of lot of good doctors who do the same thing. We have a lot of doctors who are very busy men, but by the same token we have a lot of doctors who are allowing dispensing in their offices by untrained, unqualified help—and I do not mean maybe. It is about time that the pharmacists came into their proper role in their profession and did the dispensing, and let the doctors do the prescribing.

We hear a lot, and we have seen a lot in the past, in connection with the legal profession and their fees. In fact, I think the hon. member was saying something about their fees being all challengeable—the hon. member for Downsview, I think it was. Whether they are challengeable or not, they are pretty high; possibly it is because they have to make so much payment to make up some of the discrepancies in the clients' accounts. This happened, but we hope the public does not have to pay that. We hope that they assume their responsibility and measure up in paying some of the amounts that are still owing in Perth county.

I was very happy to hear the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) mention about having taxes reduced on property to senior citizens. I would hope our government would work to the eventual aim of taking all taxes for education off property. All you have to do is look at your own tax bill at home, and you see where the taxes are and the amounts of them—and you will see the point of that in my request.

When we get into the Budget debate, there are some other things I would like to cover; but I have rambled enough tonight to bring to the attention of the House a few of the things for which I do think, while they are not directly under the provincial jurisdiction, presentations should be made to the parties in Ottawa, so that we will get a fair deal and discontinue being second-rate citizens north of the main line.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all, as custom seems to demand, congratulate you upon your continued good sense as you occupy your position, and also congratulate the hon. member for Eglington (Mr. Reilly), for his elevation to the second post. I am sure that his Irish wit and his genial smile will add much to the annals of this chamber.

I also want to congratulate the two hon. members who have just come into this House via the by-election route. I would have preferred that other faces had been here, of course, but since they are, I wish them well and hope they make a real contribution to the Legislature in Ontario.

I was very interested to hear the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Edwards) plead with his own government to do those things necessary, so that his constituents would not continue to be second-class citizens. It is always refreshing to hear a government member talk that frankly to a government. I might say to him that the ranks are always open over here if he changes his mind, and decides that he wants to talk that way from another side of the House and have some effect—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Well, you fellows are all in jail. You have no freedom.

Mr. Young: —because no matter how long you talk this way to your friends over there, they take it with a grain of salt, I fear. Of course, they also may take some of the other hon. members with a grain of salt, too. That has happened in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I come from the great riding of Yorkview and, following up what has just been said, I can only add that in Yorkview the Conservative government over the past year has spent more money on highways than in any other single riding, I think, in the province.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): I would not say that. The highway comes into my riding, too.

Mr. Young: And Downsview, of course. The hon. member for Downsview points out that he has shared in this munificence of the government. And tonight I wanted at some length to discuss this matter of highways and highway safety, and I am afraid I have not time to do it effectively here. I am not going to presume upon the time of the House to go beyond the adjourning time that has been set. But I do want, when next my opportunity comes, to place before the House certain facts and figures, and certain suggested solutions, which I think we ought to face up to in a non-partisan way, and that very soon.

It was my privilege just yesterday to meet, in the city of Albany in New York, with the committee which is dealing with safety in that state. I have been interested in their work for some time and have been in touch with them as has Heward Craftey, the Conservative member of Parliament from Quebec. The two of us were invited to meet with the committee and listen to its hearings yesterday, and to meet with that committee informally and with its staff, prior to the hearing in the afternoon.

This proved to be an exciting and extremely rewarding experience. I have sent over tonight to the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) something of the work of that committee. It has undertaken as indicated in the House the other day, a study of a safety car, and has undertaken to build a prototype of such a safety car. Already the first part of that study has been completed, and is now in the hands of the hon. Minister. The other day, you remember, I asked him whether or not he might consider seriously the matter of working with this committee in the state of New York, if they so desired it, in order that Ontario might make its contribution to this project; because after all, with the international automobile agreement, we are desperately interested, and I think we are unified, in our interest in the whole automobile industry and in the problems attendant to it.

So I asked the hon. Minister whether or not he would welcome overtures from the state of New York in regard to operation on this project and he said:

This is rather hypothetical. I would hardly know how to answer it. I would say that The Department of Transport has had a continuing concern with the many aspects of highway safety as regards also vehicle design and maintenance. If, as a result of this project, some useful findings

come of it, I can assure the House that our department will give them very careful and detailed consideration.

Mr. Singer: And lengthy.

Mr. Young: I have some faith in the hon. Minister of Transport, and that it will not be too lengthy. I think the consideration can be done very quickly, and that his mind can be made up, and that he can make certain recommendations to the House within a reasonable length of time.

An hon. member: Do not count on it.

Mr. Young: I have so much faith that, when the committee met with us informally, and one of their first questions was: "What is Ontario going to do to help us in this project?" I said, and Mr. Graftey said, "We cannot speak for our respective governments. We have no power to do that. We are simply here as representatives in our own right. And, while we are members of Parliament and the Legislature, we cannot speak for government." And they quite understood that.

They asked us to convey to our respective Houses their desire that Ontario and New York, as well as Iowa and Illinois, represented there, should co-operate in a real project in connection with safety of motor cars. I told them I would convey this to the hon. Minister and that I would bring him the report, which I have done. So I convey to the hon. Minister this wish of theirs, and the secretary of the committee will be writing the hon. Minister officially within the next day or two to place this whole project before him and to explain it to him.

I will have something more to say about the details of the project as I saw it, and as Mr. Graftey saw it, and I hope Mr. Graftey will be in touch with his friends on the government side of the House, in this case in Ontario, to also urge them that they should take action in this regard, and to show them the vital significance of this project which is being undertaken in the state of New York.

This has the blessing of Governor Rockefeller, and more and more of the legislators in that state are coming to see the importance of car safety as well as highway safety and driver education, and they are driving forward on this project. But they say to us that it is hardly sensible that Ontario should go through all the programme of research and the inquiry which they have already done, and which has been done in various places in the United States. I assured them that we were making some experiments of our own—the salt corrosion problem is being investigated here, and Ontario is at least moving forward in some safety field. They felt that together we might do a real job and undertake a very significant project for the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these few remarks, perhaps I should call this debate to a halt tonight but I do want to place this whole problem and this whole project in detail before this House at the earliest possible moment, because I believe that the hon. Minister and all the hon. members of this House will be not only interested but fascinated in the things that are going on.

I have here some pictures of the safety car which is being built. These will be available. I have a couple of spare reports, and I would be glad to loan them to any hon. members of the House who might be interested in looking into this kind of project.

Mr. Young moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House, I understand that the debate on the Medicare bill will proceed in the morning.

Hon. Mr. Allan moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:30 o'clock p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, February 11, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

CONTENTS

Friday, February 11, 1966

Medical Services Insurance Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, second reading	438
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Young	458
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Young, agreed to	458
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	458

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1966

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as visitors to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from John G. Althouse public school, Islington.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all hon. members of the House will share my satisfaction over the settlement of the dispute between the Oshawa *Times* and the Toronto newspaper guild.

With differences cleared out of the way through responsible negotiations, it will now be possible for the newspaper and its staff to resume the public service which they have provided so ably in the Oshawa area.

Now this has been a difficult situation for all concerned. It must be noted, however, that without the responsible and co-operative approach that was taken by the parties during this past week, no settlement would have been possible. Both parties responded with complete good-will to my invitation last Monday to resume talks on Tuesday. There was no doubt in my mind that both wished to do all they could to bring about a settlement through collective bargaining.

In order that the climate for discussion would be favourable, the company took steps entirely on its own initiative to postpone the court proceedings that were pending for Tuesday morning, and did so again on Thursday morning.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under our system of free collective bargaining, a system that obviously works in spite of difficulties, the parties are not obliged to agree with one another. Nor does the government possess any instruments that would force them to agree with one another. Nevertheless, in this situa-

tion the process of give-and-take has brought them to a mutually satisfactory conclusion. I compliment the Thompson Company on its responsible and co-operative approach, and this applies as well to the Toronto newspaper guild.

Other issues came to prominence, Mr. Speaker, during the dispute, and these must, and will be dealt with, in an atmosphere of reason away from the immediate differences engendered by a particular dispute.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day: I am sorry the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) is not in his seat. The other day when he asked the question about some fires at Millbrook he asked a supplementary question and I promised to get the information for him.

The supplementary question was: Was there any damage subsequent to these particular fires?

The answer to that is: Inmates in some cells attempted to create a disturbance by banging on the furnishings and knocking dishes against the walls and doors. A few dishes were broken but actual property damage was negligible.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour, a copy of which has been submitted to him.

In view of the violence reported in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* over the truckers' strike, what efforts are being made by the hon. Minister of Labour to bring these parties together?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I and the officials of my department have been in constant touch with both the truckers and the union since their meetings last weekend. Depending on developments over this weekend I plan to call the parties together early next week in an effort to promote the resumption of negotiations.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I have another question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr.

Simonett), a copy of which has been submitted to him. Would the hon. Minister inform this House whether or not his department has investigated complaints of spillage from oil drillers into the natural water system in the Wallaceburg area?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, we have received complaints of spillage in the Wallaceburg area and I might say that personnel of the Energy department and the OWRC are investigating them at the present time.

Mr. Newman: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. Minister? Is the department considering the dropping of the ban on offshore drilling in the Lake St. Clair-Lake Huron regions?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Pardon, I did not get that.

Mr. Newman: Is the department considering dropping the ban on offshore oil drilling in the Lake Huron and Lake St. Clair areas?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member knows the policy as stated by the government and announced by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) two years ago and I might say there has been no change in that policy up to the present time.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, before the orders, I wish to announce the appointment of Professor Harold Robert Stuart Ryan, QC, to membership on the Minister's advisory council on the treatment of the offender and Mr. H. David Archibald to membership on the regional detention centre planning committee.

Professor Ryan and Mr. Archibald are associated with the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation. Professor Ryan is a member of its professional advisory board and Mr. Archibald is executive director of the foundation.

Mr. Archibald, a master of social work from the University of Toronto, has been responsible for the development of the foundation since its inception. As the hon. members well know the Ontario foundation, which operates an increasing number of clinic and hospital services throughout the province, was the first government-sponsored programme in this field in Canada. It has been designated by the world health organization as a model for work in this field.

The alcoholic is a tremendous problem in the local jail situation, and as the regional detention centre planning committee is entering into discussions on programming for the new centres Mr. Archibald, with his detailed knowledge of this problem, will make a great contribution to the formulation of effective programmes for the alcoholic.

Professor Stuart Ryan, faculty of law, Queen's University, taught criminology for five years and criminal law from 1957 until the present time.

He was the organizer and assistant director of a seminar on sentencing in 1962 and a seminar on the persistent offender in 1963. He led four seminars at the centre of criminology 1964-65 on theory of punishment and sentencing.

He is the author of many papers and articles which deal with the work of corrections. A former president of the John Howard society of Kingston, he is presently serving as vice-president of the John Howard society of Ontario.

Professor Ryan, with his expertise in criminal law and penology generally, will be of inestimable value to my advisory council.

We are very pleased to announce the appointment of these two gentlemen.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion for second reading of Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

(continued)

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, at the time the debate was adjourned yesterday I was just beginning to outline to you, sir, some of the history in this province of so-called Medicare. I was likening the performance of the government to a serial story—each year we get a new version. We have had Medicare '63 and Medicare '65 and now we have Medicare '66. The similarity between any one of the chapters of this serial, I think, is strictly coincidental.

I think it is important, sir, that we do refresh our memories and see the wild statements that the government has surrounded these various approaches with. The hon. Prime Minister got a little excited yesterday

afternoon when I was quoting some of the advertising—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Never excited, never excited.

Mr. Singer:—that was used by his party in the election of 1963. I was recalling to his mind—although I did not have the exact text before me then, I do have it now—just what was put in these advertisements. The advertisement read: “Medicare for everyone, not thought, but action” and then in a little square box the word “done.”

When you get a little farther down into the text you also find a big plan ably developed by the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Well, Mr. Speaker, that fraud was developed—I deliberately call it a fraud—on the basis of a bill having been introduced into this House and having been given only one reading. On the basis of that—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It actually had second reading. It was debated on principle.

Mr. Singer: All right! I accept the correction. Thank you, Mr. Prime Minister. On the basis of that, our good Conservative friends went out on to the hustings and they told everybody that they had done this wonderful thing—Medicare for everyone, not talk, but action.

Well, I say the only way to describe that is a fraud. It did not exist then, it does not exist now, but they did manage to pull the wool over the eyes of the people of Ontario in this first chapter of this wonderful, exciting, shocking Medicare serial story.

In 1965, Mr. Speaker, chapter two was this great new bill, two years later. Two years after the election a big plan, ably developed by the hon. Minister of Health, came in and there we were in 1965. We had this new bill and probably the most strenuous debate that has taken place in this House, certainly within recent years, probably in the history of the House.

But in any event, after all of this debate and the government saying “This is it, this is what we believe is right,” and the government using its majority, as is its right, to push the bill through, we had chapter two, Medicare '65.

I grant you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health is undoubtedly going to mention it, he has mentioned it before; he said he has never said the 1963 bill was the answer, nor that the 1965 bill was the answer, nor

even that the 1966 bill, the one we have before us today, is the answer.

But some of his more exuberant colleagues have taken some of this out of context, perhaps, and have said: “In 1963 we had the answer; in 1965 we certainly had the answer and now in 1966, this is the be-all and the end-all.”

Mr. Speaker, my appeal today to the government is this. Let us be frank and let us be honest with the people of Ontario. Let us tell the people of Ontario what the issues are.

Now, there are substantial issues. Substantial differences, Mr. Speaker, between the government and ourselves and the socialists as well, between the views expressed in this House as to what should be done.

Maybe, and I underline this word maybe, maybe the government has a case to present. But we cannot get at the case. They will not tell us what their case is. This is the real issue.

My colleagues, particularly my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson), have outlined at some length our grave reservations about the plan as it is presently being presented, so I am not going to review that.

But what I say, Mr. Speaker, is we must know what the issues are now between the federal government and the provincial government. And we cannot get that from the hon. Minister of Health. We have not got it yet from the hon. Prime Minister. I do not know whether we are going to get it later in this debate or not. But we cannot get those answers.

I was very fascinated to read a news story the other day when Mr. MacEachen, the federal Minister of Health, was interviewed by the press and this is what the press reports he said:

Hon. Minister Allan MacEachen reiterated yesterday that Ottawa will not compromise on Medicare to accommodate Ontario and other reluctant provinces. In an interview the federal Health Minister said the government will stand by its four principles as a reasonable and sound basis for a national programme despite holdouts by six provinces.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying, one of the holdouts is this great province of Ontario. My point again, and I am going to repeat it, my point again is if Ontario is holding out, why is it holding out? What are the differences?

We want those answers, we are entitled to those answers. The people of Ontario are

entitled to those answers and we have not got them during this debate.

These principles are universal coverage, comprehensive services, portability between provinces and government or non-profit agency operation. Mr. MacEachen said the government also aims to meet its July 1967 deadline for the introduction of the federal plan to provide approximately half the costs of the participating provinces.

Mr. Speaker, if the words of Mr. MacEachen mean anything, and I think they do, this seems to me to be an offer to the province of Ontario, somewhere in the vicinity of \$100 million. The figure \$115 million has been used, perhaps that is a more correct figure.

But I think the people of Ontario, having faced the awesome statement by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), the other day, where he is raising taxes by some \$200 million, I think the people of Ontario are entitled to know why the government of Ontario apparently is discarding out of hand more than \$100 million of federal money.

Is anyone in this House pleased that taxes had to be raised? Can anyone say that, anyone on the government benches?

Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North): They have said it.

Mr. Singer: Is anyone in this House pleased to see what the hon. Provincial Treasurer had to tell us the other day?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): You are pleased, and everyone else is regretful on this side of the House that any taxes had to be raised.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister of Mines perhaps is pleased. I am not and I do not think most of his colleagues are.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Everybody over there on your side of the House is pleased that taxes had to be raised.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, this tale of gloom and doom told by the hon. Provincial Treasurer could have been only half as doom-filled and only half as gloomy if the hon. Minister of Health had indicated how the province of Ontario could have accepted \$100 million or \$115 million of federal money.

Mr. E. A. Dunlop (Forest Hill): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. Singer: Certainly.

Mr. Dunlop: How much more does the hon. member estimate it would cost the province if they accepted the \$115 million? How much more would the province have to put into the medical services plan to fit the federal requirements?

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is a question. That is a bit of an argument, but let me try to cope with it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that the so-called answer to the so-called question is this. If the hon. Minister of Health had come into this House openly and frankly and said, "Here is the picture," if he had laid his cards on the table, if he had told us what the issues were, we would be able to intelligently discuss the point raised by the hon. member for Forest Hill.

Mr. Speaker, working in a vacuum—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, working in this vacuum as we are, being told yesterday afternoon by the hon. Minister of Health that he cannot tell us about these private discussions that go on with his friends, we have not got these answers. This is the point of my remarks today.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Singer: If the government was prepared to take this House into its confidence, to take the people of Ontario into its confidence, we could then determine whether or not the government of Ontario has a case.

In view of the fact that they will not take us into their confidence, in view of the fact that the cards are not laid on the table, in view of the fact that all the aces apparently are up the sleeve of the hon. Minister of Health, we do not know what is going on and we cannot tell.

Mr. Speaker, the government is condemned by reason of the lack of information that it has made available to the people of Ontario. Mr. MacEachen goes on—

An hon. member: And on, and on.

Mr. Singer: Well, I think it is the responsibility of the Minister of Health to go on federally and provincially and present things that are good for the people of Ontario

and Canada. My objection to the hon. Minister of Health here in Ontario, is that he does not go on in public. He does not go on and tell the people of Ontario what the issues are.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It has been going on and on for 47 years in Ottawa.

Mr. Singer: He says nothing. Now Mr. MacEachen goes on:

Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Saskatchewan have made commitments while Quebec is quite favourable to the federal scheme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. Minister of Health is not saying that the governments of Newfoundland and New Brunswick and Saskatchewan and Quebec—and we have heard mention perhaps that British Columbia is getting very close to this position as well—that all of these governments are stupid, all of these governments do not know what they are doing, all of these governments have sold out their birthright, all of these governments are accepting an obnoxious grant, and only he has superior wisdom and is holding out.

If all of these governments have carefully examined it—and I am sure the hon. Minister's colleagues, the gentlemen who hold similar portfolios in these other governments, are equally as conscientious as this hon. Minister, they studied it, they worried about it, they have consulted with their Provincial Treasurers and so on—surely if they found merit in the federal plan, then there must be something in it.

Surely then, if the hon. Minister of Health for the province of Ontario disagrees with them, and he disagrees with the federal Minister in Ottawa, can anything be more obvious than that he should get up in this House and say why?

What are the circumstances that keep him backing away? What is he trying to do? Why will he not take the people of Ontario into his confidence?

This article goes on. It now quotes Queen's Park—I do not know who it is at Queen's Park:

Queen's Park said no talks are planned between Mr. MacEachen and Ontario Health Minister Matthew Dymond although both will appear tonight on a University of Toronto panel discussion.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I think I have to point out to the House this is complete and total misreport-

ing because talks are going on between Mr. MacEachen and myself.

Mr. Singer: I accept the hon. Minister's statement on that, and I am glad to hear the hon. Minister correct that statement. What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if these talks are going on, what the points are that are still at issue. As I listened very carefully to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Health yesterday, I could not catch at all what the differences might be.

I was very interested in reading in this morning's paper the report on his speech, and the report of what he told the press outside the House. He told the press outside the House far more than he told the House. I just fail to understand why he was prepared to take the reporters into his confidence to a greater extent than he took the House into his confidence. The only conclusion I can come to, Mr. Speaker, is that he is afraid to state his case.

But the hon. Minister of Health, if this report—and could I ask the hon. Minister if he read the report in the morning paper? Is it substantially correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is not.

Mr. Singer: It is not substantially correct? Well, the poor old Minister of Health is always being misquoted, that is too bad. If the hon. Minister of Health is being persecuted by the press in that he is always being misquoted—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I have never suggested that I am being persecuted. The only people who exhibit tendencies or feelings of persecution are all on that side of the House. The press has never persecuted me and I do not think it is going to. The press have only a certain amount of space, sir, and I did not take the press any more into my confidence than I did this House.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the word "persecuted" was just a bit too strong, but in two articles in two days in two different newspapers the hon. Minister of Health has said these statements were incorrect. Perhaps he is not being persecuted, perhaps he is just being constantly misquoted. But I wish, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister has statements to make that are authentic and are meaningful, that he would make them in the House so that we can hear them. Then we will have them in *Hansard*, we can have the record there, and we can see exactly what he did say.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What I said in the House is in *Hansard*.

Mr. Singer: Yes, but what you said to the reporters, and what the reporters said you said to them, is not in *Hansard*, and it goes much further apparently than what you said to the House yesterday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The hon. member does not like statements before the orders of the day.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I am awfully sorry that the government cannot really recognize their responsibility in this most serious debate. Mr. Speaker, to reduce this matter to its simplest terms, we have before us a so-called Medicare bill. The hon. Minister is anxious to bring something into effect this year.

Someone quoted, yesterday, from Mr. Justice Hall's report, and talked about our duty as a nation. I ask, Mr. Speaker: Where does Ontario stand as a part of the Canadian nation in Medicare? I think we are entitled to that answer; we have not had it from the hon. Minister of Health. We have had no explanation as to why Ontario apparently is turning down \$100 million or \$115 million; we have had no answers as to what the differences are.

I feel certain, Mr. Speaker, if the government felt in its heart, if it really believed that it had a case to make, it would not hesitate to bring the facts before this Legislature. My only explanation for this is that it knows it has a weak case. It is afraid to talk about it in public, and it is avoiding its duty, its real responsibility of bringing the people of Ontario into the picture in this most important point.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any point in belabouring these obvious facts any longer. I would urge the hon. members of the House, and I would urge my good friends over here, the socialists on my left, to vote—well, they really have no choice, there is only one vote. The authority on the rules, the hon. member for Woodbine, knows this.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker is the authority on the rules. Ask him.

Mr. Singer: Well, the hon. member has apparently replaced him.

I would hope that they would vote with good heart and with good conscience, the way they spoke last year and the way they voted last year; because it is only in a united way that we are going to get these things

properly before the people of Ontario, and it is only in a united way that we are going to provide the best plan. I would think the government could and should take as its watchword the slogan that they coined for the '63 election—that we will have Medicare for everyone in Ontario, not talk, but action. We have not got it yet.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): I thought the hon. member had something to say.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the hon. member for Downsview expounding his theory, and the theory of his party, with regard to the Medicare bill. Many of the points which he raised I think we are in full agreement with. The one thing the people in our group are concerned about, however, is that it took the party on our right so long to come over to our line of thinking.

Mr. Speaker, I have been reading with great interest last year's statement by the hon. Minister of Health when he introduced his short-lived version of what he considered at that time a Medicare scheme. The hon. Minister said, of Bill No. 136 on May 11, 1965:

It will be voluntary. Although many cry for compulsion, an equal or even greater number cry out against it. The records in Ontario show that, given the opportunity, our people do not want, do not like and would rather not have compulsion.

On the one hand, the hon. Minister establishes the fact that many Ontario people want a compulsory Medicare scheme. On the other hand, he establishes the fact that many, or perhaps even more people, are against a compulsory scheme.

The hon. Minister's basis for this alleged fact is, in his own words, the records in Ontario. But, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. Minister goes to such pains as to assure us indirectly that, if the majority of Ontario people were for compulsory Medicare, this government would introduce a compulsory scheme, where are the figures on which he makes his case? The hon. Minister's trouble, and that of all the government front- or back-benchers who rise to denounce the so-called compulsory scheme, is that there are no statistical figures at all.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The Gallup poll—

Mr. Freeman: The hon. Minister has a lot of faith in Gallup polls.

Mr. Bryden: A poll like that means nothing. The remarkable thing is that so many people said compulsory in relation to a question like that.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Tell me what has happened to the government of Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member for Fort William has the floor.

Mr. Bryden: What has happened to the plan in Saskatchewan? The plan in Saskatchewan is in full force; has the hon. Minister not heard?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Freeman: But the hon. Minister of Health knew very well why he glossed over the so-called records in Ontario. The fact is there are no records.

At any rate, let me stray into the semantics of that much used word "compulsion" and this I think is worthy of some thought. And I quote from the *Concise Oxford Dictionary of Current English*, as adapted by Fowler and Fowler, 3rd edition, 1942; and I may say, Mr. Speaker, that I do not believe that in the 24 years since that edition "compulsion" would have undergone a radical change in meaning.

Compulsion, according to this dictionary, means, "Constraint, obligation." Now I think all would agree that of the two words we should use "obligation" to do something rather than "constraint" from doing something. Who is under obligation when we think of Medicare? We firmly believe that this government is under the obligation of providing to each and every citizen the necessary health care at the lowest possible cost to the citizens. That, we all agree, is only possible when the Medicare scheme is administered on a non-profit basis by the government—in other words, by the people of this province. All too often hon. members of this government speak against themselves when they argue that government should not become an all-engulfing Moloch that dictates to the people.

Let me return briefly to the words "compulsion" or "obligation." This government has been whining away for years that the people of this province should not be obliged to accept the Medicare scheme, but that is not what compulsory Medicare means. This government keeps repeating that each person must have a choice of his own health care insurance. What kind of choice does the

average citizen have? He can choose between a private scheme, by which he helps the carriers get fatter and fatter financial paunches; he can pick a group insurance scheme that is on-again, off-again when he changes his job; he can also choose not to be insured, particularly when he does not have the \$150 a year necessary under the provisions of the new bill. That is Bill No. 6.

If we could be sure that every citizen, no matter how well or how badly educated, would do the right thing and say on every pay day: "Well, I must make sure to put away the money for my family's health care before I pay rent, buy food, clothes, pay other bills that are overdue." Mr. Speaker, the human mind just does not work that way. To assume such large budgeting would presuppose that every citizen is a financial wizard who tries to make his, let us say, \$75-a-week wages fit an expenditure commitment of \$85 or more—\$100 if you like.

But I am not speaking of the poor; I am thinking of the low- and middle-income groups that do not qualify for free coverage under this Medicare scheme in Bill No. 6. No, Mr. Speaker, the word compulsion or compulsory alludes to this government. It has an obligation to the people to provide them with a Medicare scheme financed out of premiums, out of taxes or out of money already in the Treasury.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): We cannot pay any more taxes now, after the Budget.

Mr. Freeman: Eventually, of course, everyone covered by the compulsory Medicare scheme will pay for the health services he receives, but a compulsory scheme means also that the distribution of the burden is equitable. Under Bill No. 6 it is inequitable. It is a statistical fact, Mr. Speaker, that the rich have more imaginary ailments than the poor. Most doctors will confirm that, and figures compiled by various medical associations prove that.

When I mention more equitable distribution of the burden, I mean, of course, that those persons and institutions who are wealthy should be hit harder with the kind of taxation that would provide the money to finance a compulsory Medicare scheme.

I am all in favour of having the mink-coated dowager, with a twitch in her eyelid, who must be nursed, coddled and operated on and alpha, beta or gamma-rayed expensively, pay a little more than the man with eight children who cannot be looked after

medically because he dreads the extra expense not covered by Bill No. 6.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what compulsory Medicare means to me and to everyone with a grain of common sense. But, of course, we cannot expect the hon. Minister of Health to display any common sense in this case because he is a doctor who cannot bring himself to believe that some people have trouble getting along on their pay. We cannot expect the hon. Minister of Health to abandon his precious 18th-century conception of free enterprise which, to him, means socialism for the rich and free enterprise for the poor.

Mr. Speaker, let me end my remarks on this note. We need in the field of health care neither of these two fashion symbols, socialism or free enterprise. All we need, and I mean all of us, is a medical care insurance plan that guarantees our right to the best health care available without discrimination. The provisions of Bill No. 6, unfortunately, do not meet this requirement.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I have sat here patiently listening to this debate, not only this year but in former years, and I have not taken a part simply because I thought all of the ground was covered. I felt that with the debate from both sides of the House and the many points that were made, the problem was settled and by this day we would have had something that was badly needed.

I decided to get into this debate a short period before that outburst a day or two ago when they were deciding who was going to take what part and how they were going to approach this serious problem. I think, hon. gentlemen in this House, regardless of your political stripes, we have a serious problem. We have something to do for our people, regardless of how we believe it. I thought the best approach of the lot was made about a week ago when the Prime Minister was at the Royal York hotel with a group of his followers and many other friends. He outlined the proposition to the people at that time. I liked the comments I read in the paper and I think they are worth repeating. He made this statement: "Seven months after the federal government offered to pay half of the shot"—as they put in here in the paper—"for a national Medicare programme"—and he goes on—"the result is that the federal Cabinet is squeezed between its back benches." You see, Mr. Speaker, they have the same problem there that you have here.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not say that, did I?

Mr. Bukator: No, I am talking about the Prime Minister of Canada. We had better put the record straight. I was speaking about the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada, Rt. hon. Mr. Pearson.

We have made an excellent point, Mr. Speaker. The Prime Minister of this province has said he is a fine gentleman. I think that this particular debate will have to come down to the Prime Ministers of the provinces and the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada rather than the hon. Minister who has had three meetings on this issue and has not as yet come to any particular conclusion. Now then, I read on:

We cannot impose policies and programmes on provinces in respect to matters within their jurisdiction.

Mr. Dunlop: He tried.

Mr. Bukator: Pardon?

Mr. Dunlop: He just tried.

Mr. Bukator: I would think that I would take the word of the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada in this respect. He was speaking to a lot of people and I do not think he was trying to deceive anyone.

Mr. Dunlop: Never does.

Mr. Bukator: If some of the people who are representing the public in this province and in the Dominion of Canada would apply the tactics of the Prime Minister of Canada, I think we would get somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You are reaching.

Mr. Bukator: I am not reaching; I am reading an account of another individual and I would like to make some comments on it.

We were making some comments about the hon. Minister while we are on this particular subject. The hon. Minister of Health himself, a little while ago got up like a banty rooster, and was waving his arms and flailing the air. Someone said that he was a fine gentleman. Yes, he is one of the finest when you talk with him, but here he puts on a new hat and he becomes a politician. I might say, as an individual who has sat here and watched him for six years, that it is not becoming to the doctor.

I think we have to get down to the facts of this particular problem, and the problem that is outlined briefly in this particular account.

We cannot impose policies and programmes on provinces in respect to matters within their jurisdiction, and we

will have to be increasingly careful in participating in joint federal-provincial programmes in which all provinces do not participate.

Now, I think he is being fair.

On the other hand, we will not forego our right to make grants to provinces to help them in programmes such as Medicare which are provincially administered, and our right to relating grants to the acceptance of certain principles which, in our view, justify the expenditures of federal funds for provincially administered schemes. It is then for the province to decide whether they wish to co-operate on this basis.

It is very brief. It is then for the province to decide whether they wish to co-operate on this basis. You know, I might define a Minister to you. Quite some time ago, a friend of mine was asked to run for government. If he was elected, they would give him a fine position; he said he wanted to be a Minister in the government and he was very quickly told by his supporters that he did not have the capacity to be a Minister. He then said: "I did not say Deputy Minister. I said Minister."

An hon. member: That is a good point, too, I think.

Mr. Bukator: If this problem is going to be worked out it is going to be worked out by the deputy and if it is going to be settled, it is going to be settled by the hon. Prime Minister. I think the hon. Prime Minister of this province is a man who, regardless of his political affiliation, is a man that we look up to with respect, regardless of what we say in this House. He is a diplomat and he is capable. I think that the time has come—as a matter of fact, it is long past—that he, along with the Prime Minister of Quebec, who has not turned his back on this programme, sit down with the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada and settle this problem, because now three provinces have decided that they will take part in it. The hon. Minister himself can come to this particular point and correct us, because again, as usual, he puts it very clearly to us that he does not care to tell us what stand he is taking.

I have the Niagara Falls *Evening Review* here; it says:

The federal government plans to press ahead with medical care legislation on the basis of agreement with only three provinces, Health Minister MacEachen hinted here Wednesday night.

Then it goes on in the whole account, and finally says:

Other informed speakers were Ontario Health Minister Dr. Dymond and Dr. Robert Jones of Halifax, president of the Canadian medical association.

But it does not say, even in this account, what our particular Minister of Health has in mind.

The bill is a good one. It has taken a tremendous stride forward to assist the poor and it is about time that you took the suggestion of the federal government. I am looking forward to the day, and I hope it is not next June but sooner than that, that the hon. Prime Minister of this province, who represents us all, will sit down with the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada and take our problems seriously rather than sit here and waste the time of the House, as we have done, on many occasions on this very matter. We have concluded absolutely nothing up to this point.

Anyone who is in business would never run his own affairs the way this particular province is run. None of you would run your own business the way you run your different departments of government. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves, with the small amount of time we have to sit down and debate these issues when we spend millions and millions of taxpayers' dollars. I have been under a doctor's care for several months now, and I tell you that the plan we have, and which is the best that money can buy, even with your PSI, hospitalization and all of these things that one has to have, I find that, from time to time, one has to reach into his own pocket, even with the best of plans, and still pay part of the bill.

A doctor waited on me, I had my examination and he sent me a bill for \$25. I sent it on to PSI; they sent me a cheque back and said that this man does not belong, therefore we are sending you \$16 or \$17 and I had to make up the \$7. They sent me to the hospital to get a blood test and I produced all of the cards that I had in my pocket, but apparently I did not have the right one. I had to pay for the blood test myself. This is Medicare, and I hope this is not the type of thing you are thinking about, Mr. Minister. I hope you give them an all-inclusive plan which pays the shot completely. I am looking forward to the day this is done. I hope very soon that the Prime Ministers of all the provinces, but especially of Ontario, will wield the big stick. I think our Prime Minister of Canada wants to complete this problem and bring it

to a head, and I am looking forward to the day that will be done.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, when I was first elected seven years ago to represent the people of Hamilton East, I committed myself to forward certain legislation, and I committed myself to represent the best interests of everyone in the riding and, in particular, the people of Ontario. It must follow then, that I cannot, in all conscience, support legislation that would separate the people of Hamilton East and the people of Ontario into three groups, as does this proposed Medicare plan.

I have a kind of a rule of thumb which I apply to this type of social welfare legislation. It must meet everyone's needs, it must be available to everyone and it must be at costs that everyone can afford.

Will the proposed Medicare plan meet these three simple basic principles? Will it meet the needs of everyone? Not completely, because it does not cover drugs, dental or optical services, appliances and certain other related services. But, since no one is excluded from the services that it does include, I suppose it could be accepted as an important first step along the way. The need to make at least a start is so important that I am willing to accept this portion.

Is it available to everyone at costs they can afford? Here is where we start separating into groups, and here is where I find a major point of disagreement. I think there will be a large group of people which simply will not be able to afford to pay the high premium. From all the figures thrown out, I would estimate something like 15 or 20 per cent would fall in this category. Let us take the first premium category under which pension assistance is given; that is the single person who has a taxable income of \$500 or less. The complete cost is \$60. The government would pay \$30 and he would pay \$30. Presumably, this means anyone with a taxable income up to \$500. The lowest category would, I believe, be something like an annual income of \$1,110. The single person would be allowed a basic exemption of \$1,000, plus \$100 in lieu of medical bills and donations, and would pay income tax on \$10. He would have a weekly income of \$21. The top of this bracket would earn \$30 a week. How can a single person making something like \$21 to \$30 a week forfeit one or one-and-a-half week's wages every year, plus hospital insurance to protect his health? The

answer, obviously, is that he cannot. So, of course, it follows, as night follows day, that he does not. The result is that he is excluded from the plan by an economic barrier. He is forced to take the big gamble that he will remain in good health. Suppose a single person earns \$31 a week. With only another \$1 a week income, he then must pay twice as much, so that he would pay \$60 a year, or two weeks' wages, all but \$2.

There are people earning such low wages: we all know they are in Ontario. It is typical of this government to penalize low-wage earners still further when it comes to the most precious gift any man, woman or child can have, and that is good health.

Why should these poor people have to do without protection, or be forced into paying such high premiums? The very wealthy can afford custom-made shirts without sacrificing any basic necessity. There are those who can pay \$15 for a shirt, without giving it a second thought. Other income groups can pay \$5, \$8, or \$10 with no personal sacrifice. Another group must secure them in the bargain basements for about \$2, but the man whose every cent goes to basic necessities must sometimes go shirtless. That is just the position in which we would place certain of our citizens with the present Medicare plan.

I have chosen to illustrate my point with category one, the single person. Perhaps the plight of category three—the family of three or more—is even more serious, because their medical needs, with several children, are greater, not to mention their other fixed costs of living.

Speculation has been rife in this House as to who has had a hand in drawing up the proposals and the premium rates. I know one thing—whoever had a hand in this, has never been in the financial position of the people in these three categories, nor in the position of those just emerging from this financial status. I am sincere when I say I hope they never are, although perhaps we would now be examining much more realistic figures had they had this experience. Terror—not just fear—of illness or any other additional expense, however minor, is the constant companion of these people.

So then we have this fairly large group of people excluded out of economic necessity. Not just these three categories, mind you, but those emerging from this financial strata as well. And we must bear in mind that these, plus those for whom the province is picking up the whole tab, are the people

who, because of their low incomes and pensions, are at least able to protect their health through good and proper foods, through preventive medications, through well-heated homes and a supply of protective clothing. These are the people with the highest incidence of poor health and who are termed the poor insurance risks. These are the people who dare not now call in a doctor at the first sign of ill health but who, instead, wait another day and another day and yet another day to make sure it really is serious and then it is often too late.

Then we pass on to those people already covered by some form of group insurance and the forms of protection under these plans are as many and varied as there are companies. But what about these people? Some of their plans will not provide as good a coverage as we are considering here. Does this Ontario plan make provision that no plan falls below the standards of this one? No. Well, the hon. Minister of Health says we cannot take them in as a group. He says they can give up their present group plan and join the Ontario plan as individuals. But can they?

In many cases, their plan is part and parcel of a wage plan where they forfeited wage gains to protect their health and that of their families to some degree. They have no way of saying: "Now that the province has finally come up with a health plan, we'll take the cost of our plan in wages and join, as individuals, the Ontario plan." They will not be able to do that. I think the hon. Minister knows this and I can hardly credit him or anyone else with making such a ridiculous statement. But it was made.

To go back to considering these people now protected by group plans, some of which have equally good or better coverage and some at less cost. Basically, these people are healthier because usually they are in better-paid occupations and because, over the years, they have been able to visit their doctor and call him in in case of illness. They are called the good insurance risks. They are to be excluded from the Ontario plan.

So now we have the Ontario plan covering what is termed the poor risks, while this government showers the profit-making private insurance companies with the good risks at the expense of Ontario taxpayers.

I am simply amazed, in spite of all the reasoned arguments presented in favour of a universal, government-operated Medicare plan, that this government refuses to make use of the magic of averages, through which benefits are available to every Ontario citizen

regardless of health or income, through which costs are spread to the maximum and through which the lowest possible premium can be set.

This principle is not something dreamed up by New Democrats, it is the basic principle on which insurance companies operate. It is the basis on which the Hall Royal commission on health services made its recommendations.

Dr. Charles Berry, who is now with Princeton University, carried out an investigation which confirmed earlier opinion that governments can operate a medical insurance plan at a much lower cost than can private carriers. In Dr. Berry's study of private insurance plans, he discovered that 30 per cent of premiums were spent to provide profits and to cover office expenses and selling costs.

As opposed to this, Dr. Berry estimated that a universal, government-operated plan would cost only 10 per cent for administration.

He clearly predicts a saving of 20 per cent which this government is denying to the people of Ontario, along with the even more serious denial of health benefits for large numbers of Ontario residents who simply will not be able to pay the premiums set by this government—premiums five times as high as those of Saskatchewan—because they have gathered unto themselves all the poor risks and handed over to private carriers the rich mother-lode of group insurance. Of course, the five- and six-figure and higher income brackets pay no more than the four-figure income earner. I suppose you could say they certainly are not paying more than they can afford.

Although I heartily endorse the free coverage extended to the pensioners and other people receiving assistance under the various welfare Acts, and while I support the principle of assisting those with low incomes, I feel free coverage is cut off too soon and that reduced premiums are cut off too soon. No one should be excluded.

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot feel I would act in the best interests of my own constituents or the people of Ontario if I were to support this plan as it is before us now.

Nor do I feel I could support the recommendation of the Liberal Party members to send it back for further study. Of course, their proposal was to be expected. The federal Liberals have been studying Medicare since 1919; now it is the turn of their provincial Liberal body to start studying. We could

go on into eternity with their approach and still never have a Medicare plan in action.

Now that the Conservative and Liberal members here have finally declared they agree with New Democratic members that Medicare is a must for Ontario, let us give birth to a plan that is government-operated and that covers everyone without exclusion. Only under such a plan can all Ontario citizens be protected at a minimum cost.

One final point before I close, Mr. Speaker. It is a word of caution to the medical profession, which I hope it will heed.

The letter sent on January 17, 1966, by the Ontario medical association to Ontario doctors is reported to say that patients think their own doctor is a "great fellow." Do they really? If they do, how long will they continue to hold this opinion if the medical profession continues to wilfully misrepresent Medicare?

People are becoming ever more dissatisfied with the modern assembly-line techniques now employed. The much-talked-of doctor-patient relationship is almost a thing of the past. When people, gathered together, discuss doctors, as they often do, someone is bound to recall the old family doctor in glowing and affectionate terms. This often kicks off a whole series of recollections by the others, but the conversation invariably ends on something like: "Well, they're different now," and everyone says: "You can say that again."

What was once a proud profession is fast becoming a business. I do not know the cause. Certainly I do not feel bad when I can give my insurance number to the doctor's receptionist and not worry about whether I will be able to pay the bill. I really feel much more kindly disposed toward my doctor. I would think he would feel the same way, when he did not have to worry whether I would be able to pay his bill or not. He and his fellow doctors are even free to charge what they see fit, since the association sets the schedule of fees. I wish I had had that latitude when I was negotiating wage increases with my employers. It would have made me and every other worker very happy, and so I feel it should please the medical business.

They are free to treat and prescribe as they see fit. Of course, there is the danger that the patient will not be able to afford to take his prescription to the drug store and have it filled, but this has always been the case. It is no different under Medicare than without it. That problem will not be solved until drugs are included in Medicare.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate I do not really intend to deal with the particulars of this bill. I will deal with some of the principles involved. I think my hon. colleague, the Minister of Health, has dealt with the broad principles involved in the bill, both in the remarks he made on first reading and his part in this debate.

Before I enter into this debate I would like to deal with the question that I seem to have to deal with at least one a year; that is the question of that advertising in the 1963 election campaign. For the interest of the hon. members, I went back to the Throne speech of the session preceding that election. The House opened on November 27, 1962, and in that Throne speech, under the heading "Medical health insurance" the following appeared:

My government endorses the principle of medical health insurance. In realization of the present-day concern of our people about the crippling financial cost of illness and their desire to be able to obtain proper medical treatment when required, legislation will be introduced which will ensure that medical health insurance from insurers by arrangement with the government will be available to all our people regardless of age and physical condition. The government will also accept the responsibility of providing coverage for those who, for a variety of reasons, may be deemed not to be able to provide for themselves.

Because of the many problems involved in bringing this plan into operation and the many groups that will be affected by it, a committee composed of representatives of medical, hospital, labour and other groups will be appointed to examine the legislation and to receive representations from all interested parties before the provisions of the bill are brought into effect.

That is what we set out in the Speech from the Throne; that is precisely what we did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would really ask after all this time, let us look forward to the next election and not back to the last one. Now let us forget it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we need a little perspective on the whole problem with which we are dealing here and a little perspective in looking at this particular piece of legislation.

I think that our critics, the hon. members of the Opposition, have been dealing with this matter in which I would term isolation; they the dealing with this one particular bill without looking at it in relation to the entire problem that we face and the entire programme that this government has initiated.

I would say that this bill is really only part of a very large whole. To start at the beginning, of course one must go back to 1959 when the health insurance programme was first introduced. Since that time there has been a great deal of activity in many different areas, all of which was designed to bring to our people a totality of health care, if I may put it that way. This is developed along many fronts. The bill with which we are dealing this morning is only one item and I think it is necessary that we look at the total picture in order to get this bill and what it proposes to do into proper perspective.

I would suggest to hon. members that this bill, if it is looked at in relation to other things being done by this government, is four-square within the framework of the recommendations of the Hall commission, Mr. Speaker.

If I turn to page 14 in the early part of their report, they have what they term a basic concept. If I read from the bottom of page 13—and this is under the heading “Basic concepts” and I think it is very basic—they say:

We must reiterate however that the comprehensive universal health services programme we recommend requires careful planning, wise use of resources at our disposal and acceptance of the principle of prepayment whereby all Canadians can be provided with health services.

On the top of page 14:

We recognize of course that this whole programme cannot be put into effect immediately or simultaneously in all provinces. We do not foresee the programme coming forth full grown but rather as an orderly and well planned series of steps which taken together will in a period of years accomplish our objective.

Now this is the basic concept of the Hall report. I consider it to be sound; this government is in agreement with that basic concept and I think we are proceeding in this province just exactly according to this basic concept as set out in the Hall report.

Now I would like to read one more quotation from the Hall report. And this is under the heading “Medical education and recruit-

ment.” This is found on page 70 and I quote a paragraph there:

Because of the length of time [a minimum of seven years] required for the education of physicians there can be no substantial increase in our graduating classes before 1970 since the students graduating up to that year are already in university. To meet our needs in the 1970's it will be necessary both to expand several of our existing schools to their optimum size and to establish at least five new schools to come into operation during the late 1960's and the early 1970's.

And then they go on to detail some particulars in that regard.

But the point I am making is simply this. The Hall commission report is, I believe, dated February, 1964. But looking ahead from that date they see no substantial increase in the number of doctors in Canada prior to 1970.

Mr. MacDonald: They still urged action on the plan.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Now, in the light of that, let me detail for you what this government has done and perhaps bring you up to date on what is going on.

On October 29, 1964 I announced in this House a programme which we undertook at that time. I think it could be called a crash programme to carry out some of the recommendations of the Hall commission report and to put this province in shape to be in a position to implement the recommendations in that report.

We announced at that time the establishment of a new medical school with basic teaching facilities at McMaster University; we announced the creation of a new school of dentistry at the University of Western Ontario; we announced the expansion of the medical school at the University of Toronto to admit an additional 75 first-year medical school students; we announced an expansion of the medical school at Queen's University to completely renovate it and also to provide for additional students.

If this whole programme is taken in total, it will provide places for approximately 900 additional medical students and 400 additional dental students.

That is the background. This programme was announced, and this programme I might tell the hon. members is proceeding at the present time. I have here a newspaper clipping, I am not given to reading newspapers back to the hon. members of the

House, but it simply details a two-stage medical centre planned by McMaster University.

We made the announcement, we made the funds available to McMaster University and I am now pointing out to the hon. members that the plans we instituted in October of 1964 are bearing fruit and here is one example of it: "Two-stage medical centre planned by McMaster."

Some of the items are rather interesting because of their estimates since those days of 1964. I think we estimated about \$150 to \$170 million in 1964. But I noticed in this news report that the programme at McMaster alone is going to cost \$100 million.

One other thing I noticed about it, it will be built over a period of ten to 15 years, which further bears out the contention in the Hall report that these matters take time. In other words, it is difficult just to estimate when we will get the first medical graduate from the new medical school at McMaster University.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Whose fault is that? The government's fault or Dr. Hall's?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I do not understand the hon. member's question. Now in addition to that, I have—

Mr. MacDonald: The Liberal amendment—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I will get to the Liberal amendment. This is what I would like to show hon. members, because I had the great good fortune to open the new medical building at the University of Western Ontario on October 23, 1965. There is a \$20 million medical complex, and this is the report of the latter part of last year, an additional \$20 million medical complex being created at the University of Toronto.

I point out that within the total health programme for the people of this province, we are moving ahead on a fairly broad front. There is the question of the construction of hospitals and in this area we have certainly been pretty active as well.

Since 1948, for instance, we increased the number of beds from 16,000 to 40,600. Now there was an increase in hospital beds during that period of approximately 150 per cent of the number of beds in the province and our population during that period increased approximately 69 per cent, to give you some idea of the rapid increase in the number of beds. At the present time, there is a total

of 4,980 beds under construction in the province, and of course about 2,300 of these are in this area.

I point these things out to indicate that this bill with which we are dealing is nothing more than part of an overall programme.

To go back to the beginning of the bill, as I have said, it was announced first in the Speech from the Throne in 1962. That bill was introduced into this House, it was given second reading and debated in principle.

It was referred to the committee mentioned in that Speech from the Throne, which became known as the Hagey committee, because it was chaired by Dr. Gerald Hagey of the University of Waterloo. That committee reported in December, 1964, which resulted in Bill No. 136 being introduced in this House and debated very vigorously in May and June of last year.

Then we come to the present bill, and as I say, I do not propose to deal with the particulars of this bill, because I think that this has been done by my colleague, the hon. Minister of Health.

During the year since we debated that bill here in this House in May and June, there have been some really quite startling changes in the whole area of medical health and in various areas which affect this bill, in various areas which have affected the government thinking about this bill.

I would like to say that I make no apologies whatsoever, nor does this government, for bringing forth certain amendments to the bill we introduced last year. We said at that time we did not think this was the final answer. My own thinking is I rather doubt that this bill in its present form is a final answer to this problem.

Mr. Singer: Then why does the hon. Prime Minister not bring in the final answer?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Because we are not ready to bring in the final answer. No, sir, we are not ready, and I propose to tell you exactly why we are not ready.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear these comments. All these people over here I assume are going to support that half-baked amendment and what they are doing is what they have done from the beginning. They are attempting to shelve the whole issue and put it away so they will not have to deal with it.

I do not see any proposal in their amendment for anything that is going to do anything

for anybody in this province in the foreseeable future. All they are saying is: "Let us hand it to a committee, draw up great terms of reference and let them study it for another couple of years and then we will see what we will do about it then, or we will wait for the federal government to make up our minds for us."

Now I think it is part of their reasoning. I think what they are proposing has some relationship to what goes on in Ottawa. In any event, as far as I am concerned, the amendment is completely unacceptable. It will do nothing for the people of this province.

I intended to save this part of my remarks until the end, but when I get these interjections, perhaps I will repeat this. I will make these remarks now and at the end as well, because I think it is the most ridiculous amendment to any piece of legislation I have ever read in my life.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If hon. members go back to my remarks of last year in response to the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha), I agreed with him that I hoped the Hall commission report would not be filed away to gather dust. As far as this government is concerned, certainly this has not been the fate of the Hall commission report, because I am just pointing out what we have done, positively in this government, to implement the recommendations contained in the report.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): The Hall recommendations, phased in by 1971.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, we may have brought in three bills in three years, but I remember one year when the hon. leader of the Opposition's party had three positions on Medicare in one year. As a matter of fact, I just have an idea that it was not even one year, I think it was about four months.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It was in one calendar year, but it was just four months. Here we have a plan that will function on July 1, 1966. That is what we have. That is what we are proposing. No more committees.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid that I will have to remind members that there are not

supposed to be any interruptions across the floor when a member is speaking. The rule book definitely states so, and I would ask the members to refrain from further interruptions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I realize the rules say that there should be no interjections and so on, but there is a great deal of custom in this House and I would hate to see it all destroyed, either in this regard or in many others.

I would like to mention some of the matters that have occurred in the years since we last debated this whole programme and this whole situation. In the first place, we have coming into effect the Canada assistance plan and, like many things that are going on at the present time, this has been discussed, but it is not yet in the form of law. The bill has not yet been introduced into the House of Commons, although there have been many conferences between the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) and the Minister of National Health and Welfare in the federal government. So we are not yet in the position to be certain of the details but we do know basically what we think if the bill passes the House of Commons with all the possibilities there are for change or amendment.

But this bill, in one respect at least if it takes the form it has been agreed upon, will provide 50 per cent of the medical costs for all those who receive general welfare assistance—there are about 105,000 of these in Ontario—and all those who receive mothers' allowances—there are about 31,500 of these people in Ontario.

We hope we will be able to work out the same arrangement. As I say, this is a hope, these are not facts. These are things that have been discussed but are not yet accomplished although we think there is a very good chance they will be accomplished and we will then have a similar sharing arrangement of costs as for those who are receiving old age assistance, blind pensions, disabled pensions and old-age security. In that category, there are about 153,000 people in the province.

Now, in regard to our programme for construction and in regard to the recommendations in the Hall report. The Hall report recommends—and I will not bother quoting the particular chapter—but it suggests to the federal government that they should underwrite 50 per cent of the cost of the capital facilities necessary to develop the personnel that will be required in order to make any comprehensive medical services plan possible.

In other words, they recognize the lack of doctors, the lack of nurses, the lack of paramedical personnel, and their suggestion is that the federal government should enter this field to the tune of 50 per cent.

Now, on September 23 last, the federal government announced proposals to establish a health resources fund. Once again, I might say to you that we are dealing in an area in which this is a proposal. There have been discussions concerning this fund, but the fund is not yet created and no legislation has yet been brought forward in the House of Commons. Nonetheless, there have been discussions as to what this fund would be and how it would be used. It is a fund of \$500 million.

That sounds like a lot of money, sir, but I would point out to you that immediately following the \$500 million it says over a period of 15 years.

I hope I will not be interpreted as belittling the efforts of the federal government in this regard, but I am of the opinion that the sum of \$500 million to meet these requirements over a period of 15 years is not a very realistic approach to the problem. However, we will take our share with gratitude because we intend to proceed, as I have outlined. These plans are going ahead. They are going to cost the people of Ontario a great deal of money, as was made very evident in the Budget produced in this House on Wednesday. \$500 million divided over a period of 15 years is about \$33 million per year spread across Canada; on that basis, our share would be roughly a third or a little less in this province—about \$10 million per year. In terms of what we face in this area, much as we welcome this assistance, I do not think it is as meaningful as the figure \$500 million might lead one to believe. That is a good round figure, but stretched over 15 years it does not amount to quite so much.

How it is to be finally allocated across the country has not yet been finally decided, although there have been discussions in this regard. A technical advisory committee, set up at a meeting of the hon. Minister of Health and the Minister of National Health and Welfare of the federal government, has suggested that, in the first place, the top \$25 million be allocated to the Atlantic provinces in recognition of perhaps greater need in that area than in other parts of the country. Then, \$375 million will be divided up across the country on a per capita basis. The remaining \$100 million will be allocated by the federal government on the basis of national need and purposes. This simply means that in some

areas, perhaps, just one institution is needed to produce a certain type of technician or trained personnel for all of Canada. It just is not reasonable to think that every province would want to create this. When I think that at the University of Toronto there is a school of hygiene quite unique, it is doubtful whether we need more than one of these in Canada. This is the type of thing that would qualify for assistance in this \$100 million, which will not be distributed on any basis of population nor per student equality across the country.

That is where that fund stands. This is the result of the discussions that have taken place at various conferences. The hon. Minister of Health of this province and his staff have attended these conferences; I point out to you, however, that this is only in the agreement stage. The \$500 million has not been voted—indeed, the legislation has not even been introduced. But it has developed since the last time we debated this question and I think will have, in time to come, quite an effect on the total health situation in this province.

The next question I would like to deal with, and the next event that has occurred since last June, was, of course, the announcement by the Prime Minister of Canada last July, at a federal-provincial conference, that his government intended to institute what is erroneously called a “national medical services plan.” I must point out to you that it is impossible for there to be, under this scheme, a national plan, because the federal government has said in this proposal that each province must develop its own plan. Those plans must meet certain broad outlines, but there is no national nor federal plan; each province must develop its own individual health care programme, which must meet certain qualifications. Then the participation of the federal government in this exercise will be simply a matter of grants.

Mr. Singer: What an equivocation that is. Playing with words—only \$150 million.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think it is a valid distinction to make, because we really do not know whether we are going to have a national plan. There are wide areas of variation that could occur from province to province and still stay within the four boundaries they have, that is all. I am not criticizing it; I am not saying the federal government is right or wrong. I am just telling you what its proposal is. You asked for us to tell you these things, and I propose to tell them to you.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Prime Minister still has not told us.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I am telling what was proposed at that time. And I am telling you that the federal government, in its participation in this, will make a contribution of money through grants. I might say that this announcement was made in July. There was—and I have mentioned this before, and I will mention it again in the House—no prior discussion with any of the provinces, at least not the province of Ontario. There may have been discussions with other provinces. I do not know about that, but at least I can tell you that until the Prime Minister of Canada read this announcement to that conference, nobody in this province knew anything about it; we had not been consulted in any way whatsoever. Once again, I make no comment on this, I am only telling it to the hon. members as a fact, because certainly it has had some effect on what we are planning to do in this province.

Now, sir, once again, there has been an announcement and we are in the area of discussion. There is no legislation before the federal government at the moment, unless it has been introduced in the past day or so.

So far as I know, there is no bill before the House of Commons at the moment, but there have been some discussions. Originally, a meeting of the Ministers of Health was called by the federal government. At that time, all the provinces were asked to say by December 31, 1965, whether or not they were going to participate in the plan of the federal government. None of the 10 provinces, by that date, knew what its intentions were.

I do not think—in fact, I am quite certain—that the final details of this plan are yet complete. However, as far as we can understand it, I would like to outline to the hon. members how we would participate if we were to participate, how the financing of the plan is to take place and how grants are to be made.

I would point out that in the allocation of these grants I think we should all understand that there is a built-in equalizing factor. As you know, in the fiscal arrangements in this country we have equalization payments made between provinces in varying amounts in order to produce some sort of standard income across the country from coast-to-coast. In developing their system of grants in this regard, the federal government are planning to use a national average cost. Their point is that they will pay in grants 50 per cent of the national average

per capita cost of medical services, by way of grants.

I think we should all understand, because we are going to use the national average, there will be a degree of equalization in this and it simply means some provinces will receive as much or more than their actual costs, that is 50 per cent of their actual costs and other provinces will receive less. This will be true of this province because our medical costs here—I do not want to get into a debate on the actual dollar amounts and I am not going to; I want to stay in principle—our medical costs in this province will be greater than the national average.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Because of private carriers?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: Because of private carriers?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: No. Private carriers have nothing to do with it. I am talking about the medical costs in the province and in the country as a whole.

Our costs here will be greater than the national average but the grant that will come to this province will be half of the national average so we will not receive 50 per cent of the actual cost as will accrue in this province. Other provinces will receive proportionately more in relation to their actual costs.

Now, I would assume that if this plan comes into effect it would be necessary for us to meet the balance of the cost probably as we presently do with our hospital insurance. This would mean that we would then have to finance this plan, a combination of grants from the federal government, premiums which would be chargeable to individuals in the province and the balance made up from the general tax revenue of the province.

I would point out that this plan would wipe out of existence and destroy completely some 16,000 group plans that are presently in effect in this province, covering some 4.6 million people.

Now, most of these 16,000 plans, I suppose, are different, tailored for particular circumstances. They are tailored to suit perhaps the employment contract; in some of them the employer pays the whole cost; in some of them the employee pays the whole cost; in others the cost is split in varying degrees but the point I make—

Mr. Bryden: It could still be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: But the point I make is simply that this is what will happen. There are 16,000 of these plans and they will completely disappear and there will be 4.6 million people who will be affected by it.

An hon. member: Fair enough.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Fair enough? Well, I think the interesting point here, that I might make, is that these 4.6 million people, at present looking after themselves, seem to perhaps like it that way. I was interested to see in the Toronto *Daily Star* yesterday, a Gallup poll of Canada—

Mr. Bryden: A loaded question.

An hon. member: Read the question.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will read the question: "Do you think the Medicare programme should be a compulsory one in which every Canadian would have to join or do you think it should be a voluntary plan in which Canadians themselves could decide whether or not to join?"

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Prime Minister misses the point.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, if it does not suit the hon. member, he is going to argue against it. But I am just pointing it out. A Gallup poll question and in the province of Ontario 54 per cent of the people wanted a voluntary plan; 40 per cent of the people wanted a compulsory plan and six per cent of the people were undecided. Now, the point I make—

Mr. Bryden: Would the hon. Prime Minister not agree that in a complex matter like this a simple question like that is bound to falsify the facts? They are not pure alternatives. It is not voluntary versus compulsory; there are a lot of other factors involved, such as the degree of coverage, but anybody faced with the simple question, "Voluntary or compulsory?" will say, "Voluntary." Mr. Speaker, I have many times permitted the hon. Prime Minister to interrupt me and you have never objected.

Mr. Speaker: I am not objecting to the question of the member, but I thought he was launching into a debate.

Mr. Bryden: Well, the hon. Prime Minister has occasionally done me the honour of doing the same thing and he was not objecting here. I have made my point anyway.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member has made his point. I might say

that I have no objection at all. I like to debate. I do not like just to stand up here and make a speech, and if there are any comments I would like to hear them.

I think it is a complex question, an enormously complex question, and it takes a great deal of study to understand it. On the other hand it is a Gallup poll and there it is for what it is worth.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, if that is what the hon. member wants, that is what he is going to take from it. It either proves your point or it is wrong, one or the other. It is my opinion that 54 per cent are people probably who are looking after themselves, and like it that way. I think that is why they get that percentage.

Our people in this province are used to insurance; they understand the principles of it. We have a highly developed province; we have a highly urbanized and industrial society and I think our people understand the principles of insurance. They are looking after themselves, and I think the 54 per cent represents a real area of thinking where they are quite happy to look after themselves and they do not necessarily want the state moving in on them with a plan.

Mr. Thompson: Are they happy with their hospital insurance?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I think they are, yes.

In regard to these 16,000 plans and 4.6 million people involved: this, of course, as can be seen, poses an immediate problem in this province that probably does not exist to a similar extent in any other province in Canada, because I doubt very much if any other province has as highly developed a system of medical protection in the private sector of the economy, if I can put it that way.

This comes about simply because we are industrialized, because we have what I might term a very sophisticated form of management-labour relationship in most of these plans that come about as a product of terms of employment and bargaining between employer and employee.

Some of these plans are part of labour relation agreements that run until 1968 and 1969. There are a whole host of them, and it poses just an enormous number of problems in administration of rights and readjustment of rights when you say in one fell swoop: "We are just going to wash all those out of existence as of such-and such a date."

Mr. Thompson: What does the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) say to that?

Mr. MacDonald: That is what was done in hospital insurance and there was no problem. It was done in one fell swoop and everybody was happy.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would suggest to you that there are many more complications in this than there were in the hospital insurance programme.

Please do not misunderstand me; I am not saying these things cannot be done. But I am pointing out to you some of the considerations that I think have entered this situation since we last debated this bill. These are some of the considerations which flow from the announcement made by the federal government just before the election, I think in September.

Mr. MacDonald: Theoretically, the hon. Prime Minister has got himself on both sides of the question, and on top of the fence—all at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: If I can accomplish that I will be very happy—both sides of the question and sitting on the fence at the same time.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): The hon. Prime Minister will not get any ploughing done that way.

An hon. member: And the hon. member knows a lot about that. The farmer from Parkdale.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am sorry, I missed that one.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would suggest that in considering this question of national Medicare and its financing, and what its effect is going to be on the finances of this province, the figures involved in it were very well put before this House by the hon. member for Forest Hill. I would suggest to the hon. members some of the decisions that lie in this area of national Medicare are but a part of a much larger sphere of considerations respecting the entire federal-provincial fiscal relationship field and the arrangements that will have to be made between the various governments of Canada between now and the first day of April, 1967, when the present tax agreements run out and we will have to enter into some new agreements. We have

at work at the present time the Carter commission, of which we are all aware. Some parts of that report have been released by the commission to officials in the federal government. They have not been made public, so we do not know what they contain. But I would be very surprised if the Carter commission did not bring forth some fairly broad and perhaps radical recommendations for changes in the fiscal relationships between the federal government and the provinces. We have the tax structure committee, which is working very hard at the present time; this is a unique body in the history of our country.

There has never been anything like it. It is an investigatory body established under the aegis of a federal-provincial conference consisting of the heads of the 11 governments of our country. It is using the best brains that we have from coast to coast in taking an overall look at where our country is going as such, instead of 11 separate entities each going a separate way. We are trying to bring this thing together, and I am certain, in my own mind, what that committee will produce will be very frightening indeed in terms of total expenditures when they are put together across the country and stacked up against revenues across the country. But I think it is something that has to be done.

Mr. Bryden: There is no use being frightened.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is right. I am not the least bit frightened, I am just saying what I think they will find. Did I say frightening?

Mr. Bryden: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I did not mean it in the sense the hon. member has taken it. Let me put it this way. It will be startling, and I think it will require a good deal of action on the part of all governments.

In any event, I think I have put my point across.

Now, sir, we have a working committee in this province, but the point that I am making is that this question of a national plan is inextricably bound up with these other considerations. I think they are all going to have to be dealt with at one time.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: I notice the hon. Prime Minister is emphasizing the point that because of discussions and deliberations in

Ottawa and across the nation, he is moving, he says, slowly on the Medicare approach as we get further clarification across the nation. May I ask him, in view of the fact that there are two tax committees, if he would not have felt that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should have applied the same principle instead of having this enormous mass of taxes brought in?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr Speaker, no doubt we will debate this in the Budget debate, but I am quite prepared to answer my hon. friend. All that is needed to do is to look at the expenditures that this government has to make in the fields of health and education to realize that we could not wait. The alternative would have been simply to borrow or not to spend. No government has a choice in anything more than three things—a government can tax, borrow, or stop spending. We felt that our priorities were there, that these things needed to be done and so we had to increase taxes. An alternative would be not to spend the money on education and health and these various items. The other alternative would have been to borrow, and we did not think either of those courses was wise in the overall good of our province.

What I am suggesting to you is that against this background that I have outlined to you here—and I have tried to give you all the information that I have—we have brought forth the plan which is embodied in this bill and it is designed to meet our financial capabilities at the moment. It is designed to help those who need help most, and it is designed to come into effect on July 1 next, when we wish to help the people in this province who need help. I would point out to you that in this regard the Hall commission report makes all its projections to the year 1971. It is perhaps with some misgiving that we look ahead to what is going to be an attempt to implement a plan right across the country in 1967—four years earlier than the Hall commission felt this could be done. The commission report established its priorities in the area of education and so on, which we have tried to follow.

On the other hand, against the background of all this, this bill is before you today. It is tailored and designed to suit the needs of our people in this province. It takes into account those 4.6 million people in those 16,000 plans that are presently looking after themselves. It will provide assistance for those who need it and we, in taking this step, will develop the administrative machinery which is going to be needed to administer a plan of this size. In the meantime, as I

have pointed out to you, we will have advanced all our programmes which we are developing for the training and the provision of trained personnel. We will have time to see what is going to be the ultimate fate—and how it is to be dealt with—of these 16,000 group plans involving, as I say, over 4.5 million people, and we will be in a position to put it in effect by July 1, 1967.

There is one other matter that I might mention briefly in the area of federal-provincial relationships, and that is the question of the conditions laid down by the federal government in regard to grants of various kinds. I think this is something that we will have to think about in this province.

You will recall that several years ago, when they developed the technique or practice of opting out and in opting out, it simply meant that any province could opt out of a shared-cost programme so long as that province agreed to conduct a similar programme with certain standards. Then, instead of the federal government paying its share of that programme, the federal government simply paid the money to the province. So that you opted out of the programme, but you undertook to maintain those conditions and for this you got a cheque—or as a matter of fact, it was translated into terms of percentage points of personal income tax, which is the most flexible instrument; and the balance, to get the exact figure, was paid in cash.

Now, this means that for a province which opted out, you got control of the source of revenue in your own province, but you had certain conditions to meet and opting out took place on this basis.

I might say that the province of Quebec is the only province that has opted out. This province has taken no position, that is, we did not opt out, but we did not say we would not, we just simply went along with the programmes as they were. The option to opt out is open to this province if we wish to have it.

I notice developing in this area, a change which I think will be very significant to this province. It will be very significant to the federal government and to our country.

Spokesmen for the province of Quebec are now advancing the proposition that when they opt out there shall be no conditions. Now, this would mean that the sources of taxation would go back to the province, but there would be no conditions imposed by the federal government and the income from the return of those tax sources will be used

by that province as it sees fit in any field it wants.

I know that the Premier of the province of Quebec made this proposition to a group of students at McGill University. I happened to be in Montreal at that time and I believe Mr. Kierans raised the same point at the conference of Ministers of Health in Ottawa.

You can see if this principle is accepted—I do not know whether it will be, so far it has only been advanced by the province of Quebec—but you can see where this could lead. You can see what effect it might have on what we are discussing here this morning. You can see what an effect it might have on all the national programmes we have in this country.

Now this is yet another factor that I bring to hon. members' attention in this equation with which we are dealing at the present time.

In view of the fact that we are able to go forward here with this plan, which will do certain things for those of our people who need help, and in view of the fact that all these matters are in the process of discussion and debate, I do not think that it is necessary for this province at this stage of the game and in this debate, to say what we are going to do on July 1, 1967.

There will be many meetings, there will be many discussions on the points that I have raised here between now and then. In the meantime, we will go ahead with our own programme of providing the care that is provided for our own people in this bill.

I will not repeat my remarks, Mr. Speaker, about the amendment. To me, it completely dodges the issues. It is an amendment that would simply shelve the whole programme. It would mean that there would be nothing for our people on July 1, 1966. There would be nothing being done immediately in the realm of preparation for what may lie ahead.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Prime Minister if a standing committee, as he understands it, as certainly I understand it, reports during the session? In our amendment it is very clear that we wanted to have a Hall type of commission. We were very grateful that the New Democratic Party had supported it last year—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I would just simply say: Support this bill and we will have a plan in effect on the first day of July, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: The debate being concluded, so that all the members of the House clearly understand the procedure for voting on the motion for second reading of this bill, I would like to recall for the members that during the last session of the House we returned to the full adoption of rule 56, which perhaps I should read, in case the members have forgotten it in the interval between sessions.

If on an amendment to the question that a bill be now read a second time or the third time, it is decided that the word "now" or any words proposed to be left out stand part of the question, Mr. Speaker shall forthwith declare the bill to be read a second or the third time, as the case may be.

I would remind the members, therefore, that by reason of this rule, when a motion is moved to strike out the words "the bill be now read a second time" the first question I must put to the House, is whether or not those words shall stand.

Therefore, all those in favour of the bill being now read a second time, will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the bill being now read a second time, will please rise.

As many as are opposed, will please rise.

The motion was carried on the following division:

AYES	NAYS
Allan	Braithwaite
Auld	Bryden
Bales	Bukator
Beckett	Davison
Boyer	Farquhar
Brown	Gaunt
Brunelle	Gibson
Carruthers	Gisborn
Carton	Lewis
Cecile	(Scarborough West)
Connell	MacDonald
Cowling	Newman
Davis	Nixon
Downer	Oliver
Dunlop	Reaume
Dymond	Renwick
Edwards	Sargent
Evans	Singer
Ewen	Spence
Gomme	Thompson
Grossman	Trotter
Harris	Whicher

AYES

Haskett
 Hodgson
 (Scarborough East)
 Hodgson
 (Victoria)
 Johnston
 (Carleton)
 Kerr
 Knox
 Lewis
 (Humber)
 Mackenzie
 MacNaughton
 McNeil
 Noden
 Olde
 Pittock
 Price
 Pritchard
 Randall
 Reilly
 Robarts
 Roberts
 Rollins
 Root
 Rowe
 Rowntree
 Simonett
 Spooner
 Stewart
 Thrasher
 Villeneuve
 Walker
 Wells
 White
 Whitney
 Yaremko—55.

NAYS

Worton
 Young—23.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 55, the "nays" 23.

Mr. Speaker: The "ayes" have it. Second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we might move the adjournment of this debate; there are only 10 minutes left.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member still has a long time to go, I would be quite prepared to agree.

Mr. Young moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will take Bill No. 6 in committee of the whole House. The House will sit at 3 o'clock and there will be a night session.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12:50 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, February 14, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Monday, February 14, 1966

Second report, standing committee on standing orders and printing, Mr. Apps	461
Police village of Baden, bill respecting, Mr. Reuter, first reading	462
Township of Pickering, bill respecting, Mr. Walker, first reading	462
Town of Burlington, bill respecting, Mr. McKeough, first reading	462
Town of Weston, bill respecting, Mr. MacDonald, first reading	462
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mrs. Pritchard, first reading	462
Greater Niagara general hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Spence, first reading	462
Township of North York, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading	462
Excelsior Life Insurance Company, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, first reading	462
Board of education of the city of London, bill respecting, Mr. White, first reading	462
Estate of William A. Dickieson, bill respecting, Mr. White, first reading	462
Board of trustees of the continuation school of the township of Pelee, bill respecting, Mr. Paterson, first reading	463
Township of Michipicoten, bill respecting, Mr. Farquhar, first reading	463
City of Toronto, bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, first reading	463
Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacDonald, first reading	463
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, in committee	467
Recess, 6 o'clock	490

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from Powell Road public school, Willowdale.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston), from the standing committee on standing orders and printing, presented the committee's second report, which was read as follows and adopted:

The committee has carefully examined the following petitions and finds the notices as published in each case, sufficient:

Of the Greater Niagara general hospital praying that an Act may pass establishing the terms of office of the board of governors.

Of the board of trustees of the continuation school of the township of Pelee praying that an Act may pass permitting it to pay a certain sum per day to the parent or guardian of each pupil of grades 11, 12, and 13 attending a secondary school outside the township of Pelee, in lieu of providing daily transportation to and from such school.

Of the corporation of the township of Michipicoten praying that an Act may pass authorizing a fixed assessment for the Wawa curling club.

Of the corporation of the township of Pickering praying that an Act may pass to enable it to establish an area for the supply of power for the use of the inhabitants thereof.

Of the corporation of the town of Weston praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to lease or license certain portions of untravelled highways for parking purposes.

Of the corporation of the county of Waterloo praying that an Act may pass providing for the re-establishment of the boundaries of the police village of Baden.

Of the board of education of the city of London praying that an Act may pass vesting

certain lands in the board in fee simple; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass to increase the membership of the Hamilton transit commission; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the city of Toronto praying that an Act may pass confirming a certain bylaw respecting fences; and for other purposes.

Of the corporation of the town of Burlington praying that an Act may pass to defer frontage charges on storm sewers, curbs and sidewalks.

Of Fanny Eliza Dickieson and Viola Belle Gray praying that an Act may pass vesting certain property of the late William A. Dickieson in the petitioners.

Of the Excelsior Life Insurance Company praying that an Act may pass authorizing it to apply to the Parliament of Canada for a special Act continuing the company as if it had been incorporated by special Act of the Parliament of Canada.

Of the corporation of the township of North York praying that an Act may pass permitting it to require owners of certain lands to enter into an agreement re conditions relating to development of the land.

Your committee recommends that the customary supplies allowance for the current session of the assembly be fixed at \$100.

Your committee recommends that copies of the *Canadian Parliamentary Guide*, the *Canadian Almanac* and *Canada Year Book* be purchased for distribution to members of the assembly and also that each member be given a year's subscription to the *Labour Gazette* and the *Municipal World*.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): May I speak to this?

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence. This is the first time I have sat on this particular committee, but I was rather

taken back by the fact that the majority of these bills or petitions were not advertised the prescribed number of times.

It was taken for granted that, because an affidavit was filed, and the contract for the advertisements was before the committee, they would, in fact, be advertised as many times as required. I think it is dreadful, to say the least, that many of the councils have to rush through any amendments they may want to get them here before the third week of the session of the Legislature. This may be fine if the session starts later in the year, but many councils took office in the first week in January; I think it is asking too much that they should have all the necessary bills ready to be submitted to this House by the third week of the session. I think we are perpetrating a fraud on ourselves when we were moving that the advertising was in order when, in fact, it was not. Many of those still have to advertise three times, twice or once. I understand that the committee has a discretion. This was exercised in their favour, but the trouble was that the discretion is exercised automatically. I think that if something was done to extend the time for the filing or applying for private bills beyond the third week of the session, where the session starts in January as it did this session, it would give the municipalities more time to submit their bills.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

POLICE VILLAGE OF BADEN

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the police village of Baden.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF PICKERING

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Pickering.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF BURLINGTON

Mr. W. D. McKough (Kent West), in the absence of Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWN OF WESTON

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the town of Weston.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mr. R. Welch (Lincoln), in the absence of Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

GREATER NIAGARA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East), in the absence of Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Greater Niagara general hospital.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell), in the absence of Mr. D. Bales (York Mills), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of North York.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

EXCELSIOR LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, in the absence of Mr. D. Bales, moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the Excelsior Life Insurance Company.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the board of education of the city of London.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

ESTATE OF WILLIAM A. DICKIESON

Mr. White, in the absence of Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin), moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the estate of William A. Dickieson.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CONTINUATION SCHOOL OF THE TOWNSHIP OF PELEE

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the board of trustees of the continuation school of the township of Pelee.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF MICHIPICOTEN

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the township of Michipicoten.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

CITY OF TORONTO

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Mr. MacDonald moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, by way of brief explanation, section 13 of The Assessment Act fixes the limit of municipal taxes for telephone and telegraph companies at five per cent of gross receipts. This results, for example, in the city of Toronto, in the Bell Telephone Company being freed from payment of an amount of \$726,617.88 in the year 1965 and smaller amounts in many municipalities all across the province of Ontario. The purpose of this Act is to repeal section 13.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), a copy of which has been submitted to him. Will the hon. Minister please advise if his department is doing anything to control pollution from motor vehicles?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, our department has been studying the matter of the emission of gases and the resulting pollution by motor vehicles. This is a timely question. I have found occasion to discuss this problem with motor vehicle manufacturers, and I have seen something of the very extensive experimentation and test-

ing that is being done in a variety of approaches to this problem involving the question of fuels: The reformulation of fuels, known fuels that are uneconomic today; the creation of new fuels specifically for this purpose; the reconstitution of existing fuels with additives that will make them suitable and no longer dangerous; through the re-designing and remodelling of the carburetion system; and by dealing with the products of combustion in the exhaust as by afterburners and other devices for a like purpose.

For the present, the matter of the emission of gases and pollution is controlled by The Air Pollution Control Act under The Department of Health, and by our Highway Traffic Act. These provide for this as follows:

The Air Pollution Control Act, section 3, subsections 1 and 2, reads:

Section 3, subsection 1: The council of any municipality may pass bylaws for prohibiting or regulating the emission from any source of air contaminants or any type or class thereof.

Section 3, subsection 2—
running through paragraph (e) and subparagraph (iii) thereof—

Without limiting the generality of subsection 1, the council of any municipality may pass bylaws, (e) for prohibiting, (iii) any person to operate, or to cause or permit to be operated, an internal combustion engine in such a way as to cause air pollution.

Under The Highway Traffic Act, there is this provision in section 42, subsection 2:

The engine and power mechanism of every motor vehicle shall be so equipped and adjusted as to prevent the escape of excessive fumes or smoke.

This matter is under continuing consideration by our department, and I have every hope that effective steps will be found before long.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question?

During the summer vacation the hon. Minister met with various manufacturers of automotive vehicles both in Canada and the United States. Did he receive any assurances from them that the automobile in the near future would contain such controls as to prevent the pollution of atmosphere caused by the burning of the fuels?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I would not care to say that I received assurances. What I related

to the hon. member in reply to his primary question covers the situation adequately, I think.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may follow through. The hon. Minister has not received any assurances—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, the member cannot make a statement. Has he another supplementary question?

Mr. Newman: Yes. Has the hon. Minister received any information from the automotive manufacturers that the pollution of the atmosphere by their manufactured products will be stopped in the near future?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I did not get the last phrase—that pollution will be stopped in the near future, is that the question? I think that is inherent in my original answer.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett): Of the approximately 400 industries written to by the Ontario water resources commission asking if they would undertake a programme of effluent improvement promptly, I would ask: 1. How many have replied; 2. How many would undertake such a programme; and 3. How many have actually undertaken such a programme?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, the letter referred to requested no reply, but drew attention to those sections of the OWRC Act dealing with water pollution control and the objectives for industrial waste control in Ontario.

Approximately 320 of the industries receiving the letter have already met with the staff of the OWRC to discuss the quality of their effluent in the light of these objectives. More than 50 per cent of them are meeting their objectives, and 140 others have appeared before the commission or senior staff for further discussion, and are working on improvement programmes.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). In view of the hon. Attorney General's remarks in New Brunswick on Saturday, can it be concluded that it is the government's intention to remove the function of his office, or any part thereof from the consideration of this Legislature, by means of the appointment of an official or officials whose actions and omissions could not be examined by the Legislature?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the remarks which I made to the New Brunswick section of the Canadian Bar association on February 12, consisted simply of a historical review of the office of the Attorney General, from the earliest times up to the present. I have a written text before me. I believe a copy has been made available to the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson).

I quoted largely from the text of a book written by Professor Edwards of the centre of criminology, called *The Law Officers of the Crown*, in which he points out that since 1928 in Britain, the Attorney General has not been a member of the Cabinet.

I think he makes it very clear that the Attorney General is answerable to the House for his actions. I expressed no personal opinions. I merely gave a historical recital, as anyone examining the text may see, and I certainly expressed no suggestion of a policy change on behalf of the government.

Mr. Singer: I take it then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney General was not flying a balloon, he was just giving an interesting talk from Professor Edward's book. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I trust the talk was interesting.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree). Are all labour standards, especially hours of work laws, in the trucking industry, being enforced during the current dispute within that industry?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, with respect to those firms in the trucking industry which come under the jurisdiction of the province of Ontario for the purpose of labour standards, I can assure you that the law is being enforced.

Of the 55 trucking firms directly involved in this dispute, technically only 19 come under provincial jurisdiction. I understand that our labour standards branch has not received any complaints in this matter since the trucking dispute began.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour, notice of which has been given.

In view of the hon. Minister's statements on Friday, may the House expect legislation at this session to amend the law in respect of the granting of ex-parte injunctions in labour disputes?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to add to my statement of Friday last, except to say that this whole question is currently under review by the government.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I have three related questions to put to the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management:

1. How many property negotiations remain unsettled in the acquisition of land for the Pittock dam at Woodstock?

2. Were the negotiating committees set up by the amendment to The Expropriation Procedures Act used in these settlements?

3. What were the dates of meetings held by the negotiating tribunal set up by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) to bring about settlements?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first question, there are seven properties which remain unsettled at the present time.

To the second question, the answer is "no." The special negotiating tribunal was set up by the hon. Prime Minister on January 28, 1965, prior to the amendment to The Expropriation Procedures Act.

To the third question: No formal meetings of the tribunal were held; instead, interviews were held with individual property owners.

Mr. Nixon: Might I ask supplementary to that, Mr. Speaker: Is this tribunal still working at the settlement of the remaining cases?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I might say that the tribunal is not out canvassing or talking with the property owners but it is willing to negotiate if any of them would like to come to Toronto.

Mr. Nixon: Then could he predict when final settlement of these outstanding cases might take place, sir, or are they just going to stay up in the air indefinitely?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I do not think I should answer that question. That would be up to the property owners.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport.

Is the hon. Minister of Transport using his powers to ensure public safety on our highways during the current trucking dispute? And, supplementary to that, is the hon. Minister aware that truckers not involved in the dispute are going more than 60 hours per week and in excess of 3,500 miles per week, in violation of the PCV Act?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in our scale operations we are conducting safety checks on vehicles passing over the scales, in the usual way, as we have been doing for some years.

Is the Minister aware that truckers not involved in the dispute are drawing more than 60 hours per week? I would say I am not aware of it. The PCV Act as such does not prescribe hours of work for transport drivers. These hours of work are administered by the provincial and federal Departments of Labour, through their respective labour standards legislation.

Mr. Paterson: Supplementary to that, does not the department concerned with the PCV Act rule on the number of miles that can be driven by drivers in a week?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: I do not think that is limited by The Highway Transport Board Act or regulations.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), notice of which has been given.

Has The Department of Labour decided whether employees of the Niagara Parks commission may properly be represented for bargaining purposes by the civil service association of Ontario?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member if he read his question as "has The Department of Labour"?

Mr. Speaker: I might say to the Minister that I had this question directed to The Treasury Department. Originally the member had it directed to The Department of Labour. We thought it belonged to The Treasury Department and directed it in this manner.

Mr. Braithwaite: It was transferred to the hon. Provincial Treasurer?

Mr. Speaker: That is right.

Mr. Braithwaite: I repeat the question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, Mr. Speaker.

Has The Department of Labour or the hon. Provincial Treasurer decided whether employees of the Niagara parks commission may properly be represented for bargaining purposes by the civil service association of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that I am still not able to understand the question. The Treasury Department has nothing to do with the arrangements at Niagara Falls, nor for that matter does The Civil

Service Department. The employees of the Niagara parks commission are not civil servants but are employed by the Niagara parks commission. They do have certain benefits by way of pension but are not civil servants.

Mr. Braithwaite: A supplementary question then, Mr. Speaker. Could the hon. Provincial Treasurer tell the House first of all, will these employees be allowed to bargain collectively; and secondly, which department would they fall into, since they do not seem to come under the Provincial Treasurer and they do not seem to come under the civil service commission?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, as I have already mentioned, these employees are employees of the Niagara parks commission.

An hon. member: A Crown corporation.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, that is right, which is a Crown corporation, and I do not think any department has anything to say as to whether or not there shall be negotiations through the civil service association.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Surely Crown corporations have to be answerable in this Legislature through some Minister? There must be some responsibility, or is this Legislature just a façade?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that those who are asking the questions should study The Public Service Act and see to whom it does apply.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond).

Will the hon. Minister indicate if it is proposed in the regulations under The Medical Services Insurance Act to enjoin doctors from billing patients directly?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the hon. member's question is "no." While it is anticipated that the majority of doctors will bill the department directly, it is not to be forbidden that they deal directly with the patients.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport. Are weigh scales on Highway 401 and elsewhere maintaining normal operations during the labour dispute in the trucking industry? And can the hon. Minister assure this House that there are no excessive violations of the PCV Act in respect to licences, ownership of vehicles, bill of lading, types of freight being

transported and overloadings during the time this dispute has been in progress?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, in answer to part one of the question, the answer is "yes." In respect to part two, the answer is that there have been no excessive violations.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. I have another question for the hon. Minister.

Is the hon. Minister aware of the great number of transferrals of ownership of transport trucks at very nominal prices during the past few weeks? If so, has there been any violation of the PCV Act and The Ontario Retail Sales Tax Act? Also, has The Department of Insurance been notified of all these changes?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, there are in excess of one million transfers of motor vehicles issued annually in this province through almost 300 agencies. We have no way of pinpointing any slight increase that might occur for any reason or in any particular segment.

In respect to part (b), since the strike began there has been no greater number of violations than in normal periods in advance of the beginning of the strike. The retail sales tax is collected by agents of the Provincial Treasurer.

Finally, with respect to part (c), there is no requirement that The Department of Insurance be so notified.

Mr. Paterson: Might I get clarification from the hon. Minister on his first point? He mentioned one million transferrals a year. Is that specifically on PCV licences?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: No, on vehicle licences. I say we do not break them down. There is in excess of one million vehicle transfers issued in the course of a year.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

Inasmuch as the sales tax, after April 1, will be five per cent instead of three per cent, will the hon. Provincial Treasurer ensure that the five per cent will be charged only against the goods purchased, and not also on the 11 per cent federal sales tax, which is an example of tax on tax?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the hon. member must understand that it would be entirely impossible to sort out the tax that has been charged on goods upon which we charge sales tax. As everyone

knows, the 11 per cent is paid at some stage before it reaches the retailer, or certainly before it is retailed. We have no way of knowing at what stage that tax was paid, how much was paid, nor upon what amount it was paid.

It may be that the hon. member is referring to a few instances where the manufacturer sells directly to the consumer. One instance of that is in printing. The material is printed, the printer charges an 11 per cent sales tax and our sales tax is added to the invoice after the 11 per cent has been paid. I think the hon. member would understand that it would not be possible to make an exception in one particular area, nor is it possible to know the amount of tax that is in any invoice for goods; certainly not in the amount of the retail price of the goods.

There is one advantage of the retail sales tax which is generally recognized, and that is that there is no mark-up on the retail sales tax. It is charged after the mark-up has been added, and it is for that reason that many feel that this is a just tax.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a brief statement in which I think the House would be interested, on the capture of the escapees from Kingston penitentiary on Saturday, which I think was a splendid example of co-operation among the police forces of all three levels of government. The Ontario provincial police, the Metropolitan Toronto police, the Barrie and other municipal forces were active from the moment of the escape on Wednesday. Although the men were known to be in the Barrie area, their whereabouts were uncertain.

On Friday, Commissioner McLellan of the RCMP telephoned Commissioner Silk that the personnel and facilities of the RCMP were available. When word came that the men were in the Niagara peninsula, the alert went out on radio and Telex from the Ontario provincial police Burlington headquarters to all OPP units, as well as to the municipal forces on the peninsula. The Royal Canadian mounted police were immediately called in. A prearranged roadblock pattern, which is available at a moment's notice for any part of the province was set up.

The commander of the Smithville detachment of the Ontario provincial police recalled that the Lincoln county chief was not equipped with radio and advised him by telephone of the situation. It was Chief Robert Rippey of the Lincoln county police and Constable Juhlke who first sighted the

men. They followed, alerting the St. Catharines police manning the roadblock. They, in turn, followed, meanwhile radioing ahead to the other St. Catharines personnel who made the actual arrest.

The public was most helpful in this whole matter and the value of our Telex and radio communication system was demonstrated to be of great worth in this type of police activity. I commend the forces that were involved.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Third order, committee of the whole House; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

On section 1;

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, under section No. 1, we feel that section (e) regarding covered persons, should be enlarged, we are deeply concerned that the hon. Minister (Mr. Dymond) has chosen to develop his bill in order that it will cost the government more money. It will be a most inefficient way of running an insurance scheme; in fact, it defies every economic law of administration in connection with health insurance.

I know the hon. Minister is as aware as everyone in this House that the most expensive method of administering health insurance programmes is on the individual basis. Indeed, we look at PSI, a non-profit organization. Under pay direct, it was costing \$204 a year for a family of three or more. PSI were finding that the problems of extra billing and of reminders meant extra administrative costs. And PSI found that, under a group plan, they were able to charge \$159 a year and that they were making money through this.

We feel that if groups are not included, it means that the government is leaving the groups for the private insurance agencies and this is where they will be able to make a profit, while it will be the obligation of the government to take on this costly administrative approach, therefore the government is going to have to subsidize its own plan, as well. I say that, sir, because last year, as you recall very well, the government was suggesting a projected premium of \$180.

This year, the premium has come down to \$150 but they have extended services.

Why could groups not be included in this? I think, for example, of the 14,000 employees of General Motors. This is an approach, if they were allowed to join with the government plan, which would bolster the plan. I refer to the Laird of Lindsay and his remarks about the hospital insurance commission, saying the need for 15 employees or more to join would give the economic bolstering to a plan so that it would be workable. The fact that in this amendment the hon. Minister is saying "covered person" indicates to us that he does not understand insurance principles and, again, he is leaving the lucrative area to the private insurance companies.

We are also somewhat dissatisfied with the subsection 1, sub-paragraph (j). The hon. Minister had said last year that one of the things he wanted to do with the plan was to avoid duplication and overlapping; he was going to have facilities to avoid unnecessary administrative costs. He was indicating that this would be interrelated with the Ontario hospital services commission. Now he comes before us and tells us that his efficiency experts had a look at the floor plan and one and a half floors are not enough for his new programme. Well, I think that is not a sufficiently adequate excuse to present to the people of Ontario to be setting up a completely separate division. Prior to this, he talked about the fact that he did not want a separate civil service division; he was going to avoid overlapping, he was going to avoid duplication. Then he comes into the Legislature and tells us the reason he has to permit overlapping and duplication is because of some floor plan.

Sir, it is for these reasons that I move that subsection two of section one be amended by the addition of the words "a group" after the word "person" where it appears a second time in the first line of sub-paragraph (e), so that the said sub-paragraph (e) will read as follows:

(e) Covered person means a person or a group which is covered by a standard medical services insurance contract.

Section one is further amended by striking out all the words after "division" in the second line of sub-paragraph (j) in subsection five and substituting the following: Of the Ontario health services commission.

Mr. Chairman: In connection with this amendment of the leader of the Opposition, I am inclined to think that this has properly been discussed under the principle of the

bill. I can see merit in your second amendment in section one, further amended by striking out all the words after "division" in the second line of sub-paragraph (j) in subsection five and substituting the following: Of the Ontario health services commission.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I say that under "covered person" I add "group"? I fail to see how you can suggest that is against all the principle that we discussed before and was approved. I do not understand your reasoning on that. I can surely add to enlarge on the definition of covered person to mean covered person or groups. I am making this very clear to you and I see nothing wrong with that whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman: It would be my observation to the leader of the Opposition that we discussed in principle whether we are going to be covered individually or collectively as groups, and I would consider that this would be a principle of the bill.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, would you permit me a word on that? I think it is important now that we try to get our ground rules cleared, and I can appreciate the position you are in. But, I submit to you that the fundamental principle of the bill has nothing to do with voluntary coverage of groups.

The fundamental principle of the bill, as the government told us time after time, was so-called voluntary versus compulsory insurance, and limited versus universal coverage, and this amendment does not violate that principle.

The bill as it now stands provides that individuals can obtain coverage voluntarily upon application, and all that the proposed amendment offers, as I understand it, is that groups should be put in the same category as individuals. They would not be necessarily covered, but they could make an application for coverage, just as an individual.

Now, that does not go to the principle which was settled in the vote on second reading of this bill. I think it is an important addition. The government may disagree that it is a desirable addition, but at any rate the whole idea as to whether or not we should put groups in the same category as individuals is really an important point that has not yet been covered by any decision of this House. Therefore, I think it is in order that it should be discussed either here or at some other time during committee stages. This may not be the appropriate time, but we

should be allowed to deal with it at some other time.

Mr. Chairman: I want to say to the member for Woodbine, I have some doubts in connection with it. I am prepared to give him and the leader of the Opposition the benefit of the doubt in this connection, and they will be heard.

Mr. Bryden: So the discussion, sir, now is on the amendment—on both parts of the amendment now before us. Is that correct?

Mr. Chairman: That is correct.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I have something to say here. This is in violation of the principle of the bill. It has been stated throughout this entire piece that this bill was directed toward insuring individuals and not groups. Indeed, it has been repeated time and again that groups were not included in the bill. This applies to individuals, and it is not the belief of government at the present time that we can extend this to include groups.

Mr. Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I am ruling that this is now in order at this time. Who wishes to speak on this amendment?

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my hon. leader in his remarks on his amendment to this section. One of the great weaknesses in this section, and throughout the whole bill, is the fact that groups have been ignored. It is an unfortunate situation that groups such as the civil servants of the province of Ontario are not within this bill because it is most important that these large groups become a part of any government-operated plan that is going to succeed.

By inserting the word "group" and making it possible that groups do become a part of the plan, it makes it possible that so many of the more prosperous—the better risk groups—are within the plan.

Under the present situation, as this legislation now stands, it means that the government or the taxpayer is carrying those who are more apt to join such a government scheme as this, that is those who are ill, those who are older. It is by having the group in on a plan that we have an opportunity literally to make money on the younger and on the more healthy people who apply for health insurance.

I would also like to emphasize the amendment to sub-paragraph (j) in subsection five

of section one, in use of the terms, Ontario health services commission. By broadening the scope of the Ontario hospital services commission and bringing all our health services under one roof, under one plan, we will have a far better organization, not only to administer the hospital services and the medical services insofar as they are now planned, but it gives the government a greater opportunity in an organized fashion, and in a well planned fashion, to expand health services that are going to be needed in the province of Ontario in the future.

This section, in its definitions, is the beginning, and in order to get off to a broad and strong beginning, our definitions should plan for the future.

We on this side of the House, when we talk about health services, not only envisage the medical services that are coming under this bill, but we are looking forward to a much broader scope of health services and medical services, and in this we include research.

But as it is now, under this subsection 5 sub-paragraph (j) in section 1, this business of a medical services insurance division is just one more large section of the department. So we are going to find in insurance that we have the hospitalization; we have medical insurance as envisaged under Bill No. 6; and we have the groups that are run by the private insurance companies.

So in essence, by bringing about these amendments as the hon. leader of the Opposition has suggested, we want to broaden the scope of this plan, we want to bring in the groups, and we want to see to it that we have a well organized, well administered system of health services here in the province.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification on the amendment which has been proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, to what reference is the reference to the Ontario health services commission? Surely if a new term is to be introduced into the bill, this is the place where it should be defined properly.

Mr. Thompson: I would be glad, Mr. Chairman, to answer the hon. member's question. We have always envisaged that there should be the broadest approach towards the total health need. We saw the first move take place with the Ontario hospital services commission, and we felt that with the machinery, with the experience, with the knowledge, with the staff, which we have in the Ontario hospital services commission, it would be logical that when we move into the medical

insurance field it would be within this framework that we would continue. We want to have the name called "health" because we do not want a narrow attitude taken on this, but a broad attitude.

We came to this conclusion really because the hon. Minister of Health—who told us that he could see a great deal of logic in this—said, if I could quote him from last year, Mr. Chairman:

I said that the division of the department will be housed in the Ontario hospital services commission building. We will utilize all the facilities there so that there will be no duplication and no overlapping and therefore no unnecessary administrative costs.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there are two or three points that I want to make, but to establish as much continuity as we can in a debate of this nature, let me carry on from the point that the hon. leader of the Opposition has just been dealing with.

I think there is merit in establishing the proposition of a health services commission now. I do not think this bill permits the proposition of including, or even anticipating at the moment, that great range of services that is spelled out in the Hall commission report or was spelled out in the amendment that the Liberal group introduced on second reading. Much as I would like to see those included, I think we have to face reality and recognize that those are future steps and consideration of them at the moment is just going to frustrate achieving the immediate step of covering doctor bills.

However, it is not too early to establish a health services commission so that we can incorporate the coverage of both hospital and doctor bills. We have the two basic needs that can be covered, the one that has been covered now for a number of years, and the second one which is anticipated in this bill.

I recognize that the hon. Minister of Health gave us a reason as to why he indicated last spring that this could and would be done and then subsequently changed his mind. But I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, I never heard a more feeble and irrelevant excuse for changing his mind—namely, when they took a look at the situation they discovered that the floor space in one particular building occupied by the hospital commission did not permit of including the two of them together.

Mr. Chairman, surely we are all aware of the fact that on occasions when floor space

became inadequate for a department in one area, then the department may have to be located in two different buildings, or conceivably move to another building. But there is no need to compound the difficulty today and for years to come, by separating the two of them when, in terms of efficiency, they obviously should be included at the moment.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, just let me quote from the Toronto *Telegram* of February 4, which is after the hon. Minister came to his conclusion that he did not have enough floor space and therefore he would have to reverse his announced decision to this House last spring. This is a special interview that Peter Thurling of the Toronto *Telegram* had with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). Just let me read the first two or three paragraphs:

Premier Robarts said last night that Ontario will put together Medicare with hospital services as the provincial health plan develops.

I concede that the hon. Prime Minister was saying "as it develops," but the hon. Minister, after having indicated last spring he was going to do it, now says he is going to separate them. Our point, the point of the amendment, as I interpret it, is that we should move now. Indeed, if I may continue the quotation:

In an exclusive interview, the Premier said: "It is an obvious solution as Medicare evolves. If you have health services over there and Medicare here," the Premier said, as he showed how with his arms, "sooner or later you are going to bring them together."

Our question is, why later? Why not sooner? Why not right now? Why compound the difficulties and add to the inefficiency which is almost an integral factor of this whole proposal of the government by separating them at the present time?

So we certainly would be in support of that proposition. However, Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to two other aspects, one to underline a point that the hon. leader of the Opposition raised, namely, that the tragedy of this bill is that it is really violating the basic principles of insurance.

It is a very interesting commentary that we find a Conservative government has not even an accurate assessment of how insurance principles operate. Or maybe it understands how insurance operates today with many companies, as they gradually get away from high risks to cut their losses, and the government tolerates that kind of thing. But

what this government has done is to separate the high risks and assume responsibility for them, and to open the prospect that more and more of those high risks will come to the government-sponsored and subsidized coverage, whereas the low risks and therefore the high profit coverage is going to be left with the private insurance companies.

This is a travesty of the application of insurance principles. Surely if you were going to operate on the basic principle that this government has been proclaiming right from the outset—even though it is phony—that this is a voluntary scheme and that anybody who wants to come in shall have the privilege to come in it, how can the hon. Minister now rise and say that if you are an individual you can avail yourself of the voluntary basic principle of this bill, but if you are a member of a group you are denied the opportunity of availing yourself of that voluntary principle? Because you are a member of a group, you have to stay outside, you have to stay with the high cost and the high profit private insurance companies. It defies logic and it makes a mockery of the whole application of basic insurance principles.

There is one other point, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to make, and I make it in comment on the hon. Minister's interjection as you were soliciting views from the House and laying the guidelines for this debate. The point is, and I think it is interesting for the hon. Minister particularly to take note, that the proposal that groups should be included in the amendment in defining covered persons is not a proposal that has come only from the Opposition.

Indeed, in second reading of the bill, the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), a Tory, indeed one of the most outspoken exponents of the government legislation almost on an automatic basis, rose in this House and said that he thought we should move immediately to include our own civil servants. He proposed that if we are operating our own bakeshop—I think was his particular analogy—we should buy from our own bakeshop.

Fine—if we are operating our own medical services plan we should certainly provide coverage for our own employees under that plan. In other words, we have already had from the government side of the House at least one hon. member rise and speak—how many were agreeing with him, I am not in a position to say or even guess—but at least one of them has risen and said that if this government is going to be sensible and logi-

cal—if we can really ask for that in the face of this kind of bill—it should then include at least the civil service group which amounts to some 45,000 people, and which, in this past year, the government “rescued” from PSI and handed over to the general mercies of an insurance syndicate headed by London Life.

The points made by the hon. leader of the Opposition in these amendments deserve, and will have, our support.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I regret that this amendment should cover two points, both of which are, in my opinion, of vital importance and each of which deserves separate treatment by itself. However, that is the way in which the amendment has been put forward so we have to deal with the two points at the same time, even though they are not really related. The only thing they have in common is that they relate to clauses in the “definition” section.

I would like to say a little more about the question of voluntary coverage of groups, which I take is the purpose of the first part of the amendment of the hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not think we have to worry about the technicality as to whether or not the amendment, if carried, would accomplish the purpose. It is sufficient to consider the purpose and have the House go on record one way or the other in relation to it.

The hon. Minister stated a few minutes ago that it had never been his intention that groups could be covered under this legislation under any circumstances whatever. I would like to hear some justification from him of that arbitrary decision on his part. Certainly, the bill as it now stands would not permit groups to apply for coverage to the government agency which will administer the Act and which, as far as individuals are concerned, will apparently provide coverage more cheaply than private insurance companies are now doing, even more cheaply than PSI is now doing, Mr. Chairman. Not nearly cheaply enough in my opinion, but more cheaply than individual coverage which is now available under any existing plan.

Now, if that benefit is to be extended to individuals, why should it not be extended to groups as well? If the government can provide coverage to individuals more cheaply than do private carriers, then surely it can provide coverage to groups more cheaply. I think there are obvious reasons why it can do it more cheaply. For one thing, it does not have big selling costs; it does not have

any profits to deal with; it just has the basic administration costs.

If people who are not in groups are to get that benefit, then I think that people who are in groups should have the same benefit. As my hon. leader pointed out, there was a suggestion from the Tory back benches that one of the largest groups in the province should be immediately covered.

Unfortunately, the hon. gentleman who made that—I was going to say he is not here, but he has just arrived and I am happy to see him. I hope his deskmates will fill him in on what is going on.

I was not able to follow at the time he made the suggestion why he wanted this legislation to be available only to the group that now constitutes the civil service. If that group is to get the benefit of the legislation, then I would think that any group should be entitled to it, if they wish to apply for it.

We are accepting the decision as of last Friday that it is no longer open to us to debate the whole question of universality, which is possible only under a compulsory plan. We have let that go. We are accepting the basic principle established by the vote of Friday that this plan will be voluntary. Our only suggestion is that all people should at least be treated as equals within the framework of the voluntary coverage, and that people who are in groups should have this possibly open to them, as well as individuals.

Furthermore, from the government's point of view, there is no question that it would be highly advantageous to have certain groups—as many as care to—come into the plan that is now being set up. Everybody knows that coverage can be provided to groups more cheaply than to individuals. Why does the government deprive itself of this benefit? Why does it take only the worst risks?

I think the answer to the question is quite obvious, and though the government will not admit it, we might as well state it. It is far more concerned in this legislation about the welfare of insurance companies than it is about the welfare of the people of Ontario. That is the only conceivable reason why it is not willing to accept the principle of the first part of the amendment that is now before the committee.

If it would concern itself less about the insurance companies—who, after all, have lots of other types of business to engage in if they are gradually pushed out of this field—and consider the welfare of the people of the province, then it would, in my opinion, accept the amendment now before us.

I would also like to refer to the second part of the amendment which proposes that the administration of this legislation, inadequate as it is, should be consolidated with the administration of the existing Hospital Services Insurance Act and any subsequent legislation in the field that may be ultimately adopted.

I would like to hear from the hon. Minister an adequate explanation of why he is not prepared to do that. I think that last year, as has been mentioned, he suggested that it was a sensible idea to co-ordinate administration. After all, the hospital services commission already has an elaborate administrative setup with quite highly developed business machines and so on. Why should we set up another division to duplicate its work? The job can be done much more efficiently if it is all done in one agency, or through one agency.

I think that the hon. Minister made some excuse not long ago, that this was not feasible because there was no more room in the hospital services commission. Therefore he was setting up a separate division of his own department because of the lack of floor space or something in the hospital services commission.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you as a business man that that is perhaps the weakest excuse that has ever been put forward by anybody—that one does not expand an agency when it is logical to do so merely because the agency has run out of floor space in its present quarters. Either you get new quarters or you expand the present quarters. At least you do things in a logical and rational way.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the reasons why the government will not do what is obviously sensible from an administrative point of view, and is obviously the most efficient way of doing the job, is because of some curious childish susceptibility of the medical profession.

I see that out in Scarborough they are not going to bill the government agency, they are going to bill the patient who, in turn, will bill the government agency. I suppose the reason that the hon. Minister has set up a separate agency is that he thought that they might consider that they could protect their virginity better if they were dealing with The Department of Health rather than with the hospital services commission.

Surely we cannot cater to that kind of childishness, Mr. Chairman. We have to do things in a logical way and expect that adult human beings will act like adults.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister, in

any case, that if this is the factor that is involved, he is not accomplishing his purpose. The doctors out in Scarborough apparently consider that they risk their virginity even if they deal with The Department of Health. So you are never going to get any rationality out of these people.

You have to go ahead and do the thing in a sensible way, and then hope that in time they may see the foolishness of the position that they are now taking.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would strongly urge the House that it should vote for this amendment. It is an amendment in two parts, in a sense. It might be fairer to put each part individually. A person could be in favour of one part and not in favour of the other. But whether or not you feel it logical to do that, I believe that the hon. members in good conscience should support both parts, and if they have to vote on the amendment in one block then they should support it.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, I think that the hon. Minister of Health owes it to the House to tell us in a straightforward way what will happen if a union negotiating the collective bargaining agreement with an employer negotiates adherence to the Ontario government plan. Will The Department of Health or the medical services insurance division require that each member of the bargaining unit shall apply for a standard contract, or will they be flexible enough to allow the executive of that union to enrol them as a group?

In other words, is the hon. Minister so tenaciously committed to the principle of individual participation that he will not allow, in the illustration that I have posited, the enrolment of a large number of individuals through one organization?

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for Sudbury, I think the Minister has explained to us previously under the principle of the bill it would be accepted only individually and not as a group.

Mr. Sopha: I thought he might be enlightened, Mr. Chairman, after the discussion that has taken place today. It is possible that he has changed his mind to the extent that he sees the good sense of what is being proffered from this side of the House. That indeed is embodied in this amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Are you ready for the question?

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister is going to sit there and say

nothing, we have put a very cogent reason as to why, for example—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, if they would just sit down and give me a chance to speak—I am waiting until they have had their say.

Mr. MacDonald: You were not waiting.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I am waiting.

Mr. MacDonald: The Chairman was calling for the question and you were sitting back—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: How does the hon. member know what I am going to do?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, as I stated at the outset, this bill was aimed at providing for a need that now exists, and that need is to ensure that individuals have available to them a standard comprehensive medical services insurance contract.

We believe, and we know from experience, that groups are now well covered and in spite of all the arguments about them being left to the tender mercies of the profit-making insurance organizations, facts do not bear this out. Indeed, there is not an insurance carrier today who would not be very glad to throw over this total service, because not one of them admits to making anything on it. As I said on Friday—close your eyes, my friend—in spite of all that has been said in the Hall commission, I sat at a table with the director of research for the Hall commission who publicly admitted that the insurance companies were not making money.

But I am not here to defend the insurance companies. As I have said many times before they are big boys, all of this fancy and conjecture in which my hon. friend across the way indulges is completely without foundation in fact. Indeed, I think, sir, they talk to hear themselves talk. The programme which we have presented to the House is to meet the need of those who cannot, for a variety of reasons, get the medical services insurance coverage. For this reason, I say to you, sir, because of the fact that the government has spelled out time and time again that this was the reason for the bill, it would be violating a principle if we included groups in this.

The hon. Prime Minister has already said—and I have repeated this every time I have talked about this programme—that this is but a step and we must take a step at a time. Surely none of us who listened to the Budget last Wednesday afternoon can fail to appreciate the fact that we must look carefully where

we are going. While in this bill we provide for those who need—and I repeat this over and over again, sir—provide for those who need, I think the province of Ontario is taking a logical and a sound step forward.

This principle of insurance has not been violated. The hon. members opposite speak as though 40 per cent of our population, who constitute the potential available to this programme of the government, are all bad risks. Mr. Chairman, this is absolutely foolish, and this is the most kindly way I can express it. The 40 per cent of the population may have in it, because of the fact that ill health is one of the reasons why these people cannot get insurance coverage, we may have in it a larger number of high-cost risks, but they are not all going to be bad risks. Indeed the actuaries and the economists who have studied this brought the price down this year because of the greater number which we could potentially cover under the programme.

The figures which I presented in the House last year of \$72, \$140 and \$180 were the figures the actuaries then gave me for the limited number available to us, recognizing that in that limited number would be a very large number of high-cost risks. By community rating, I am told that for this whole group—the whole potential available to us—this premium structure is quite reasonable.

Then in the matter of 5 (j), Mr. Chairman, it is obvious as one listens to the hon. members of the Opposition that they do not listen to what is being said in the House. I know it is not very interesting at times, but if the hon. members would read the things they are going to talk about and argue about, and show they have some knowledge of what they are talking about, they would not talk so stupidly.

They said that my whole argument about the OHSC was because of—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That was one argument. Would the hon. member kindly put his fist in his mouth, please? My apologies, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister still has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the floor space was only one of the features. Indeed, last year when I introduced the bill in the first instance, I said nothing about putting this under the hospital services commission. I said the medical services insurance division would be housed in the OHSC building and

would utilize all of its resources, material and human, that was possible. I stated in the House last week, sir, that I had made that statement and meant what I said when I made it, without knowledge of what was involved. When we had the organization and methods people look at the programme, they told me how much space was needed and pointed out to me the great difficulty in melding the programmes because they are both completely different programmes. Even if this were under the OHSC today, they would have to have two separate divisions, just as separate as they are at the present time.

The hon. Prime Minister has given this House the assurance that as the programme develops it will be melded under a health service where there might be a commission. But let me remind you, sir, and remind the hon. members of this House, that all of the health services including the Ontario hospital services commission are melded within The Department of Health. The Ontario hospital services commission is not an agency complete and separate or apart. It must report to this House through the Minister of Health and therefore all of the health services are now under The Department of Health. I would hope for the welfare of Ontario this will continue.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of what I have said, I cannot support the amendment.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. Minister of Health has set the tone for this debate, I think we are going to have quite an interesting afternoon. He contradicted himself completely out of his own mouth.

If you talk about a principle of group insurance, under any circumstance you must recognize the fact that by enlarging the group, by enlarging the number of people covered, you reduce the premium. The hon. Minister himself has just stated that because the group which was originally to have been covered under the standard contract has now been enlarged it was possible for his actuaries to bring down the cost of that insurance. What we are asking here is that the scheme be further enlarged and that if it should be the wish of any group of people in the province of Ontario to participate in that plan, they be allowed to participate in the hope that this would have the effect of reducing the costs to all the people who participate in the government plan.

Certainly, so far as the hon. Minister is concerned, he has admitted this and it would be my belief and my understanding that he

should now therefore accept the first part of the amendment.

The hon. Minister has also stated, of course, the perfectly ridiculous statement that the insurance companies in the province of Ontario would like to be out of this business. If they would like to be out because it is uneconomic then I say that in our society we cannot afford to have uneconomic activities carried on. The place where you carry on economic activities in the health field is by providing for group coverage of all the people in the province of Ontario, and if this is a first step or a second or a third step, let us leave the avenue open so that the next step can be taken without having to have another protracted debate in this House.

On the second part of the resolution, it just seems that the hon. Minister is determined to confuse the points which are made by the members on this side of the House. It is quite true that the Ontario hospital services commission reports through the Minister to this House, but there is an entirely different area of responsibility on the Minister between a division of his own department and a separate commission set up and established by the legislation of this assembly.

The Ontario hospital services commission as such has a responsibility directly to the people of the province of Ontario and reports through the Minister of Health. If we can have that kind of commission divided, whether it is necessary or not, into one or two divisions which will look after the health needs of the people of this province, then I think this is the time to do it.

We have had no indication from the hon. Minister that he or his department is able to provide the kind of statistical information which is necessary for a continuing study of the health needs of the people of the province of Ontario. We have had very good indication that the Ontario hospital services commission, in the area which has been its responsibility, is in fact able to make adequate and continuing judgments and assessments from the statistics available to them as to the costs that are involved in their services. What we are fundamentally interested in here in this bill, and in this particular amendment, is the cost to the people of the province of Ontario. The costs will be greatly reduced if groups are admitted into this plan, and the costs will be greatly reduced if the administration is entrusted to the Ontario hospital services commission under a renamed commission—the Ontario health services commission.

I would urge that the hon. Minister either answer the further questions which have been raised, or that, in any event, the members of the government would support this particular amendment.

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would start trying to say that I hope that this debate can be carried out with a certain amount of calm, and that the hon. Minister will not feel drawn on because of lack of defence to say to a member of the House: Put your fists in your mouth or something. I do not think that is conducive to further discussion.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I do not need the hon. leader of the Opposition to read me a lecture on parliamentary behaviour. I think I could give him a few lessons.

Mr. Thompson: I would say that if a man blows awfully hard and loud it is because he has not got much substance to his argument. This is exactly as the hon. Minister says, and exactly what is problem is. Sitting next to him is the hon. member for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop), a man with a keen intellect who comes to the crux of a question. Last year, when the hon. Minister had his medical carrier he referred—I am referring to the amendment—he said that the high risks would be carried by the medical carriers. As we understand it, the medical carriers were going to form a pool system, by which the private insurance companies would have to pool the high risks. Now the hon. Minister has taken that over. Either the hon. member for Forest Hill is wrong, or the hon. Minister is wrong. I expect that the hon. Minister is wrong instead of the hon. member for Forest Hill.

May I say that this affects the people of this province in costs. I can see a situation of members in the civil service. I will just take that as an example. Some lowly paid man—and gosh knows there are enough of them—who is cleaning the floors or something, belongs to a group plan with London Life Insurance. He decides he would like to go with the government plan, but because he belongs to a group plan he is going to have to stay with that plan rather than get the benefit of the government plan. I am going to say this to the hon. Minister; I am going to read this back to him, Mr. Chairman. It was read back last year to him to show him he was wrong, that he is going to have to

subsidize this plan. And who is going to subsidize it? The cleaner, the fellow who is forced not to belong to the government plan but to pay to a group plan. He is also, through taxes, going to be paying to keep the government plan going. We say that is unfair. We think that people in groups should be able to join.

I would like to see the example taken by this government again to recognize the insurance principle. I reiterate what members of the Opposition have said—that the whole principle of insurance is that you get groups where you have the healthy, who perhaps are better risks, helping those who are not better risks. I find it very indicative, frankly, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister said, in explaining about the fact of not moving into the building with the Ontario hospital services commission; “I made these statements,” and then, “I had no knowledge about some of the factors.” That, unfortunately, it seems to me, is why he is blustering as hard as he is, accusing us of not having any knowledge when he openly admits that he made statements without any knowledge.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: “Stupid” was the adjective he hurled across the floor at us, as if he has a monopoly on all intelligence and his IQ, if tested, would show that it is superior to ours. We were not so stupid last year when we stood on principle, which has now been partially and grudgingly accepted by him. Now, in a calmer voice, I have a suggestion. If he sets the tone of debate according to that demeanour, I suggest that the hon. Prime Minister adjourn it and send him to Florida for a week so he can calm down a bit. He gets \$30,000 a year to be courteous to us here; we expect nothing less than that.

He appeared to say, if I followed his tantrum correctly, that his plan was designed to capture only the lower-income groups, those who could not afford to belong to the—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, will the hon. member permit me to correct that?

Mr. Sopha: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not say it was aimed to capture the lower-income groups. It was aimed to fill the need existing largely in three categories—age, state of health and financial status.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. I accept that correction. In other words, to capture those who found it difficult to get coverage through the classical means of obtaining coverage, that is, with the private carriers. I would ask him rhetorically—but he may not be pleased to answer—if the hon. Minister does not envisage that perhaps this plan being set up by the government of this province and publicly operated will, in some respects, be superior to that which is offered by private carriers? For example, unless I am badly misinformed, I am under the impression, Mr. Chairman, that not many of the private plans have eliminated the waiting period for pregnancy in the way this one has. Normally, in the private plans there is a waiting period. Husbands of pregnant women cannot go down and enroll in a contract, or get a contract from a private carrier. Possibly it will be the policy of the government to improve their plan as time goes on, and accordingly the government plan will, perhaps, in several different facets, become more attractive than the plans offered by private carriers. If that be so, it would seem logical to me to expect that groups of individuals, maybe some 40,000 strong, will suddenly approach the Provincial Treasurer some day and will say: “We no longer want to be covered by London Life, we would prefer to be enrolled in the government plan.” Perhaps, for all we know, the hon. Prime Minister himself will join the government plan. Perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition—

Mr. Thompson: I was thinking about it.

Mr. Sopha: Coming from a person who must confess to some measure of stupidity, as a suggestion, if the day comes that the 40,000 civil servants, through their association, want to enroll in this plan, does the hon. Minister of Health really anticipate that the Provincial Treasurer would have to say to those people—I want to stress this point, because I think it has a good deal of validity—“Each of you enrol individually?” Would it not be the better part of good sense and of common sense, of which commodity I am led to believe the hon. Minister of Health has a fair measure, that this statute now be amended to say that groups may enrol wholesale in it?

Can we, as legislators, say, having set up a government plan as we are doing now, that we want our plan to be inferior in standards or in characteristics than anything offered by any other carrier in the country? We at least want it to be equal, if not superior. If we agree on that principle, it seems a logical extension that from an actuarial point of

view, which the hon. Minister himself stressed, we want groups of people that contain a large proportion of the healthy as well as the ill. He says the plan is designed to capture those people and cover those people through age, infirmity and income—his own words—who are not able to get coverage elsewhere.

For the good of the public purse, which suffers much these days—there was a terrible assault on it last week—we would want to have groups enrol in the plan which would make it all the more actuarially sound.

I hope those reasons, as well as the reasons offered by our friends to the left, commend themselves to all hon. members of the House; so that they will vote to adopt this amendment to section one.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, following up what the hon. member for Sudbury has just said, there are a great many local unions, small local unions, that have just negotiated first contracts. These contracts have a minimum amount of security within them.

They have shared with the employer in cost, and they now have certain contracts with private insurance companies which say that they are entitled to certain benefits. Those benefits, at the beginning, are often very small, with perhaps large deductibles, covering only medical care and similar kind of protection.

Now these groups are shut out effectively from this legislation. It may well be that they might cancel the contract and come in as individuals, but then they would forfeit the amount the employer pays, and the employer would have something to say because this has been bargained to cover a certain length of time.

It is incredible that we should say to all these people, who have benefits far, far less than those given under the public plan, that they are barred from the public plan for the duration of the contract.

Even if, when next bargaining time comes around, these people want to get into the public plan, they will still want to bargain with the employer that he pays 50 per cent and they pay 50 per cent to get into the public plan. At this point they are completely shut out. They cannot bargain to come into the public plan and get the coverage needed at a low cost.

As has been said time after time in this House, there is no question that the broader the base the cheaper the contract. The bigger the group, the lower the premium, and the more of these smaller groups that come into the large group—and thereby

make an overall larger number of people participating—the lower the premium must become. So it behooves this House to pass this amendment so that the groups who are outside the plan can come in, so that premium levels can come down.

When I think in terms of the 40,000-45,000 public servants employed by the government and the contract that they have entered into over this past year, we have a responsibility to them to give to them insurance at the lowest possible cost. Surely we are not going to say to our own civil servants, we are excluding you from our plan. We are continuing your contract with the London Life at a higher rate than you could get in the public plan.

With another 50,000 people and other similar groups within the plan, from municipal and other levels, there is no question that the rates could come down. The group would be larger, the premium would be lower.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us this afternoon should face this fact, and that as responsible legislators in this province, we owe an obligation, not only to our own civil servants, but to these hundreds of groups who are now participating in group plans, the benefits of which are much lower than the benefits of the public plan.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, the members in the Opposition dealing with this amendment are trying to convince the government that the amendment should be accepted, which would provide measures to bring in groups under the Ontario plan and also to provide consolidation of administration. Certainly there have been many reasons given, and I am sure that before the vote is taken, there will be many more to justify the arguments.

I feel that the hon. Minister himself has given a very good reason why the government should take into the plan the groups in the province of Ontario. When he makes a statement that the private plans are not making money and the companies would like to get out, it indicates to us that if they are allowed to continue covering people with insurance in the province, they are not going to give them the kind of attention they deserve.

The hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) and the hon. member for Waterloo North (Mr. Butler), do not, I feel, agree with the statement the hon. Minister made, but I would take it as having some validity, and if this is the case, certainly it is a good

reason why we should allow the groups to come under the Ontario plan. I tried to point out briefly during the debate on the principle of the bill, that the private insurance plans do not have the kind of standard and quality supervision that they should have. The individual has very little recourse in having complaints looked after unless he is in a group plan that is governed by a very stable organization, such as a trade union where they have full-time officers. There is no place where he can register a complaint through lack of service, or he has problems finding and getting service at the time he might need it. I get some examples of this at different times.

We found that in our early plans some years ago—I was president of the organization at the time and had the members calling me to tell me about some of the things that they felt were not right in regard to their coverage—when we paid only for the second and the third doctor's calls, the doctor sometimes felt that the patient might be a little hard up and he would register the first call as the second or third call, thereby in a sense abusing the plan. We had a very serious abuse of a hospital insurance plan under a private company some years ago, and only because of the drive of the executive of the local union were we able to get some recourse. That was the time we had hospital coverage under private plans, whereby the coverage was to provide \$3 a day for—

Mr. Chairman: Stay with this amendment.

Mr. Gisborn: Just an example of the need to bring the groups under the plan, Mr. Chairman. We found that the coverage they had provided for \$3 a day in-hospital, doctors' calls in hospital, based on an experience of the past, at that time was two-and-a-half calls per week. We found that within the first year it had advanced to four calls, and within a two-year period the doctors were billing us a straight \$21 a week for in-hospital calls. Of course, the company agreed—

Mr. Chairman: I do not know if the member realizes it, but he is wandering away from the amendment here.

Mr. Gisborn: I will be brief on this point, Mr. Chairman. Of course, the Steel Company of Canada agreed there was abuse and jointly we approached the Hamilton academy of medicine and we were able to

get the situation cleared up. We dropped back to something that was reasonable in the next couple of years.

Another very important reason why I feel we should have the groups under the Ontario government plan, is to have some continuing research and statistical control on the trends of the physical condition of the people covered. As I recall, the Hall commission spent a whole chapter in volume two of the report dealing with the important need for research and continuing statistical control of the health trends of the people. It was pointed out in that chapter that they had never had any real research method to compile data that would give them the continuing knowledge of just what the trend in health needs were for the people of the nation. They quoted from reports from the United States where they found the same problem.

I would say that under a government-operated plan, if everybody was in it, the government could keep its pulse on the trend of the health of people by their statistical compilation of the records of the people.

So I bring to the attention of the hon. Minister these areas where I feel the groups should be covered under the Ontario plan. It would be better for the people in the groups, it would be better for the other people of the province, and it would be conducive to a good plan and place the plan in a position whereby we could go on into the other stages of comprehensive coverage as has been talked about in the House.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a direct question.

Will he consider, and if not will he give his reasons for not doing so, the proposal put forward in this House by one of his own supporters, the hon member for Scarborough North that, if nothing else, this legislation should be broadened so that at the first appropriate opportunity the civil servants can be covered by it as a group? In other words, their present group plan with London Life would be revised to eliminate medical benefits and those people would be provided for within the framework of this legislation. I would like to know if the hon. Minister is prepared to consider that, and if not, why not?

Before he answers the question, there is one matter that I think he should bear in mind in answering it. Under the lousy wages that the government pays, especially to its lower-rated employees, there is a substantial number of employees of this government,

perhaps as many as 15 or 20 per cent, who pay no income tax. A great many of them are employed right in the hon. Minister's own department. In fact I would say the bulk of them are in his department in the various institutions throughout the province.

If these people worked for anybody but the government they could qualify under the legislation now before us for 100 per cent subsidy of their medical services insurance. It is not in the bill, but as I understand the hon. Minister's explanation of what will be provided in the regulations, any person who has no taxable income will be eligible to have the entire premium paid for by the government.

We are in favour of that, we are not arguing about it, but the situation that now exists is that if people employed by the government have no taxable income they will not get that benefit. Under the plan with London Life they have to contribute. I am not quite sure what the proportion is but I think it is more than 50 per cent, certainly not less than 50 per cent. Therefore, persons employed by the government will be discriminated against. They will not get a subsidy out of public funds that is available to other people.

If the hon. Minister is not prepared to go along with the proposal of the hon. member for Scarborough North, would he at least give us, if he can, a justification of that discrimination against government employees, and indeed, against employees of his own department?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has already indicated that he is not ready to support the amendment at this time.

Mr. Bryden: Surely he can answer questions, Mr. Chairman. I thought that was the purpose of committee proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember the exact words the hon. member for Scarborough North used, but I would point out, sir, as the hon. Prime Minister made very clear on Friday, that there are discussions going on between the two levels of government—the federal government and our own. Proposals have been made in this matter by the federal government, and they are actively under consideration and discussion at the present time. I think it would be most unwise for us to disturb a programme that is already in operation and operating well for groups.

The hon. member for York South spoke about the small benefits. We have looked very well into this and when we talk about

82 per cent of our people covered we are talking about 82 per cent of our people who are covered by a comprehensive type of programme in this province. There may well be small groups that are not covered as adequately, but by and large labour-management groups are well covered. Thanks to the good bargaining for which they deserve all kinds of credit, they have seen to it that this is so.

At the present time, sir, I can only say that the proposal that the hon. member for Scarborough North did make, relative to the civil service group, will be considered in due course. But there are so many other things, all part of the whole mosaic, that need to be considered as part of the piece and cannot be taken in isolation, again as the hon. Prime Minister so well pointed out last Friday.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister then attempt an answer to the second part of my question? How does he justify the discrimination that is going to exist against his own employees, or some of them, in that they will not get subsidies even though they would qualify under the terms of the legislation if they were not part of a group? How can he justify that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think it is perfectly patent that the government is already subsidizing the civil service programme.

Mr. Bryden: But the government's plan provides for contributions by the individual employees. Under this bill, the employee who has no taxable income makes no contribution at all; the government subsidizes him 100 per cent. Surely that is discriminatory. An employee in the civil service in that category pays roughly half, an employee not in the civil service pays nothing. I take it he cannot justify that so he is not trying.

Mr. Thompson: I would just like to get it very clear: Is the hon. Minister saying that he is making it compulsory; that it is compulsory that no groups can belong to his government plan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I said nothing of the sort. I said they would not be included at this present time. I never mentioned the word "compulsory."

Mr. Thompson: Well, can they join? Can they join? Can they join, then, answer that? The hon. Minister plays around with semantics. I said that he said it was compulsory that they cannot join.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has deigned to speak in this debate really for the first time. He gave us some general comments on second reading, then it is true the hon. Prime Minister followed with some meat—the first meat other than some political platitudes we have gotten from the hon. Minister—but we are only now getting back to basic features. The hon. Minister is contradicting himself repeatedly, either in terms of what he is saying within the same five-minute period or in terms of what he has said earlier. For example, he now objects to the use of the term “compulsory.” This may be fine if he wants to object but the fact of the matter is that groups are compulsorily excluded. They cannot—

An hon. member: Nonsense!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, how do they get in then?

An hon. member: They are simply not included.

Mr. MacDonald: They are simply not included, and if they seek to get in they discover that they are compelled to stay out. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, they are prohibited to come in and prohibition is compulsory. The hon. Minister charges us with engaging in semantics, but it is he who is guilty of that. But let me go a step further here, Mr. Chairman.

The hon. Minister, in the course of his comments, tried to defend the uneconomic unit that is being built in defiance of insurance principles. He says, “You are all wrong over there. You are stupid and you are wrong. For example, 40 per cent of the people come in under our plan—”

That is very interesting, Mr. Chairman. For the first time the hon. Minister has conceded that 60 per cent are out. They are under the group coverage. He has been giving us these figures of 82 and 85 per cent covered, and a lot of others on the government side have been repeating them. But now he says there is a group of 40 per cent that is broad enough for “group” coverage, but he hastens to add, however, that it includes the aged, the infirm and the low income groups. Mr. Chairman, the aged, the infirm and the low income groups are groups for which there is any amount of statistical evidence and research to prove that these are the high risks, and the government has all those high risks.

The hon. Minister has now conceded that he has got them in his 40 per cent. Indeed, it will not be 40 per cent; it is about 25 or

26 per cent at the most—which leaves another 13 per cent of individuals who are going to be out on a limb and who, at \$150, will not be able to buy it from a private insurance company. They will be the approximately 15 per cent that will emerge in Ontario like the 15 per cent that emerged in Alberta as people who will not be covered, so that the whole objective of the plan will not be achieved.

Another point: The hon. Minister gets up and tells us to be knowledgeable and to know what we are talking about. Yet, in the course of his comment in answering the hon. member for Woodbine he said the government would be considering this in conjunction with the federal plan. The interesting thing, Mr. Chairman, is that in the early stages of the presentation of this bill to the House, the hon. Minister went through the most disingenuous procedures to suggest that he knew nothing except what was in the federal plan. When the press went to him, after he introduced this bill in the House—

Mr. Chairman: I do not want to interfere or interrupt the member, but I wish that he would stay with the amendment, if he will.

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister digresses in dealing with what we have presented in dealing with the amendment, it is pretty difficult to cope with his information and misstatements of fact without digressing along with them. I know that I am in bad company when I digress with him, but I will not go too far.

I just want to draw attention to the fact that the hon. Minister stated, for example, that when he was drawing this up he gave no consideration to its integration with the federal plan. Imagine a Scotsman, a Scots Minister, not considering something that involved \$110 million. That was the furthest thing from his mind, he said. How stupid does he think we are? Well, we are not so stupid as to believe that kind of argument—

An hon. member: Is that parliamentary language?

Mr. MacDonald: I am using the hon. Minister's own phrase; he described us as stupid; he set the tone of the debate. He argues, for example, when he was asked by the newspaper boys—and I watched it on TV after he had introduced the bill—what effect this was going to have on the insurance companies. “Oh, I never thought of it,” said he. “Never thought of it; it had never crossed my mind. I give no consideration at all to the insurance companies.”

How stupid does the hon. Minister think we are that we are going to accept that kind of proposition when the bill—as we shall show about a week from now when we have gone through it section by section—in every section has been designed to meet the interests of the insurance companies? We will show the hon. Minister, if he does not know, but he knows that he has been in consultation with the insurance companies or other people.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is an absolute misstatement of fact. I have not—and I say unequivocally in this House before you—that I have not consulted the insurance agencies or the insurance companies concerning these amendments.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister on one occasion said that he was not going to withdraw—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: If this is the kind of debate we are going to have, this is going to be a long, interesting week. The hon. Minister got up at the beginning and told us we are stupid, and now the back benches start yelling “withdraw.” If this is the kind of debate you want, just proceed with it and you will get the kind of debate such as this House has never seen, because this is not going to be rammed through without the most detailed kind of consideration.

The hon. Minister has told the city he has literature prepared that is going to be distributed on February about a bill this House—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Sir, this is a misstatement of fact. I did not say that I had literature prepared; I said that literature would be prepared and ready to go out when this bill received passage in this House.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the speaker is misinforming the House; the hon. Minister is misinforming the House. I can get him a clipping from the *Toronto Telegram* in which he told the Toronto—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I do not know what the *Toronto Telegram* says, but I am stating unequivocally before this House what I stated—

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister at this point may have changed his mind but he has already stated that it was going to be ready for February 15, and as a matter of of fact, Mr. Chairman, if it is not ready, he

is not going to meet his deadline for the enrolment period on March 1.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to ask the member for York South to accept the Minister's statement in this House and to use it as authority, and not to recognize something that he reads in the press.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps we will be able to cope with that kind of situation in rather convincing ways before this debate is over.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Has the hon. member recognized the hon. Minister's statement yet?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I recognize it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When did you recognize it?

Mr. MacDonald: I will recognize it now, if it satisfies another Minister who wants to get into the fight. And before the debate is over, I will show how, on occasions, the truth is played with in dealing with this whole issue.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I state that the hon. member, because of his attitude, has affronted every hon. member of this House. The hon. Minister stood up in his place and said that the facts were misstated.

Mr. Bryden: That is no point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is a point of order. It affects every hon. member. It is a point of privilege, then, if I may say so, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. member: You have no point at all. Sit down.

Mr. MacDonald: Then I get up on a point of privilege, I am described by the hon. Minister as stupid—stupid on this side of the House—so maybe the hon. Minister should just calm down and take a look at the inadequacies and the attitudes of his own Cabinet members. He should set the tone of the debate and if this is the kind of debate he wants, he will get it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Is that a threat?

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, it is a threat. We have had threats from your side that you are going to ram it through.

An hon. member: Ah, go on!

Mr. MacDonald: Sure, you are going to ram it through. The fact is that you have a March 1 deadline which you cannot meet unless you get literature out across the province. At least two weeks ago, inaccurately or otherwise, the hon. Minister was reported as saying that it must be ready for February 15.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to ask the member for York South to speak to the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: All right, Mr. Chairman. I shall be glad to speak to the amendment.

There is one other aspect that the hon. Minister dealt with and that is that the private companies are losing money, said he. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman—and this is proof of the fact that we have to build a viable, economic unit on the government side so that it can be efficient—that the private insurance companies have been abusing this field for years. They use it as a loss leader. When they start to negotiate with the group, they will quote a lower price for the medical coverage so that they may be very close to the margin.

I seriously doubt that they are losing money, though I will concede that on some occasions they will not be making a great deal of money on the medical coverage itself, but they do this as a loss leader to get this group in. Then, when they have 5,000 or 10,000 of them, they will sell them insurance—life insurance and other things from which they reap their profits.

The interesting thing is that this government was guilty itself in its negotiations with the civil service association—which was not particularly interested in getting life insurance—of forcing it into a package deal this past year so that PSI could not meet the package. PSI could not give life insurance and therefore the whole deal went over to a syndicate headed by the London Life, which by mere chance happens to come from the city of London.

An hon. member: Nonsense! What tripe is that?

Mr. MacDonald: There is no "tripe" in that, Mr. Chairman. As a matter of fact, even before the arbitration board had decided on it, the civil servants had reported here at Queen's Park that the London Life was down negotiating with representatives of the government on it.

An hon. member: Speak to the amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: All right. Mr. Chairman, I was speaking to the amendment and I was underlining the fact that the insurance companies are misleading the public when they say that they are not making money. They are using it as a loss leader and they are making it up on other elements in the package deal. The sooner we get out of this kind of coverage and the sooner this government will accept a voluntary scheme permitting everybody—individuals or groups—to come into it, the sooner the government will be living up to its own principles and be able to establish a medical coverage that will have some validity, instead of the phony and the fraud that we have at the moment.

Mr. Chairman: Is the House ready for the question?

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question.

Inasmuch as groups will not be covered, may I ask him about groups that are now covered by the various co-ops in the province of Ontario? In order to qualify you must belong to a church group or some group such as that. Will people have to withdraw from these groups and apply individually to come under the government plan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If they come under the government plan, Mr. Chairman, they will apply individually.

Mr. Chairman: Question?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, one of the other arguments in favour of adopting the amendment proposed by the hon. leader of the Opposition is that, as we will all recall, one of the few benefits of last year's bill, the present Act, was that the standard contract, which was then to be made available not only by the government but also by the private carriers, was to be non-cancellable. It seems to me that now the amendment which the government has proposed to this section is going to provide that private carriers need not issue non-cancellable contracts, there is very good reason to think a large number of groups might consider that advantage was so great that they should be allowed to come into the government scheme to get the benefit of non-cancellation.

Even under the government scheme with the London Life, as we attempted to point out, there is no assurance that a retired or retiring public servant will in fact be able to continue his medical coverage with the London Life. He goes through certain pro-

cedures upon retirement, and if he makes an application to the London Life and agrees to pay the premiums then in force, he may be accepted for a continuation of that coverage.

But at the present time, sir, there is no assurance in the booklet that has been put out by the government that the London Life must, in fact, continue to insure him. I would think it would be very important to make certain that the government employees, if no one else, should be protected by having their medical coverage non-cancellable; I think this is a very substantial argument in favour of the proposed amendment to allow groups to come into the government scheme if they choose to do so.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment will please say "aye."

All those opposed, will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment, will please rise.

All those opposed, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 26, the "nays" 55.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, section 2, the amended bill, suggests that clause (b) be struck out. As I refer to the original Act, section 2 says this:

The Minister is responsible for the administration of this Act. The Minister may

(a) designate open enrolment periods,

(b) exempt licensed carriers from the requirements providing standard medical service insurance contracts, and

(c) approve the general form and content of standard contracts.

Mr. Chairman, section (a) which it is suggested stays in, designates open enrolment periods. I would like to spend a moment on this.

Mr. Chairman: I think the open enrolment is in another section, in which we can discuss it.

Mr. Young: No, it is right here. I read the original Act and it is in the original, but—

Mr. Chairman: It is not in the amendment before us and I will have to rule it out of order.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, it is in subsection 2 which is being amended; we are going to propose that the amendment be somewhat broader than is now proposed by the government. That surely is in order? We are going to suggest that more be struck out of subsection 2 than has been proposed.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the hon. Minister, in his announcement, said that individuals receiving subsidies under the various welfare Acts are to be enrolled automatically.

Mr. Chairman: What I would like to do is check with clause (a) first to see if it is being amplified or not. Wait just one moment if you will, please.

Mr. Young: Although I do not want to move it at the moment, I can tell you what my amendment is—that section 2 of Bill No. 6 be amended by striking out all the words after the words "amended by" in the second line, and substituting by striking out clauses (a) and (b). In other words, we want to extend the amendment, the striking out of clause (a), so this brings it well within the scope of the debate.

Mr. Chairman: Carry on.

Mr. Young: The hon. Minister has said that the various people under the welfare Acts will be enrolled immediately, but the open enrolment period for all others will be March 1 to May 1, 1966. That is this year. I am not sure what plans the hon. Minister may have for open enrolment periods later on, or what the dates might be, but certainly in the original Act the open enrolment was thoroughly discussed. At that time we were told there would be certain periods within which people could enrol in the Act.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this does a grave injustice to the people who want to enrol. There are many people who will not be able to enrol at this specific time because they may not qualify. There may be, for example, people who have certain contracts with private insurance companies as individual contracts. Those may not end until later this year. Therefore, they are faced with the problem of enrolling now and perhaps paying the double subsidy over the period of time, or if they wait until they are eligible they have to wait for the enrolment period when it next comes up. This seems to be completely

unjust for the people concerned. There are also cases where contracts may terminate in groups and those individuals may want to enrol as individual members in the plan. Because the termination date of that contract may not coincide with the enrolment date, there will be real hardship worked on the people concerned.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to us that the sensible thing, if we are going to stick, and evidently we have just decided that to individual participation there should be provision for every individual to enrol at any time during the year. When his need is there he should enrol; there should not be this enrolment period which will only work hardship on our people. It will mean that when contracts end there will be either the double premium to pay or a long waiting period when no protection is afforded. It seems to us common sense that enrolment should take place at the time when the person becomes eligible for enrolment.

Mr. Chairman, I would move, seconded by Mr. Renwick, that section 2 of Bill No. 6 be amended by striking out all the words after the words "amended by" in the second line, substituting "by striking out clauses (a) and (b)."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview has moved an amendment to section 2, that section 2 of Bill No. 6 be amended by striking out all the words "amended by" in the second line, and substituting "by striking out clauses (a) and (b)."

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, we on this side of the House support this amendment. On a later section we had a very similar amendment, but as you have ruled to debate this matter here we are most happy to speak in support of doing away with this waiting period for enrolment.

As the hon. member for Yorkview has stated, there are many instances and times where an individual might, for example, belong to a group plan and finds, as a result of unemployment, that he is no longer with a particular company and therefore he is out of a group plan. It means he must wait until it is time to be enrolled. There are many cases where a family has been left by the father. The mother, in order to protect her children and herself, and in order to get medical insurance, must wait until the proper time to enrol.

This particular section, as the government wants it passed, is one more roadblock on the way to having a universal health insurance scheme for the province of Ontario. For that

principle alone, we are opposed to this section.

This section also, in the matter of administration, I believe, adds to the bookkeeping and head-office expense. If a person had the right to enrol at any time, there would not be the necessity of the campaigns like some of the private firms, in order that people should enrol within a certain time.

So with these few remarks in mind, Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend to this House the support of this amendment, as it is something that will further the administrative value of this bill and will further the health of the people of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before you put the vote on this amendment, there are one or two further things to be said on it. We are not only confronted with the question of open enrolment periods. We come to what is really a basic defect in the government's total approach—the so-called voluntary approach always carries with it the problem of adverse selection. The government, having opened itself up to adverse selection, is trying to protect itself against it. I would suggest to the hon. Minister, however, that he simply carry that risk. He has always stated that the purpose of his legislation essentially is to provide a haven for the bad risks, the older people, the people in a poor state of health and those of low financial status. That is his essential purpose.

So now why should he start to discriminate within those groups? If he is taking the bad risks off the hands of the insurance companies, which is true, then let him take them, and let him not worry too much about adverse selection. He will get a certain amount. No doubt there will be someone who will not apply to come under the plan until they already are sick or until they know they are going to have to have an operation. Those persons are going to have to be provided for some way or other in any case.

So if the hon. Minister has a plan that is deliberately designed in the main instance to take the bad risks, I do not think he should worry too much about open enrolment periods. There are bound to be nothing but headaches and heartaches over the administration of any open enrolment period.

The hon. Minister, as far as I can recall, has never stated how often he intends to open the enrolment. He has stated that there is going to be an enrolment period—I think from March 1 to May 1, two months before

the legislation even comes into effect. And I got the impression—if I am wrong perhaps he will correct me—that there will be open enrolment periods perhaps once a year after that. Maybe he has in mind twice a year, I do not know, but if he does not have them very frequently, to the point where they really become meaningless, he is going to create a lot of hardship and injustice.

Take a person who is under, not a group plan, but just under an individual contract with a private company and who prefers the rates offered by The Department of Health under this legislation. Let us say he is now paying to Medically, let us say, \$215 a year or whatever the rate is and he would like to switch over to the government plan where according to the information we now have, he will have to pay only \$150. How is he going to do this if the expiration of his contract does not mesh with the open enrolment period? Either he will have to carry double coverage for a period or else he will have to go through a certain period when he has no coverage.

Perhaps the hon. Minister wants it that way. Maybe he does not want people to be able to escape from Medically; maybe he wants to keep them there. Maybe he is interested only in taking the people that Medically will not have.

But I say to him that if he is willing to provide insurance at \$150 a year—which heaven knows is an extremely high rate even at that, even though it may be a lot lower than the private insurance companies are offering—if he is willing to do that, then he should be willing to do it with anybody and he should not have obstacles that make it difficult if not impossible for people to switch over from one to the other.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I think I can sum up the position we take here without an excess of verbiage. Nobody on this side of the House, as I comprehend it, is suggesting that by the repeal of this sub-paragraph we are anticipating that the individual breaks his leg today and goes and enrolls in the government plan tomorrow. We recognize that there must be some form of a waiting period until the contract becomes effective, and that will become clearer in respect of one of the amendments we are proffering in relation to a later section.

But it strikes me that here we see one of the dichotomies in the position of the government and the explanations made by the hon. Minister today. If we accept him at his own word when he says that this plan

is designed to bring medical care to the aged, the infirm and the people of low income groups, if that is the purpose of it—and I hope it is the purpose—we wholeheartedly support such an object. Then what is the need for open enrolment periods at all?

The enrolment period is an insurance device, as I comprehend it, and I do not pretend to be an expert in insurance matters. But as I understand it, the enrolment period is a device whereby they bring in a hard group of good risks and bad risks which have the effect of equalizing out. That is why they do it, and that is why the PSI and other plans open their doors for a specified period during the year.

But in the words of the hon. Minister and in his descriptions of the purposes of what we are doing here, Mr. Chairman, it is totally unnecessary that we have in mind the actuarial principles of the mixing of good and bad risks.

Now on the other hand, the hon. Minister says—he says very intemperately, very determinately and with a goodly amount of phlegm—the groups are not permitted to enrol in this plan.

Well, what, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, is the open enrolment period but the recognition of the enrolment of a group? All those people who enrol while the period is open then comprise a group. They are a group invited into the plan. They share in common the fact that between two fixed dates they enrolled in the plan. In that sense they are a group. They share that characteristic in common.

The hon. Minister shakes his head. I do not know why he should.

However, let us at least get together. Let us come to a common purpose. We are easy to get along with. If the underlying principle of this legislation is, in the words of the government, to bring medical care to those in the province who most need it, those unable to get it, if that is the goal we all seek it together and in order to achieve that goal we want these people in the plan as quickly as possible, as quickly as they want to come if they are able to put down their money and say: "Give me a standard medical care contract."

If they are not able to put down hard cash—then as soon as they come and say: "We qualify under the regulations relating to those groups who are entitled to subsidy in whole or in part," get them in as quickly as possible.

The hon. member for Woodbine says that there is going to be an open group enrolment period from March 1 till May 1. I thought it was July 1 that the first enrolment period was going to be open.

We have never been told when the next one is going to open. We have never been told how many enrolment periods there are going to be a year.

Mr. MacDonald: When? How many?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, how many and when they are going to be. If one closes on May 1, or July 1, when is the next one going to open? This plan, as it stands, is going to cover several hundred thousand people. The number on welfare, those that qualify from the eleemosynary point of view make up something in the neighbourhood of 350,000.

Now nobody in his right mind is going to get up and say on the floor of this House that you are going to catch all them in the first enrolment period. Is it not the better part of good sense to take out this subparagraph and say this plan is going to open on such a day for enrolment and it is going to remain open until all those qualified and entitled to avail themselves of the benefit of government-operated medical care insurance within its terms and as prescribed by the regulation, are enrolled?

Then, after you have them all in—and I do not know how long that will take, it may take the better part of a year, it might take two years to get them all in—then when you are satisfied, then perhaps it could be approached on actuarial principles in line with what appears to be the intention of the government here. But my plea is simply this: Let us not waffle; let us not equivocate by shifting back and forth between the insurance principle, and the principle of bringing care to the people who need it. I am one of those who suspect that some advantages of the government plan are so great, for example, the elimination of the waiting period for expectant mothers.

I am one of those who believes this may be a very attractive thing to younger people—newly married people—so that they would want to be part of the government plan—that is the people not using the pill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Are there some of those?

Mr. Sopha: So I am told. Not in my community. But it will be so attractive that large numbers—

Well, I do not need to reiterate it, but

these, I say to the hon. Minister through you, sir, are the reasons that impel us to support this amendment proffered by my hon. friend from Yorkview.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a comment on this. It seems to me that the government has in fact done away with a substantial area of the enrolment period by providing, if I understood the hon. Minister correctly when he introduced the bill, that those persons in the province who from time to time, not just at the inception of the plan, will be entitled to assistance under various welfare Acts, will automatically be enrolled as members, under which they will be entitled to received a standard contract.

It would seem to me that the hon. Minister, for an administrative reason, is not going to be flooded by a large enough number of people that would require him to impose an enrolment period. We were very puzzled when we noticed this was retained in the bill, not only for the various reasons that have been given, but particularly for the reason which the hon. member for Sudbury gave. That is, that to the extent that you eliminate the group principle from the government part of the plan, then the need for the open enrolment period should disappear.

We would urgently request the hon. Minister not to feel that this is something on which he needs to dig in his heels. I think it is very simple—he should permit anyone who wishes and is able to apply for this kind of coverage to apply today and be covered immediately. It seems to us that it is not a very difficult amendment for him to agree to and we earnestly suggest that he consent to this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the Minister is not digging his heels in on this at all. We have applied exactly the same principle to this as we did to the Ontario hospital services insurance plan. Hon. members who were in the House in 1958 will recall that there was one open enrolment period. The open enrolment period provides an incentive. It provides immediate coverage at a date. It is quite true that July 1 is the day on which benefits come in, but that is two months after the close of the open enrolment period, to allow the administration to get everything in order, so that the wheels will go smoothly when July 1 comes along and if anyone takes sick on that day he will get immediate benefits.

But there will be continuing enrolment periods. A person can enrol at any time, just

as he would under the hospital programme, but there is a three-month waiting period. The open enrolment period eliminates the three-month waiting period. It is an incentive, and this is why we are doing this, to encourage as many people as possible. We are applying exactly the same principle as PSI and all of the others who apply an open enrolment period. It encourages a large number of people.

The hon. members—rightly, I think—displayed some concern about the person who has a contract, or whose contract comes to an end for a variety of reasons, and is not in an open enrolment period. He can continue his coverage until an open enrolment period comes along, or he can apply for coverage while he is still covered under his existing contract during his three-month waiting period. There are all sorts of ways.

A person, for instance, who becomes 21 outside an open enrolment period is covered immediately. A person who comes under the operation of any of the social assistance Acts automatically does become covered, no matter at what time he comes in. This obtains now under the hospital insurance plan, because they are being maintained at public expense anyway, and this is so.

But it is just this simple, Mr. Chairman, that if we wipe out the waiting period altogether, if we have an on-going open enrolment period so that one who joins comes into benefits immediately, we have simply got to put up the price. It is just that simple.

Because of the success that has attended our efforts in the case of the hospital programme, we believe this is a very sound principle, and I would urge the hon. members to recognize that we do need this for a successful operation. It will not add, as my hon. friend from Parkdale suggested, a great deal to administration, nor is it a road-block to any further development in this area at all. All across Canada this three-month waiting period now exists with respect to the hospital care insurance programme and the same principle is being applied to our programme in medical services insurance here.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister at what frequency does he expect the open enrolment period will be made available?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would find it very difficult to answer that question with any degree of assurance. I find that my words are being thrown back once in a while, despite the fact that I confess to a certain amount of ignorance, because this is a new

area for me, too, as it is a new area for many of us.

I can only remind you that there was only one open enrolment period in the hospital programme. There was a time when we spoke about periodic open enrolment periods in that too, you know. We have never employed the device.

This will depend, I say to you very frankly, on the response in the first instance, but I would hope that open enrolment periods will come along periodically. Indeed, at one time it was urged upon me to write this either into the legislation or the regulations. Of course, we would defeat the whole purpose of the open enrolment period if we did that. I would like to feel that this is a valuable instrument that can be used to bring more people in as time and experience indicate.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to point out this one obvious fact, that this is again one of the binds we get into when we refuse to apply the principle universally. If all our people were embraced in a plan of this kind, if we had universality, we would not then have to offer incentives and set dates when people should come in. We could systematically enrol our total population and this kind of thing which is now being proposed would not have to be undergone. I think this again demonstrates the difficulty of administering a plan which is not universal and which is only partial and covers only a very small proportion of our population.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I understand, of course, that there is a three-month waiting period in the case of the hospital insurance, but you can enrol at any time, even though you have to wait the three months. Why in this case are there only certain enrolment periods?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are open enrolment periods when there is no waiting period, but you can enrol anytime. Then there is a three-month waiting period if you enrol outside an open enrolment period.

Mr. Trotter: I want to make this clear. Assuming that an individual is away from Ontario and returns and the open enrolment time is closed, how long does that person have to wait? Three months, or until the next enrolment period?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If that person registers or enrolls on the day he returns to Ontario, he would wait three months, unless it happens to be an open enrolment period, at

which time he would wait only until the first of the next month following.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a brief comment on that. The hon. Minister, in effect, envisages one of two ways. He said we might have only one open enrolment period like we had for hospital insurance; alternatively, he may make them available more frequently to bring more people in. If he does not make them available, that means they have to enrol three months in advance and go through this three-month waiting period. The net effect of this is that the person is going to have double coverage if he is seeking to transfer from another group. He is going to have to pay twice for that three-month period. Consider the situation for one moment, and I will cite a couple of cases. Here is a case of a family whose child is in an educational system, is covered, but who is going to work as of a certain period—suppose we say at the end of his academic year, in June. The only way that person can avoid going through an uncovered period from the end of June on is to anticipate it by three months. They pay their money for the three-month period in which they are getting no coverage, and they are already under the family coverage. Or, alternatively, let us take a group. I got a letter today from a school teacher who was responsible, in one of the local school teachers associations, for providing coverage at the present time for the teachers within that particular association. They have a policy in connection with PSI. The query was this: Can we forego this policy with PSI, which costs more than the policy which is now available from the government?

I had to say in a letter, which I have dictated and which has not gone—I trust I can correct it if any errors have crept into it in light of the greater information we are getting here—that the only way they could enrol was to get out of PSI and join the government plan as individuals. I think, in light of what the hon. Minister said earlier, that this is the case. But the only way they can do that is to anticipate the conclusion of their contract with PSI. If it comes, for example, next November, they will have to enrol with the government plan in August. For September, October and November they will be paying both PSI and you, although they will not be getting any coverage from you for the three-month period. So they will have to make double payment for the three-month period. As the hon. member for Yorkview said, this is just one of the many anomalies that come when you have this

piecemeal approach to providing coverage instead of an overall comprehensive coverage.

Mr. Gisborn: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister would tell us what the prepayment period will be? In other words, what is the advance payment period? Is it going to be a one-, two- or three-month period?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It will be payable quarterly; three months.

Mr. Gisborn: But how far in advance will it give coverage for? How far in advance of coverage will that be?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It will always be paid three months in advance.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of matters I would like to raise in regard to this discussion. First of all, I wish the hon. Minister would cease making reference to the hospital insurance plan, which really is not comparable at all. When the hospital insurance plan was initiated in this province, it was compulsory for approximately 60 per cent of the people, for large numbers of groups now excluded altogether under this legislation. So it really is not meaningful to talk about the hospital insurance plan.

I would also point out to him that there are provinces in Canada where there are no open enrolment periods or waiting periods. When the scheme is compulsory you have no problem about waiting periods, nor of adverse selection. Everybody is covered anyway, and you thereby spread your risks. That is one point.

The other matter I would like to raise is in relation to the statement which I think the hon. Minister made, if I heard him properly, to the effect that it would defeat the whole purpose of the open enrolment period to designate in the legislation or in regulations when the open enrolment periods would be or, at any rate, how frequently they would be, or how many times per year. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I do not follow his reasoning on that. I wish he would elaborate on that claim if I have interpreted correctly what he said.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly patent, I think, if we were to lay down by legislation or regulation, that the open enrolment periods would come at a certain date each year. Then those who wanted to delay until that time would delay and we might very well be faced, as I stated,

with inordinately large claims. The simple answer to this whole thing, I repeat, is if we abolish the waiting period altogether and allow people to come in at any time and come immediately into benefits, we simply would have to put up the price.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I do not think the question has been answered at all. The waiting period really is a distinct question; it is not involved in this amendment. It will come up later in the bill, as I see it. But I do not see how the hon. Minister would defeat any purpose at all by designating when his open enrolment periods will be. He has already designated in advance what his first open enrolment period is going to be. Has he prejudiced his plan by doing that? The legislation is not even through, but he said a couple of weeks ago that the first open enrolment period would be from March 1 to May 1 of this year. If he can do it for that period, why can he not do it for subsequent ones? Why can he not say there will be four per year, or three per year, or two per year or whatever it is, so people will know?

Let him even specify the dates. Let him say that every year between March 1 and May 1 there will be an open enrolment period, possibly one in the fall, too. It is quite true that people who are sick will probably wait for those open enrolment periods and move in the minute one is called, but they will do that anyway. If they are sick and you call an open enrolment period obviously they are going to move in at that time. I would say that they should, too, because they probably need help.

There will still be a certain amount of adverse selection under any form of open enrolment period. The hon. Minister no doubt hopes that he will offset it by a propaganda campaign that will also bring in a lot of people who are not sick, but any person who is sick, unless he is very foolish indeed, will register as soon as the open enrolment period comes along.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that if he cannot accept our amendment—and I get the impression from what he has said that he is not going to accept it—at least he should reconsider the proposition that apparently he once had considered, that he should designate preferably in the Act, but at least in the regulations, a certain minimum number of open enrolment periods. I would have no objections if he wanted to declare still further ones, but certainly he should designate some periods when enrolment will

be open so that people can take such steps as are necessary to transfer from other forms of coverage if they wish to do so.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Chairman, may I ask, in the interest of a successful plan—having had some experience in hospital insurance and referring to the statements of the hon. member for Woodbine—is he suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that people, indirectly with the idea that there would be more open enrolment, should not enrol until they are needing to pay a medical bill or hospital bill? In order to make any plan successful, whether it is government or privately run, premiums over a period of time make the equation where the bills may be paid.

From what I understand from what the hon. member is saying, he wants to have more open periods. Even in the case of pregnancy a woman will go six months without paying her premiums and so forth, and then will come another open period when she may get in. I suggest to the hon. member for Woodbine that that is not economically feasible.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I am now confused by what the hon. Minister has said and what the hon. member for Humber has said. If you look at the Act, you will see it is not correct that the standard contract comes into effect by making an application and waiting three months. There is nothing to do with a three-month waiting period in this Act.

The condition of getting coverage under a standard contract is that you enrol during the enrolment period if you pay the premium during the enrolment period. If that is the principle, this is the principle which by our amendment can be instituted by providing that there be an open enrolment period. If there is a concurrence provision to the bill—it has escaped me—which says that regardless of whether there is or is not an open enrolment period, I may go and make application to get a standard contract and then wait, and then automatically three months later I become an enrolled member regardless of whether it is an open enrolment period or not, then those are two different factors. As far as I can see, the second part of it just does not apply and therefore it gives very much point to our need to know how many open enrolment periods the hon. Minister anticipates having.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, again in answer to the hon. member for Riverdale, may I suggest that I think he has misunderstood my point. In Ontario hospital serv-

Mr. Bryden: It is not relevant.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I beg the hon. member's pardon?

Mr. Bryden: We understood the point perfectly. It is not relevant.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Well, it is relevant to the fact that the hon. member is asking for more open enrolment periods, which is not feasible or economically possible. In effect, the hon. member is saying open enrolment periods must be extended.

Mr. Bryden: No, I say we should eliminate them.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Eliminate them entirely?

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member wants to know what I said, I will tell him.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: I have been asking the hon. Minister to indicate what he has in mind with regard to open enrolment periods and he says he does not know. This is one of the difficulties which we have always been up against when bills of this kind come before us. We ask for highly relevant information which is important to the people of the province and the government has still not figured out the answers.

It is going to be sending out propaganda shortly and it does not quite know where it stands. I have been pressing the hon. Minister for information as to how many open enrolment periods there would be, and I was proposing to him that it should be possible to do as he apparently once thought of doing, namely, set forth in the regulations certain periods in the year, or one period at least, when there will be an open enrolment period.

Now the hon. member for Humber, as I understand it, suggested if that were done there would be a certain amount of adverse selection and that is true. But there is always a certain amount of adverse selection under open enrolment periods.

The people who happen to be sick during the period of open enrolment will obviously get in at that time. So I really do not think

that the example he cited greatly affects the point I am trying to make. My basic point is to support the amendment that has been proposed, namely, to eliminate the open enrolment period altogether and have what the hon. Minister has aptly described as a continuous open enrolment period. If that should fail then I think we should have some indication of how generous the government hopes to be with respect to its open enrolment periods.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, again, if I may be permitted, I now understand the idea of the hon. member for Woodbine that, quoting his words: "There should be a continuous open enrolment period where there is no waiting for benefits."

Now, is that the idea? If that is so, no plan in the world, whether it is government-run or privately run, would be feasible. You just could not make it work.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I can tell of many plans in the world that have no open enrolment period. They are compulsory plans and, therefore, they eliminate this problem of adverse selection.

If the hon. member for Humber had been here earlier when we were dealing with the open enrolment period *per se*, he would have heard our argument. We admitted that the elimination of open enrolment periods would permit a certain amount of adverse selection. We further suggested, however, that that is a penalty—if I can put it that way—that the government should be prepared to accept for its flat refusal to institute the only adequate type of plan, and the only type which would make them totally unnecessary. It should be prepared to accept that penalty and to accept a certain degree of adverse selection.

We do not think that people should be penalized, for example, by having to pay double premiums for three months or whatever the period may be in order to switch from one plan to another. We think they should be able to make a direct transfer without double premium and without any interruption in their coverage.

It being 6.00 o'clock, p.m. the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, February 14, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Monday, February 14, 1966

Medical Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, in committee, continued	493
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	518

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

THE MEDICAL INSURANCE ACT, 1965 (continued)

On section 2:

Mr. Chairman: Moved by Mr. Young, that section 2 of Bill No. 6 be amended by striking out the words after the word "amended" in the second line and substituting "by striking out clauses (a) and (b)."

All those in favour of the amendment say "aye."

All opposed to the amendment say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of the amendment as moved by Mr. Young, please stand.

All those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 17, the "nays" 35.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 2 is carried.

Section 2 agreed to.

On section 3:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): On section 3, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Unfortunately I had the eye of the member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) first.

Mr. Bryden: I do not know how you could have seen him, Mr. Chairman, you have been looking at me all the time. Were there any arrangements here that we did not know about?

Mr. Chairman: No arrangements.

Mr. Bryden: It is very hard to conceive, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, on this very important section 3, I would like to say a few words.

Section 3 is the section that forms this council, the council that is to give the hon.

Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) advice on how to run the scheme that will effect medical insurance in the province of Ontario. We on this side of the House would like to see the hon. Minister get some good advice, not only from the council but from us this evening. Mind you, he listened to lots of good advice from us last year and he finally decided to take it this year.

It is extremely important in any plan such as Bill No. 6—or last year, Bill No. 136—that it does not fall into the hands, either by advice or otherwise, of any particular small group. There is one improvement in the amendment as before the House this evening in that the potential power of the insurance companies has been cut down, simply because all these provisions for private carriers have been removed. But the fact that the council is going to be cut down, according to this amendment before us now, from nine members to seven is a bad thing. What we need on such a council is a group large enough and varied enough to represent the various regions of Ontario as well as various groups.

For example, let me point out to you the importance of the regions of Ontario. We know full well that parts of northern Ontario, eastern Ontario and western Ontario do not have nearly as good services as they do in what is called the Golden Horseshoe from Oshawa to Niagara Falls. There is no doubt that there is greater wealth in the southern end of the province, but it would, I believe, and this party believes, be of great assistance if on this council we had, let us say, one representative from western Ontario, one from eastern Ontario and one from northern Ontario. In this respect, these areas that have not had as strong a voice as they should have, would have an opportunity to voice their needs to the Minister.

Also, whenever this council meets, instead of just having the council meeting maybe in some large building here in Toronto, or in some other large centre close by, it would be wise, I believe, for good medical services here in the province of Ontario and for the interests of all Ontario, to see to it that the council should meet at least once a year

in some other section of Ontario. When I say some other section, I mean the west, the north and the east. By doing this, the government would emphasize that it recognizes the needs for these other regions in Ontario for greatly improved services insofar as this Act concerns medical services.

The other thing that is so important to keep in mind in this council, is that just as we vigorously fought the fact that the insurance companies seemed to be getting a vise-like grip on the council and on the insurance plan as they had under the legislation last year, I think it is important also that neither the insurance companies, either directly or indirectly, nor the OMA, either directly or indirectly, gets any type of vise-like grip on the administration of our scheme. If any medical insurance scheme is going to advance over the years it is important that we receive advice, and particularly that the Minister, who is administering the scheme, sir, receives advice, from those people who are most interested in advancing and improving medical services so that it can be within reach of all the people in Ontario.

For example, we have known that the Ontario federation of labour has been anxious to further the cause of medical insurance. We know that the Ontario federation of agriculture has also advocated a broad universal scheme in the matter of medical insurance, and the Ontario welfare council for years have campaigned and have, through publications, education and talks by their leading men and women, advocated medical insurance here in the province of Ontario.

These are the types of people who should sit on a council. Too often, on our various advisory committees, be they within government or be they on hospital boards, you find a very select few, a great tendency, being overwhelmingly from big business. We all know that big business, especially those connected with the large insurance interests, will do everything they can to hold up any expansion of medical insurance or any type of insurance—in fact, any type of other business—that is going to interfere with their profits.

I grant you that naturally on such a council doctors should be represented, and I would suggest and recommend to this House that two members of the medical profession be on the council. But the important thing in this section—and this I emphasize again and again, Mr. Chairman, and through you to the committee of the whole—is that if this scheme and this Bill No. 6 really is the

incubation of a scheme that I hope will become far broader and far more universal, it is very important that this section have in it the possibility and the real hope that the hon. Minister is going to bend his ear and listen to those people who are really anxious to encourage the cause of good health here in the province of Ontario.

We have seen, over the last four or five years when this matter of medical insurance has been considered, a great inundation of literature. It has been very obvious to all of us that the insurance companies have been lobbying against medical insurance, as well as the OMA. And what we most certainly need is to give the Ontario public every protection we possibly can against what I have called on many occasions the strongest lobby in Canada, the insurance lobby.

So with this in mind, Mr. Chairman, in regard to section 3 of this bill, I move:

That section 3 of Bill No. 6 be amended by striking out the words after "1965" in the second line thereof and substituting the following:

It is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

1. There shall be a medical services insurance council which shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council and which shall be composed of nine members, as follows:

(i) One representative from western Ontario, eastern Ontario and northern Ontario and one from Metropolitan Toronto;

(ii) One representative each to be named by the Ontario federation of agriculture, the Ontario federation of labour and the Ontario welfare council;

(iii) Two representatives to be named by the Ontario medical association, and the Lieutenant-Governor in council shall designate one of the representatives named in sub-paragraphs (i) or (ii) as chairman.

2. Subsection 4 of the proposed section 3 is amended by adding to the proposed subsection 6 of the Act, the following:

And for the purposes of this subsection the council shall hold public meetings advertised in advance, at least once a year, in western Ontario, eastern Ontario, northern Ontario and Metropolitan Toronto, and at such other times and places as in its discretion it seems advisable.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Trotter moves an amendment to Bill No. 6, section 3:

That section 3 of Bill No. 6 be amended by striking out the words after "1965" in

the second line thereof and substituting the following:

It is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

1. There shall be a medical services insurance council which shall be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council and which shall be composed of nine members, as follows:

(i) One representative from western Ontario, eastern Ontario and northern Ontario and one from Metropolitan Toronto;

(ii) One representative each to be named by the Ontario federation of agriculture, the Ontario federation of labour and the Ontario welfare council;

(iii) Two representatives to be named by the Ontario medical association and the Lieutenant-Governor in council shall designate one of the representatives named in sub-paragraphs (i) or (ii) as chairman.

2. Subsection 4 of the proposed section 3 is amended by adding to the proposed subsection 6 of the Act, the following:

And for the purposes of this subsection, the council shall hold public meetings advertised in advance at least once a year in western Ontario, eastern Ontario, northern Ontario and Metropolitan Toronto, and at such other times and places as in its discretion it seems advisable.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): What about central Ontario?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Is there an insurance man over there at all?

Mr. Chairman: Order. The hon. member for Woodbine has the floor.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if need be we will support this amendment as it is proposed, although we would like to see some changes in it. In principle, it incorporates the idea of an amendment that we proposed last year when this same section was before the House. I think, in one way, it proposes one change which is an improvement on our amendment of last year, and one change that is the reverse. When I speak of improvement I refer to the second subsection of the amendment which proposes that the medical services council to be established would meet at least once a year in various regions of the province, and hold such other meetings as they saw fit to hold.

In a province as diversified and far-flung as this, that is a good idea, and one that should be incorporated in the legislation. The amendment also proposes a change in the method to be used in naming this council. It carries on with the government proposal essentially, in that two of the members would be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in council. Actually, the proposed amendment says they would be named by the Ontario medical council, but I presume that what the draftsman meant was that they would be named by the Lieutenant-Governor in council on the nomination—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It says that.

Mr. Bryden: If they really mean what they say, that they are to be named by the Ontario medical association, I am not too happy about that, either. I would prefer the idea that people could be nominated by an interested group, but that the final responsibility of naming them would rest with the government.

Mr. Sopha: Paragraph 1, subsection 1.

Mr. Bryden: It says to be named by the Ontario medical council. As I said, I assumed it means that they are to be nominated, not named, by the Ontario medical council. Although I have had some conflicting advice from my hon. friends over here, I take it that their final view is that they meant "nominated" and not "named," so I will take it that is the purpose of that clause of the amendment.

The first two clauses are in a somewhat different category. They propose that there will be an additional seven members—which in my opinion is a sensible idea; that three of them should be nominated, although they say "named," by special organizations which I think could be considered as having a right to claim that they represent a substantial part of the public—not all of it by any means, but a substantial part of it.

Then we have above that a further proposal that there should be four representatives named on a regional basis. Apparently it is to be left wide open to the government to decide who these regional representatives will be. To be honest about it, Mr. Chairman, on the basis of experience I am much less trustful of the government than my friends on the Liberal benches appear to be. I have no doubt at all that, under this clause 1, the four representatives from western Ontario, eastern Ontario, northern Ontario and Metropolitan Toronto will be in all cases good, sound Tories who can be counted upon to

recommend to the government whatever it wants them to recommend. When you take those four and add to them the representatives of the Ontario medical association, you have six out of nine; six representatives of reaction as opposed to three representatives of the public. I do not like that kind of council very much more than I like the kind that the government is proposing.

The government is proposing a council of seven—two to be appointed on the nomination of the Ontario medical association, the other five to be appointed by the government as representatives of the public, but without any consultation at all with organizations that could be considered representative of the public. We well know that when the government set up the Hagey committee, to consider its now defunct and unimplemented bill of a couple of years ago, it named people who were ostensibly representatives of the public; but, with one or at most two exceptions, they were all people who could be counted upon to give the government the recommendations it wanted.

I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that that is not the purpose of the Ontario medical services council. If it has any significance at all, it should genuinely represent the public; and although ultimately all members would be appointed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council, I submit that they should be appointed in such a way that there can be no question but that they represent various organizations with broad public support.

I do not think it should be left to the government just to put its handpicked people on the council to give it the recommendations it wants. Such a council would be a waste of time. The government knows what it wants without consulting a council of that kind. I would suggest that, if they are not prepared to provide in this section for a method of appointment which will guarantee that the members, whether they are Conservative, Liberal or NDP, will indeed be representative of broad sections of the public, then they should forget the whole thing because it will just be a piece of window-dressing. The Ontario medical services council will be nothing, merely a rubber stamp for the government. It might as well not exist.

The section the government proposes leaves itself wide open to that sort of abuse. I am afraid that the amendment that my hon. Liberal friends have proposed also leaves it wide open. There is no method suggested in the amendment whereby the representatives from various regions will in fact be nominated by organizations independent of the govern-

ment. In my opinion, that is a rather serious weakness in the amendment. I would much prefer to see a situation whereby the seven so-called public representatives are all nominated by organizations with a broad base of public support. The more of those organizations we can have who are involved in the thing, the better—the better for the public. The better also for the government because in that way the government will not in that way get the advice of yes-men but of people who have some claim to speak for the public.

I think it is far more important at this stage to guarantee that these people will be nominated by independent organizations than to try to impose some formula of regional representation. Frankly, I suspect that if, say, seven different organizations with broad public support, nominate panels from which the government will make its selection of members on the council, there will be a considerable regional variation in the composition of the council.

In any case, I think it is far more important at this point to ensure the genuine independence of public representation than to try to arrive at a formula of regional representation. After all, subsection 2 does meet the regional problem to a certain extent by requiring that the council shall meet at least once a year in each of the main regions in the province.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would move that the proposed amendment be further amended by striking out the proposed clauses 1 and 2 of section 1, that is, the two clauses which provide (a) one representative each from four different regions and (b) one representative each nominated by the Ontario federation of agriculture and the Ontario federation of labour and—

Mr. Sopha: On a point of order, we established last year that no amendment is permitted to an amendment. Last year we had the wonderful exhibition of co-operation between ourselves and that group to our left in proffering amendments sometimes after consultation. If we were to change that, I am perfectly happy to change the rules if you are agreeable to change them, Mr. Chairman. But if not, I think you should rule now on what your course would be.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to rule before you move the subamendment that the same conditions which prevailed last year will prevail where the amendment is to strike out words; then you cannot have a subamendment to strike out further words.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, that being your ruling, I do not see how I can argue with it, since it is obviously correct. But I will read the amendment I would have proposed if you had let me get away with it, and perhaps my hon. friends might consider whether or not they will incorporate it in their amendment. If not, that is their business and as I said, we will vote for their amendment as is, but we would vote for it with much greater alacrity if it were changed in the way I am going to suggest.

What I am going to suggest is that the proposed clauses 1 and 2 of the subsection 1 of their amendment, which I have already outlined, should be struck out and that in the place of them we should have the following:

Seven representatives of the public, one of whom shall be nominated by the Ontario federation of agriculture, one by the Ontario farmers union, one by the Ontario branch of the Canadian association of consumers, one by the Ontario federation of labour, one by the Ontario welfare council, one by the Canadian association of social workers, Ontario division, and one by the Canadian council of churches from among its members in Ontario.

Essentially, what this proposes is that the seven public representatives should be nominated from panels submitted by seven different organizations, each of which clearly has a broad basis of public support and all of which together, I think, could be considered as speaking for almost the whole of the public. If my hon. friends would see fit to incorporate that in their motion, that will be fine, but that is entirely up to them.

At any rate, Mr. Chairman, I do want to emphasize again that if we are to have public representatives, there should be a meaningful way of appointing them. It should not be left totally to the discretion of the government. The government should be expected to solicit the opinions of bodies that have broad bases of public support.

I am not suggesting that any of these organizations should have the right of appointment, any more than the government proposes that the Ontario medical association should have the right of appointment, but I think the government should be prepared to ask them to submit panels of, shall we say, two or three names each, from which the government will select one nominee.

This would do two things. First, it would protect the government's ultimate right of appointment. On the other hand, it would

guarantee—and what is more important it would convince the public that there is a guarantee—that there has been a genuine effort to find representatives to speak for the public.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, in principle I would say that we agree with the hon. member for Woodbine. We hope that the representation from the public would indeed represent elements of our society which are close to the health of the people of Ontario. Our concern, frankly, had been that if you take from the council of churches, there are some—I do not know, is the Presbyterian Church under the council of churches? I apologize that I do not know that but I am not of that particular sect. I would not want to leave that group out, perhaps. For that reason we were particularly concerned that it should be from regions, Mr. Chairman.

I think you can see the validity in that—there are such glaring deficiencies of health services in some of the regions that even though a man is a true-blue Conservative, his veins would be strong enough that he would say, "I am going to speak out if I get on that council to see to it, for the people in my region, that something is done." That, sir, is why we thought we should pick from the north, for example, and from the west and from the east and from the centre as well—we do not want to leave out Muskoka. I know that they have problems, when you look at the comparison of the health services up in that area with Metro Toronto.

Mr. Boyer: Muskoka has very good health services.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I say this, that we last year had a look first of all at the child mortality rate in Glengarry county for example, and then compared it with another county. We looked at the number of doctors in one county and compared it with another and there was such disparity that it was a shocking situation.

One of the concerns that we also have is the role of the council itself. I would hope that this whole area of health is never going to be narrowed down just into a straight little suffocating approach on the administration of bills. I would hope that the people on the council would have a much broader point of view than this.

I have been interested that the President of the United States has been realizing there has to be new team work and new

approaches to providing health services. I notice where he has suggested that the three main killers today are heart disease and cancer and strokes and that they are planning a co-ordinated approach on this throughout the United States.

I am saying this because I would hope that the commission would not see itself as purely looking after the administration of bills, and that it would have a broader vision. I would suggest that as the commission was meeting in the north, for example, it might look at the health units in the north and it might see that there should be more efficiently equipped methods of communication and of transport for the people in the north. This might mean the difference between life and death for a number of people.

I have been interested recently in having a look at one of these main killers, heart attacks, and I find that today, with modern medicine, you just do not have one doctor who is looking after heart attacks. You will have a doctor with a special talent to diagnose, to suggest that something has got to be done quickly and the kind of approach to be taken. You will have another specialized doctor who will be dealing with a failing heart. A cardiac surgeon may be drawn into the picture for cardiac massage. You need biochemists to control the substances in the blood. You need anticoagulant therapy. You need engineers for monitoring equipment. You need psychotherapy.

In other words, I am suggesting, sir, that team work is needed today in medicine and my hope would be that the council would have people—representatives from medicine, but also from the public—who would, as they move from region to region throughout the province, have a broad health approach. They would decide, for example, where there is a university that it might be an idea to have a certain kind of health unit which will do research and provide other services because they are near a university, and that this picture then may be given to the Minister of Health, so that he will be looking at it with a larger vision on health needs.

It is for that reason, sir, that we felt that the council should definitely be made up of representatives from regions. We have tabulated in this Legislature the fact that there is not an adequate dispersement of medical people throughout this province. There are not adequate health services. There are not adequate health units. There

has got to be a broad plan by the hon. Minister of Health. Advice could certainly be given to him to have a broad, concerted approach, if he had a council which was made up of regions.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might put a question to the hon. Minister before we have the vote on this?

Has the hon. Minister started to build this council? Have there been any nominations or appointments to the council as yet?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Not yet, Mr. Chairman, but I have been giving a good deal of thought to it. One almost thinks that if I had put anything on paper, the confidentiality would have been broken, but it is still in my own head, so that there is no fear of that. But I also believe in regional representation and it is fully my intention to have the province represented. I cannot accept the fact that we should seek panels of nominees from a certain specified group of organizations because, after all, Ontario is a large province with scores of organizations, each one of which might rightly claim the privilege of naming representatives, and this would be an impossible task.

Mr. Chairman, I think surely the hon. members of this House must trust the government to do something. After all, we are charged with the responsibility of doing it and our concern is not that this council will represent sections or represent particular interests. It is specifically spelled out in the Act that the council represents the people of the province of Ontario and to that end we have set up a council of five to represent the interests of the people, and two nominated by the doctors, because after all the doctors and they alone are going to give the professional service necessary under this.

The hon. leader of the Opposition gave a very interesting talk about what he envisioned in this council but I would suggest to him and to the House that these duties envisioned by the hon. leader of the Opposition are far broader than is inherent in the responsibilities of this council. The duties and the matters that he has pointed up are very important and are of very great interest, but they will come under the direction of another council, the appointment of which was announced in the Speech from the Throne. This is the Ontario health council, which will be responsible for the overall broad research and planning necessary to ensure a continuum of the best possible quality of service.

A council of seven, we believe, is quite adequate. We use as precedent the hospital services commission of seven. I have been advised on every hand not to establish too large a council. It might well be, as time goes on, that we will see the wisdom of a larger council or perhaps the wisdom of a smaller council. I personally have the belief that in the long range again we should have a council both for the hospital services commission or at least in the long range for the health services representative of all the regions of the province. There are now 11 health regions in our province, and it would be our thinking, again in long range, that a representative from each of these regions might well constitute the health services council.

For the present and for the purposes of this bill I submit to you, sir, that our choice has been sound. The government I think must be trusted to choose. I do not suppose it would matter how much I argue that we will do this with care and with the best possible judgment and wisdom we can exercise, some of my friends might not be satisfied. But this I assure the hon. members we will do, and I will certainly assure this House that the province will be represented in all its regions as outlined here.

In the matter of moving from place to place, I think it would be a great mistake to tie the council down to this in legislation.

In my opinion, if the council feels that it should go to any region to meet or to hear complaints, this should be their right, because this is one of the problems and this is in an attempt to assure the people of the province that there will be a ready and a sympathetic ear to listen to their problems quite divorced from government. If in the wisdom and the judgment of the council they feel they should go to any region of Ontario to listen to complaints or to hear submissions this should be their right, but I would be most loath, sir, to tie it down in legislation. It may not be deemed advisable or in the discretion of council to go.

There will be no bars placed upon them, if they feel this is part of their responsibility, and their terms of reference are quite broad. I therefore see, sir, no great value flowing from this amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister swept forward in his comments so quickly that I did not quite grasp what he said. I asked him whether or not there had been any move towards the establishment of the council; for example, any nominations towards its personnel as yet.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have nominations from the medical association, Mr. Chairman, and certain names have been submitted to me from interested persons and interested groups, but there has been no formal moving forward to appoint a council yet.

Mr. MacDonald: Did the hon. Minister have nominations?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have nominations and I have written to certain people asking if they would be interested, but there has been nothing beyond this toward their appointment.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I just suggest to my hon. friend down here to not be so hasty, because the first reply was that there had been no nominations or appointments and now we find there have been quite a number of nominations.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): He said he had done nothing on the thing at all.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I take it the hon. Minister has solicited some nominations and has also contacted some individuals, so that much has been done. I take it now he also has nominations from the Ontario medical association. Could he tell us for how long he has had these nominations?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No; it is a matter of weeks, but just how long—I could not give you the exact date. But it is some weeks, and they would invite—

Mr. Bryden: Did the hon. Minister solicit his nominations, say, last September?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I do not believe so. Now, I may have done, but I think I would have to look up my file and I am quite prepared to do that, but I did invite nominations from the medical association in keeping with the terms of Bill No. 136.

Mr. MacDonald: I think if the hon. Minister looks it up he will find he solicited them September 29 and got them October 5.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That might well be, but I will look at my file.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with regard to other organizations, the hon. Minister said that some organizations had made nominations to him. Were these purely on their own initiative or did he solicit these nominations from them? Second, could he tell us what organizations have made nominations?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have not solicited nominations from any organizations. Those that I have gotten have been apparently, as far as I am concerned, on their own initiative. I am sorry I cannot give the hon. member the names because I do not know. Again, I will look this up if he is deeply interested.

Mr. Chairman: Are members ready for the question? All in favour of the member for Parkdale's amendment please say "aye."

Those opposed please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

You have heard the amendment. All those in favour, please stand.

All opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 22, the "nays" 45.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 3 is carried.

Section 3 agreed to.

On section 4:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): On section 4, Mr. Chairman, the recommendation is here that the section be repealed but I would like to call to the attention of the House that there are certain matters here which have been overlooked and which in our opinion should not be overlooked, particularly that part of the section which deals with the setting of maximum rates on the part of the private carrier. In subsection (5) (a) of section 4 of Bill No. 136 we have recommended that the council recommend from time to time changes in benefits and maximum subscription rates.

Mr. Chairman, we quite realize that this recommendation of knocking out section 4 is to make it jibe with the rest of the bill, but it should not in our opinion be knocked out. We think that certainly if there are to be private carriers still in the field, as evidently the House has decided there shall be, then some control should be exercised over those private carriers in the matter of rates.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, this is out of order since The Department of Health has absolutely no authority over insurance carriers now. If this is repealed, The Department of Health has no authority over insurance carriers whatsoever.

Mr. Bryden: Well, speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, the section that it is proposed to repeal contained among other things certain provisions for controlling rates

and other things. The amendment proposes that, instead of the section being entirely knocked out, those features of it should be retained and The Department of Health shall carry out such duties as the Legislature decrees.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, this would really violate the entire principle of this bill and the amendments coming in, because this section which we are proposing now to the House should be repealed had reference to what was identified as the standard comprehensive coverage, the standard contract.

The standard contract now is in the hands of, and can be sold only by, the medical services insurance division. We have absolutely no control over anything else even under the terms of Bill 136 with reference to insurance carriers, and therefore I submit, sir, that since the standard contract is no longer possible or available to private carriers for sale, The Department of Health has no power over them whatsoever.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, it should have. This is the point that we are making, that there is no reason in the world why we should turn over a large section of our population because part of that population will be subsidized and a lot of the people who are under the private plans will be subsidized by this government.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no subsidy that goes to any private plan. The only subsidy, the only public moneys that will be spent at all, will be handled by the medical services division of The Department of Health. No public moneys will go to any private plan or private carrier.

Mr. Young: This means then, Mr. Chairman, if I could ask the hon. Minister, that the worker in a certain plant who may be earning \$2,500 a year and who has a piddling little fringe benefit through a private insurance company and who pays no income tax and is having a tough time, will not be eligible for subsidy.

Is that what the hon. Minister is saying?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, we have already gone over this. If he applies for an individual contract, yes. If he is part of a group at his place of occupation, no.

Mr. Young: Then he is completely out of luck, even though he may not be paying income tax. He is already tied and cannot possibly—

An hon. member: Who is making \$2,500?

Mr. Young: There are people who are doing this.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, we carried this in the first section, dealing with this particular question. What are you talking about now?

Mr. Bryden: We are talking about controlling rates of private insurance companies, Mr. Chairman, which—

Mr. Chairman: You are talking about carriers—

Mr. Bryden: There is something being taken out of the Act—

Mr. Young: We object, Mr. Chairman, to this deletion from the Act and we are talking about this clause 4 which deletes something. Our contention is that it should not be deleted and we feel that we have a right to talk in that regard.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. We have considerable sympathy with what the hon. member for Yorkview is saying, but I do not like to, in the name of sympathy, see violence done to the rules of this Legislature. The hon. Minister of Health, I contend, is perfectly right on this point of order, because in section 1 we have deleted the phrase "licensed carriers."

This section 4 of Bill No. 136 deals with carriers as it was defined in that bill and if you permit an amendment by leaving something in, you may permit a very enlightening discussion with which, as I say, we have every sympathy, but it will do violence to our rules.

Mr. Bryden: I do not know how the hon. member for Sudbury suddenly gets so concerned about doing violence to the rules. He does not normally show such—

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! I would like to rule that this is out of order. If you want to question my ruling—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we can still discuss the section. The section is to repeal a great, long, two pages of the bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order! There is nothing to discuss. It is taken out of the bill entirely.

Mr. Bryden: We can discuss whether or not we want it out.

Mr. Chairman: It is out.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that there cannot be an amendment to a repealed section?

Mr. Chairman: Not when this is already out of the bill. I have ruled that this has already been dealt with in section 1.

Mr. Bryden: In what way?

Mr. Chairman: Because carriers are ruled out.

Mr. Bryden: But, Mr. Chairman, all that was taken out of section 1 was a definition. A definition is not an operative part of an Act. Whether or not carriers are defined in section 1, we submit that we can still propose amendments that to a certain degree would retain certain provisions of the old Act to regulate them. I am surprised by the argument of the hon. member for Sudbury, who suggests that because a definition was dropped out of the Act, therefore the whole substance of that matter has now been dealt with.

Mr. Sopha: I did not say that. I merely said that you could not amend it. We can discuss it until 4 o'clock in the morning, as far as I am concerned—

Mr. Bryden: But, Mr. Chairman, just because a definition of licensed carriers is dropped out of the Act, that surely does not mean there is no way of ever bringing those words into the bill. Because they are not defined is not important; we may bring them in with a new definition or permit the ordinary usage of the words to prevail. I had thought my hon. friend from Sudbury was interested in trying to force the government—or induce the government—to make changes here, but apparently he is interested only if he himself proposes the changes.

I really do not know why he lined up with the hon. Minister of Health on this matter, but I submit to you that what my hon. friend is talking about is in order and that it would be in order to move an amendment to retain the substance, not the words—that is impossible—but the substance of some of this section. That is all we are asking for.

Mr. Chairman: All I am saying is, how can you control the rate of licensed carriers when there are no licensed carriers?

Mr. Bryden: Our province is full of licensed carriers. Whether or not—

Mr. Chairman: Not under this Act!

Mr. Bryden: Well, they have been and the fact that a definition has been dropped out means nothing. The section has not been dropped out.

We would not like to vote that the whole section be retained, because it obviously needs to be changed for housekeeping purposes, but we would like to retain some of it—that part of it that can be retained can still be consistent with the rest of the Act. That surely is quite in order.

There are more licensed carriers and more contracts covered by licensed carriers than there will be by this bill, and it seems to me that they are still relevant.

Mr. Chairman: The rates are not covered under this Act, but they will be carried under The Insurance Department.

Mr. Bryden: The Act had proposed to do something about rates.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, let me draw to your attention a point that is now really being illuminated. The hon. Minister and other members of the government earlier protested strongly when we suggested that this bill was drafted in consultation with the insurance companies. All I would say at this point, Mr. Chairman, is this: If you can get a bill as favourable to the insurance companies as this without their consultation, God help us if you ever had consulted them. And I will tell you why.

When this bill was first brought in, this government was going to do two things: one, it was going to regulate the maximums that private carriers would be permitted to charge, because it had come to the conclusion that the public should not be exploited on a standard policy; second, Mr. Chairman, it had come to the conclusion that never again should any private carrier—

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. member on what he is speaking now. Is it a point of order? Is it to your ruling, or just what is it?

Mr. MacDonald: I am speaking on this section—

Mr. Cowling: You ruled it out of order, Mr. Chairman. Is it out of order or not?

Mr. Bryden: We have not moved the amendment yet—

Mr. Cowling: It does not matter about the amendment. The Chairman ruled the discussion out of order. Is it out of order or not, that is what I would like to know?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I trust you will advise the hon. member for High Park that the debate on the section has not been ruled out. You are considering ruling out an amendment.

Mr. Chairman: There has not been any debate—

Mr. MacDonald: Right.

Mr. Cowling: Let us have some clarification, Mr. Chairman. Where do we stand on this section?

Mr. MacDonald: You need it—

Mr. Cowling: Just a minute, you have been hollering all afternoon. Where do we stand on the section?

Mr. Chairman: Order! The debate will continue on—

Mr. MacDonald: Good. Do you hear it now?

Mr. Cowling: No, I did not hear it.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, speaking on the proposal contained in section 4 of Bill No. 6, that section 4 of the Act should be repealed, I think it deserves a considerable amount of comment because this in fact is the section under which the whole of last year's plan by the government foundered.

It just fell apart at the time when the government approached the carriers who were going to be members of this Medical Carriers Incorporated to fix a rate for the standard policy, and found that even with the pooling arrangement which was contained in that section of the bill, the government was unable to persuade the licensed carriers that there should be such a thing as a uniform premium that the licensed carriers would charge for the standard contract. At that point the whole of the government's scheme fell apart, and it had to bring in this bill to make substantial deletions, including the elimination of anything having to do with carriers.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that to the extent that there was any merit in last

year's plan, one of the things there was some merit in was a machinery and a way to regulate, to some extent, the maximum rates which would be charged by the licensed carriers for the standard contract. If that whole scheme fell apart, so that now only the government is going to issue the standard contract, it seems to me that the 60 per cent, 70 per cent or 80 per cent—depending on which view the government happens to be using—who are not going to be allowed to come under this bill for the purpose of having the benefit of the standard government contract, are at least entitled to some portion of the protection which they would have had last year.

A substantial part of that protection relates to the ability of the hon. Minister, on somebody's advice, at least to take into consideration on occasion whether or not the rates which are being charged by private carriers to the 60 per cent, 70 per cent or 80 per cent of the population who are on their hands, should, or should not, be subject to some kind of regulation. It is our contention that if the government is going to eliminate the whole of section 4 because its plan fell apart, it should at least rescue that small part of it which would provide some protection to a large number of people in the province.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Renwick: But the hon. Minister does not understand they are not allowed to buy the government plan because they are members of groups and the groups have already been ruled out. Mr. Chairman, with those remarks I would like to move that section 4 of Bill No. 6 be amended by adding thereto the following words:

and the following is substituted therefor:

4. The Minister may, on the advice of the council, fix maximum subscription rates charged by private insurance carriers for any classes of benefit.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Renwick moves that section 4 of Bill No. 6 be amended by adding thereto the following words:

and the following is substituted therefor:

4. The Minister may, on the advice of the council, fix maximum subscription rates charged by private insurance carriers for any classes of benefit.

I will have to rule that this amendment is out of order because this particular clause of this bill has nothing to do with private insurance carriers.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, there is no point in challenging your ruling, but I want to complete the remarks I made before the hon. member for High Park came awake and tuned in on the—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am hoping that perhaps I can persuade the Liberals, and perhaps we can get some support from them on the issue.

Mr. Chairman, the simple point is this: In the government bill last year they at least were going to give the people some protection from the excesses of the exploitation of private insurance. Last year, the bill of the government which is going to be repealed in this section was going to fix maximums at least for the standard policies when they were provided by private insurance.

If I may momentarily anticipate another section, they also said that no insurance company could cancel a policy. Now in both instances—fixing maximums and the cancellation of policy—the government has wiped them out, so that we are right back to a wide open field in terms of exploitation of those who happen to be captured in groups and must buy their insurance from the private carrier.

What we are trying to propose is that there should be a fixing of these rates by the hon. Minister on the advice of council which we have already agreed on in a previous section.

I submit this can be done if the government would accept the principle that was part of their bill last time, namely, they were going to regulate some of the maximum rates. Apparently that has gone out the window, too, so that we are not in a position even to protect the people from these excesses.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, when we debated this bill in principle, the first basic change was, and I quote:

The standard medical services insurance contract is to be supplied only by the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health. Accordingly provisions dealing with the licensing and regulation of carriers and the medical services insurance programme have been repealed and complementary amendments have been made.

Mr. Chairman, we debated this principle, indeed it came in for a good deal of debate,

but I think it is right it should. It was passed by this Legislature, sir, so the principle was accepted.

We cannot reintroduce it here because to do what the hon. member proposes in his amendment—which I note you have ruled out of order—is quite impossible because the clause to which they are referring, as I said a few moments ago, sir, has reference to a standard contract.

It was last year proposed that the standard contract would be made available to the people who were to purchase their own from the carrier of their choice. We changed our mind about this and if we can improve the bill further, we will change our mind again.

But this is what this subsection 5 (a) has reference to—that standard contract—and since this bill exercises no control and we have agreed in principle that the private carriers are out altogether, then it is quite impossible to consider an amendment of this nature proposed by the hon. member.

It seems to me, sir, there is a place where this can be done and this is through The Department of Insurance, not through The Department of Health, because we have no authority over insurance other than this right we are asking by legislation from the Legislature, now.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if in fact you have ruled as you have that an amendment here is impossible, then I simply plan to oppose section 4 and we have no alternative in this case but to vote against the deletion of section 4 even though we do not agree with everything in it.

Now there is a principle here which we feel is fundamental. It has already been outlined by various speakers on this side of the House. There is no question that we are going to face over the next few years, pressure to raise rates in the public part of this plan. The pressure will come in large measure from private interests because of the competition of a couple of hundred or 300 companies; their selling costs, their advertising costs, their commissions, their profits, are going to demand that rates go up and so they are going to bring pressure to bear on the public sector of this plan to raise rates there, too. Competition will not lower—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Young: Competition will not lower rates; the very fact of competition in this field has raised rates incredibly. Where we

have no competition in the insurance field, wherever we have public insurance, there are low rates, much lower than this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, because of this kind of pressure that will inevitably arise we believe that some control should be exercised on the private carrier, and over the group insurance that they are selling. This is why we are so much against deletion of this section of the bill *in toto*. Some of the principles in that section we think ought to be retained, and we have no alternative but to vote against section 4.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 4 of this bill stand?

Mr. Sopha: In order to make perfectly clear the position that we take, I say that we in this party are delighted to see section 4 go. We support this section of the bill, because when section 4 goes along with some other sections that have gone already it both justifies and rewards the stand we took eight months ago.

There has been eliminated up to this point in the bill every reference to private insurance carriers.

This bill is simply not about private insurance carriers. This is a public plan we in the Liberal Party are concerned about in proffering our amendments to the chair as we do, to see if we can get out of this Legislature and this committee the best possible public plan. There are other places that the matter of maximum rates can be discussed. For the information of my hon. friends health insurance is dealt with in The Insurance Act. If they wish to bring in a bill to amend The Insurance Act to give to the government the right to control rates, that is fine; during the estimates of The Department of Insurance, they can speak until the small hours of the morning about insurance rates.

One of the failings of our friends—and I would beg leave courteously and indulgently to suggest to them—one of the major failings of our hon. friends to the left is that they will not stick to the point and they flail about in all directions on all kinds of subjects. That has rendered them ineffective and limited them to the arithmetic progression of an increase of two members every four years.

Mr. Bryden: Now, Mr. Chairman, we appreciate as always the unctuousness of our friend, the hon. member for Sudbury. We now have discovered, Mr. Chairman, that the

Liberal Party stands opposed to efforts to regulate private insurance companies in this field when the opportunity presents itself.

We have just been told by the hon. Minister of Health that after this legislation is passed—assuming it is passed and I take it my hon. friends are going to help the government along on at least some parts of it—at least 60 per cent of the field in Ontario will still be occupied by private insurance companies.

We consider that 60 per cent to be important and as far as this blather about regulating it under The Insurance Act, I would point out to my hon. friend and to the hon. Minister that The Insurance Act has been on the statute books for 50 years at least and it has never been possible to get any proper regulation of insurance companies under that Act.

I would like further to point out to this House, sir, and particularly to the hon. Minister and the gentlemen on the Liberal benches who are supporting it, that the government here has now gone pretty well full circle.

The first bill that was brought into this House two years or three years ago, before the last election at any rate, the one that they talked about being done or something in the last election—yes, that bill—it was essentially a bill to regulate private insurance companies. There was very little more in it relating to medical care insurance.

It did two things: first, it regulated private insurance companies, which had never been done in The Insurance Act, and second, it provided for certain government subsidization of certain people who could not afford the exorbitant rate being charged by private insurance companies.

Now, we did not agree with the second part of that bill, but we always agreed with the first part, the regulation of private insurance companies.

In the bill we had last year, there were features that continued to provide for the regulation of insurance companies. Now we have gone the whole circle, there is no regulation of the insurance companies, there is no effective regulation under The Insurance Act. The hon. member for Sudbury knows as well as I do that if a private member in this House should bring in a bill to try to reform that Act we would not get to first base.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You do not need a bill, you just need a proclamation of two or three sections in the Act.

Mr. Bryden: Well, that makes it even worse because we have no way of influencing proclamations at all. We could at least bring in bills to put forth our point of view but we cannot bring in proclamations. Only the government can recommend proclamations. So here we are.

There was a certain degree of regulating insurance companies which was desirable; it is now proposed that this should be thrown out in total. We object to that. We proposed an amendment which I think would have rescued the principle of this old section 4 that was still sound, it would have continued to regulate the rates of these private insurance companies.

That has been ruled out of order. I do not agree with your ruling, Mr. Chairman, but I am not going to dispute it, we accept your ruling. But since we cannot bring in an amendment, that would rescue from the section that aspect of it that was desirable, then we have no option but to vote, for the present, for the retention of the whole section.

We quite realize that there are features of that section which in the interest of good housekeeping should be stricken out because they relate to matters that are no longer provided for in the Act. But if we are to have no regulation at all now—after all this period, where we started with considerable regulation of insurance companies, we now end up with none—if that is the way it is to be, then in order to indicate our opposition to that vicious principle we will simply vote against the repeal of the section and will vote to retain the whole thing as the lesser of the evils.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on this section I will, as my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine has said, oppose the repeal of it on this particular limited ground.

As in the case of the plan put forward by London Life, which has been adopted by the government for the civil service, it will from now on, unless we put in some such provision in this bill as we had hoped would have been acceptable as an amendment, be impossible under package schemes at any time for 60 per cent of the population at least of the province of Ontario to find out in fact how many dollars each year they are paying for coverage for physicians' and surgeons' services.

The reason is very simple and you only have to look at the booklet that this government put out to ascertain that the members of the civil service in the province of Ontario cannot today find out the number of

dollars which they are being charged by way of premium in order to support the scheme of London Life.

All it has is two or three columns which indicate what the individual civil servant is paying and then a bald statement that of course the government itself is assuming a substantial portion of that cost.

Now I think it is a very, very important part of group insurance, as it is going to be carried on for most of the population of the province of Ontario, to be able to say in this package scheme where they have basic and supplemental life insurance and any other kind of coverage that you want, how much in fact is the insurance company charging for the actual cost of physicians' and surgeons' services.

Now if we are not prepared to do that, then it will never ever be possible to find out what the premiums being charged are; it will not be possible to compare them with the premiums which the government is charging under its standard contract, and the whole coverage of the province of Ontario economically—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the civil service programme is not under debate in this bill whatsoever. We have nothing in the wide world to do with it. I have nothing to do with the London Life Insurance Company. I cannot possibly answer the questions the hon. member is raising or comment on the matters he brings up. It is quite outside the purview of my responsibility.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: And the information is available if the hon. member wants it. I will get it for him.

Mr. Renwick: I thank the hon. Minister of Mines.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why I think this has a bearing on it is that the government has in its own words this afternoon decided that they are going to charge an uneconomic premium for the standard policy.

Now that means that the private carriers are going to be given an area of charging for this kind of coverage at least up to the level at which the government is going to charge. The reason the hon. Minister had to admit that this afternoon is because he admitted a number of individuals who apply for and obtain standard contracts over and above the number that he was going to provide for last year, he was able statistically and on an actuarial basis to reduce the premium.

Now if the government had accepted the

proposition that the groups could have come into this scheme, obviously the price of the insurance would be much lower. But now because we are not allowed to say anything whatsoever about what is to be charged by way of premiums to the licensed carriers you have a twofold problem.

You have a high premium which is the only standard on which comparison can be made, and you have permissible schemes where you will never ever be able to find the actual cost being charged by licensed carriers for the coverage for physicians' and doctors' services which will be provided under that type of scheme.

For that reason, of course, we have to vote against the repeal of this section.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that anybody who belongs to most of these group insurance schemes, if he does not wish to remain in it, can opt out and get in to the government scheme if he so desires.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member's understanding is all wrong.

Mr. Apps: Now, just a minute. We have a group scheme in my own company which is a pretty good scheme. I looked into it very carefully and I think we are competitive with the government. If we are not, if there are occasions where it is not, we are certainly not going to stand in the way of any of our employees opting out of that scheme and taking advantage of the government scheme.

It would appear to me that the very fact that we have the government scheme will be a very regulatory system to make the private insurance companies be more competitive than they are at the present time.

I do not see why all the argument about private insurance companies going to raise their rates all the time. I think the very fact they are in competition with the government scheme is going to make them be very much more realistic and they will bring their rates down.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Is the plan which the hon. member refers to underwritten by a private insurance company?

Mr. Apps: Yes.

Mr. Young: Then if half your employees decide to opt out, will the insurance company insure the other half for the same rate that they will insure all, or will the rates go up for the remainder?

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, that is under discussion right now. I am quite certain that they are going to come up with a much more competitive scheme than they have had before, simply because of the competition that the government scheme provides, and I think that is going to happen with a lot of group insurance schemes.

Mr. Bryden: They have—

Mr. Young: But the group remains intact. But you will find I think because of contracts and because of participation, Mr. Chairman, that in almost every case, it will be almost impossible for individuals to opt out of these plans, because the rate—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 4 stand as part of this bill?

Some hon. members: No.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

All those in favour of section 4 standing as part of this bill, please rise.

All those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 65, "nays," 7.

Mr. Chairman: Section 4 of this bill stands. Section 4 agreed to.

On section 5:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, this is a section of the bill which I think, with one minor amendment, we will be able to agree wholeheartedly with the government.

I think one of the principles which the hon. Minister of Health enunciated both last year and again this year is the absolutely essential requirement that under this scheme, standard medical services insurance contracts should be made available to all residents of the province and their dependants without regard to age, physical or mental infirmity and so on. We have been concerned, of course, by the absence of that word "all" in the bill, even though it was a stated principle of the hon. Minister that if there was anything at all that was of merit in this bill, it was the availability to every resident in the province of Ontario of standard medical services insurance contracts.

We want, more than anything else, to make certain that standard medical services insurance contracts are in fact available to

every single resident of this province and in order to achieve that we accept the amendments made by section 5 of Bill No. 6 in the amendments to section 5 of the Act and would move an additional change to section 5 of the bill. It is that subsection 1 of section 5 of Bill No. 6 be amended by inserting after the word "amended" in the second line, the words, "by striking out 'standard' in the first line," so that section 5 of The Medical Services Insurance Act, incorporating the amendment proposed by section 5 of Bill No. 6, will now simply read:

Medical services insurance contracts shall be made available to residents and their dependants without regard to age, physical or mental infirmity, financial means or occupation, only by the medical services insurance division.

In this way we believe the principle of the hon. Minister's bill will be completely fulfilled by making certain that every resident of the province of Ontario is able to obtain a medical services insurance contract from the government.

Mr. Chairman: Any further discussion on that? All those in favour of the amendment—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to say we are here to get clarification. The hon. member for Riverdale says to leave out the word "standard" with medical services insurance contracts. Someone just mentioned to me that he might be nit-picking—is that the term? I would not like to have that said about him and I wonder if he could describe to us, when he said "medical services insurance contract," rather than "standard," what is the difference?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to explain. I think everyone in the House will agree that the purpose of the bill is to make certain that standard medical services insurance contracts are available to everyone in this province. Obviously the hon. Minister has decided in his own wisdom not to insert the word "all" in here, or the word "every," so that the only way in which we can make certain that these contracts are available is to leave out the word "standard" and require that all medical services insurance contracts be provided by the medical services division of the government.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have to agree with my hon. friends on the Liberal benches that the most kindly thing I can say about the proposed amendment is that the hon. member is nit-picking.

First of all, the principle of this bill as outlined in the front of the bill has reference to the standard medical services insurance contract, which is defined in the Act. We cannot adhere to the principle of the bill if we are going to change the reference to the basic principle of the bill as we go along.

We have reference all through this bill to a comprehensive contract known as the standard medical services insurance contract. The fact that he wants "all" in does not alter the bill in any way. Of course it is available to any individual resident of the province who applies for it and meets the qualifications of eligibility. There is no question about this. I am advised by the legal counsel that this does not change anything in the bill, but I cannot accept the amendment, sir, that "standard" be dropped from this section.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that the hon. Minister might accept this amendment because I think if he did it would bridge almost all, or certainly a large part, of the gap between us. The section, in effect, if it were changed to drop "standard," would provide that medical services insurance contracts would be made available only by the medical services division of The Department of Health. In other words, that division would become the sole carrier and we think this is the most effective way to give this bill some real meaning for the people of Ontario.

Of course, if our proposed amendment were to be carried, as I hope it will be, certain other housekeeping amendments would have to be made to strike out the word "standard" wherever else it appears in the Act, or in most places anyway, but we believe we would then have good legislation if this very simple amendment involving only one word were adopted.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

Those opposed say "nay."

The "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment will please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 23, the "nays" 49.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 5 agreed to.

On section 6:

Mr. Sopha: On section 6, Mr. Chairman, it is not carried yet. The proposed amendment deals only with the repeal of subsection 4 of that section. I am going to move in a moment that only subsection 3 be retained and that it be rewritten to some extent by the hon. Minister of Health.

This is the section that provides that the hon. Minister, pursuant to the regulations to be promulgated—and we of course have no foreknowledge on this side of the House what those regulations will contain; we were never supplied with a copy of them as proposed, and indeed often they are not promulgated until several weeks or months after the statute is proclaimed—but under this section the hon. Minister may, in accordance with regulations to be promulgated, provide standard medical services contracts for persons designated by the regulations to qualify for total subsidy and he may in the same fashion provide standard medical contracts, for instance, for other persons designated by the regulations.

I will not be detained by focusing to any great extent on the use of the word "classes." That is used in subsections 1 and 2 of the present section 6. I made some comments last year. I think it is a term of opprobrium that does not suit our Canadian democracy and I merely say that we do not have any classes in this country. I hesitate to see any legislation of this House set up any system of classes.

Everybody in Canada is middle class; we have no peasantry at one end and we have no aristocracy at the other. All are proclaimed to be equal and I would prefer a less loaded word such as "groups," to be used. It certainly is a pejorative word. When one thinks of the connotation of "classes," one thinks of the days in our history when indeed we did have classes, we had an establishment and we had an established church, but all that is gone.

Mr. MacDonald: Has the hon. member read the Alberta—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes, and Bennett, the idol of the hon. Minister. Indeed, he resuscitated classes, because after we had decided in 1919 that Canadians would no longer be awarded peerages and other honours by the Monarch, then Bennett revived the custom. Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason they are in here again.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They did not give us the crystal-ball gazers.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is another subject, a very inviting one, but let me say on that score that the man who was the intimate of Prime Ministers, Bruce Hutchison, says that at no time were his political judgments ever influenced by crystal-ball gazing. So let us let the poor man requiescat in pace, as our Roman friends say.

Mr. MacDonald: What has this got to do with the medical bill?

Mr. Sopha: It has nothing to do with it but it is diversion stimulated by the hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Chairman: I know the member for Sudbury wants to get back to the bill.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. This House has just affirmed section 5, which to some minor extent rewrote the earlier statute, and that says in the clearest possible terms that medical services insurance contracts shall be made available to residents of the province without regard to age, or physical or mental infirmity. I ask, perhaps blandly, having passed that and adopted that principle and enshrined it in the bill, why do we need to give power to the Minister to use the regulations to designate those who qualify?

Surely we know the people who will qualify for total subsidy. Those will be recipients of welfare, persons in receipt of pensions for the blind, persons in receipt of disabled persons' allowances—they will be the people envisaged by section 5. Preferably I would much rather see spelled out in the statute and endorsed by this House, subject to discussion, the groups of persons that the hon. Minister has in mind to grant total or partial subsidy, rather than to give to the Minister by legislation the power to designate them.

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if I may have a copy of the amendment of the member for Sudbury?

Mr. Sopha: Oh, I am sorry. I have not moved it yet, but I will supply you with a copy.

I iterated and I will reiterate that I do not like to see this Legislature give any power to the Minister of Health, or for that matter any other Minister, that will enable him on the eve of an election to use the regulations to give a wholesale bribe to any group within this province. Certainly the power to do so under subsections 1 and 2 of the present section 6 is inherent, and the Minister may do it.

I am not saying this hon. Minister would do it. Some Minister might do it. This hon. Minister might resist such a temptation and indeed be overpowered by his Cabinet colleagues—that has happened before—who would insist that he indulge in this wholesale. Are we not entitled, on the other side, to see in the statute the groups of persons for whom it is intended the public money of the province will be used to subsidize, either in whole or in part?

To pass on, I intend to move that the only subsection that should remain be subsection 3, and in that subsection I would delete the reference to subsections 1 and 2—for if my amendment is adopted they will have gone—and I would move that the contracts be issued through the medical services insurance division of the Ontario hospital services commission.

An earlier amendment, you will recall, Mr. Chairman, dealt with the Ontario health services commission, which is a title that we in this party would prefer to see given to a new body which would be responsible for all the health of our people, and I do not need to reiterate the arguments in regard to that. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would move that section 6 of the bill be amended by striking out the first three words, so that the said section shall read:

Section 6 of The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965 is repealed with the exception of subsection 3, which is amended as follows and renumbered by striking out the words in subsection 3 "mentioned in subsection 1," and the words "Department of Health," and substituting the words "the Ontario health services commission" so that the new subsection 1 will read as follows:

1. The Minister shall provide contracts through the medical services insurance division of the Ontario hospital services commission.

Mr. Chairman: I will have to rule this particular amendment out of order. This section that we have before us now, as you know, deals only with subsection 4 and this is the only part that I can deal with at this particular time. If you wish to bring in an amendment to this other effect, you can of course do this—

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I say this? I am not interfering with the amendment to subsection 4. I am adopting it. My amendment adopts what the Minister does in regard to subsection 4. I am adding to it. I

am adding to what he does and I am repealing subsections 1 and 2, and rewriting subsection 3, which certainly is a different thing from the device proposed by our hon. friends in regard to subsection 4.

Mr. Chairman: I realize the member for Sudbury is now dealing with section 1, section 2, and section 3, but what we have before us is an amendment dealing only with subsection 4. I must rule it out of order.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to you that you may find yourself some day making discussion almost impossible? If when a section is affected, only the part that the government wants affected can be touched, this is surely a most restrictive ruling. Once they affect a section, then that whole section is open—my hon. friend from Sudbury said that he accepts this but he wants to broaden it a little bit. He might not accept the amendment if he cannot broaden it. I submit to you, sir, that once the government opens up a section then it cannot regard the parts of the section it has not touched as sacrosanct, the whole section then surely is open.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am no lawyer and I am afraid I am getting caught up in legal arguments here, but it seems to me that I have to support your ruling, because if the government had intended in its Bill No. 6 to propose amendments to these sections, we would have brought them in.

I submit therefore, sir, to you, that the only thing the hon. member can do, and he knows more about this than I, is to bring in a bill proposing amendments to these sections which he proposes to change so drastically.

Mr. Bryden: He is just dealing with section 6.

Mr. Thompson: You opened it up with your own amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not at all. I opened up discussion on subsection 4. This is the amendment that I proposed in the government bill, not the other sections at all. Had we intended or had we proposed amendments to those, we would have brought them in in Bill No. 6.

Mr. Chairman: Is the section carried?

Mr. Sopha: Just let me expand a little. Surely it is open to us in the Opposition to

say, as we are saying here: "We agree with what the government is doing with regard to this section. We agree that subsection 4 should be repealed, but having agreed with that, we go a little bit further and we say subsections 1 and 2 should also be repealed and subsection 3 should be rewritten."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is why I say, Mr. Chairman, and I must bow to the superior legal knowledge of my hon. friend, but it would seem to me the logical way to do it would be for the hon. member to propose to bring in a bill proposing an amendment to the Act. It would seem to me it would take another bill to amend this section.

Mr. Bryden: Are you presuming then that the other subsections are related to 4, or why did you put them all in one section in the first place? It was your bill last year, too. If they are related, then they are affected.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Certainly, Mr. Chairman, when the Legislature votes on a bill—as happened in the last session of the Legislature—votes on a section, and it is carried under the democratic process to become law, then the Minister brings in an amendment that deletes part of that section, which could change the whole context of that section, certainly the Opposition should have the right to deal with the rest of the section. If not, then there is a change being made without the right of vote in the House.

Mr. Chairman: I am ruling that the Opposition, under these circumstances, does not have the right to deal with other sections of the bill.

Mr. Bryden: Other sections? We are just on one section.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, on subsections.

Will section 6 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. While we are still dealing with the rules in this House, may I draw to your attention a rather grave discourtesy—in my mind, in any event—by the hon. member for Sudbury to the other hon. members of this House by dealing with that last subsection in the manner in which he did.

I do not want to pick him out particularly here, but I think it is a growing procedure that should be stopped and should be stopped right now, before it proceeds any further.

Certainly if a member wishes to bring in an amendment to a section, surely he should have to give the terms of that amending motion when he stands up to speak on it, rather than to speak on it for about five minutes and then bring in the actual terms of the motion.

In many of these cases, and we have just seen an example of it, a member can speak for about five minutes on a motion that is clearly out of order.

Surely if the hon. member wished to speak on section 6 of the bill, as he just did, or attempted to, then he should speak on section 6. But on the other hand, if he is going to speak on an amending motion to section 6, at the very beginning when he stands up, he should give the terms of his motion, otherwise it may be out of order and he may be speaking for five minutes on something that is clearly out of order.

Mr. Bryden: Well, it is a new ruling.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I may say to the member for St. George, it has not been the practice or the custom or the usage of this House so to do. Since I have been here, it has been the practice and the custom of this House for a member to speak in advance of the amendment he wants to put forward if he wishes to do so and that is why—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Then anybody can bring in a motion that may be clearly out of order—

Mr. Chairman: That is why I asked for a copy of the amendment that the member had—

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: Yes, sir, and I believe that that is a grave discourtesy to the rest of the hon. members in this House who had as perfect a right as you had to know what the terms of that amendment were.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order. I think the hon. member for St. George has missed a very key point. As soon as an amendment is made, all the debate must be centred on that amendment and when it is voted on, if it is defeated the whole section carries.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: This is one of the risks of bringing in an amendment.

Mr. MacDonald: Therefore, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member for St. George

that it is a completely legitimate procedure that if you want to talk about the section as a whole and then finally end your remarks by bringing in the amendment, that you have a full right to do that. Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that you do have it, because that is the only way that you can debate the whole section.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: The defect in that argument, of course, is that if you bring in an amending motion to a section, such as section 6, you obviously have the right, and it has been the procedure in this House to give the speaker the right, to talk on the whole of the section, both amended and prior to the amendment. This has been the procedure in this House.

Mr. Chairman: I have ruled on this.

Shall section 6 stand as part of the bill?

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7:

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, with regard to section 7, you refused to accept an amendment earlier on the point here. I feel rather confident that an amendment here is completely in order.

The proposal in section 7 is that sections 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 of The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, are repealed. Now what this does is to strip completely out of all the licensing of carriers, all the rules and regulations with regard to it.

Some of it, I agree, has to go. But I think that it is necessary to retain the right for the licensing, which is contained in section 8 (1). I think it is entirely necessary that we should have in section 8 (3) "an application for a licence under this Act shall be made on a form supplied by the superintendent." In other words that in the procedures by which this is done, we should have an appeal from a refusal to grant a licence.

In section 10, for example, "that the superintendent may cancel or suspend a licence under this Act" we should have the appeal related thereto and the penalties in the event of an offence under this Act.

In other words, what they are doing is throwing out the baby along with the wash.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I take a minute to explain this? This licensing has only regard to the operation of Bill No. 136 and since the amending Bill No. 6 removes the private carriers altogether from this programme, all this is rendered unnecessary.

Now, this has no regard to the licensing of the carriers under The Insurance Act. They had to be licensed separately to operate under this Act, Bill No. 136, namely, to provide the standard medical services contract and the standard medical co-insurance contract as provided in Bill No. 136.

But it has nothing to do with their licensing nor has the repeal of this section anything to do with robbing the superintendent of insurance of any of the powers he has under his own Act. They still remain completely under his jurisdiction now and we have no control or authority over them whatsoever.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's logic is rather strange. If all of these powers were invested in the superintendent of insurance and presumably he was exercising them, why in the bill a year ago did there have to be created parallel legislation in this Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This was with respect to two particular types of contract only.

Mr. MacDonald: I realize—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The only legislation that gave government the power to control subscription rates.

Mr. MacDonald: I realize and accept the differences between the hon. Minister and me, Mr. Chairman. He insists that the private carriers should be given complete carte blanche, that there is going to be no licensing; that there is going to be no regulation at all. We fought it out on the issue of maximum premiums a while ago, and now we come down to the basics. In our view there should be a licensing—there should be all of the necessary paraphernalia so that there is going to be some regulation of the private carriers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is. There is licensing under the two Acts—The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Insurance Act and the ordinary insurance Act. There is all the power necessary, but it is vested in another department of government, not in The Department of Health at all.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister and I are not on the same wavelength. The powers were invested in those statutes last spring and the hon. Minister still saw fit to duplicate them here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But not with respect to the standard and the co-insurance contracts—

Mr. MacDonald: I realize that—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: —the control of maximum rates.

Mr. MacDonald: I realize that, but the difference between the hon. Minister and me is that I insist that we should have some regulations here where conceivably they be effective—they have not been effective elsewhere on any occasion up till now. Therefore, I move that section 7 of Bill No. 6 be amended to read as follows:

7. Subsection 2 of section 8, and sections 9 and 12 of The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965 are repealed.

Mr. Chairman: I must say to the member for York South that it has already been decided that this bill has nothing to do with the private carriers and any amendment dealing with the licensing of the private carriers is out of order. And I would so rule this amendment out of order.

Section 7 agreed to.

On section 8:

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you. To accommodate my friend, the hon. member for St. George, whom I esteem most deeply, I am going to move an amendment to subsection 1 of section 8 of the bill.

I move that subsection 1 of section 8 be amended by striking out all the words after "1965" in the second line thereof and substituting the following:

Is amended by striking out in subsection 1 of section 14 all the words after the word "paid" in the fifth line and substituting the following: "And the effective date of such contract shall be the first day of the following month," so that the said subsection 1 of section 14 shall read as follows:

1. Every resident who is not a dependant or where such resident is the head of a family and has not applied for a standard contract, his dependent spouse is entitled to have a standard contract issued to him if the application therefor is made and if the subscription therefor is paid and the effective date of such contract shall be the first day of the following month.

2. Subsection 3 of the said section 14 is repealed.

You will note that section 8 of the bill provides for the repeal of subsection 3. I have accommodated that in my amendment.

You will further note, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed subsection 1 (a) of the bill uses in its first three words "notwithstanding subsection 1." Sir, my contention to you is that one cannot comprehend what the hon. Minister intends—yes, what the mover of the bill intends—in regard to the proposed amendment without reading subsection 1; they are inextricably linked together. Therefore, my amendment has the effect of rewriting to a limited extent subsection 1 of section 14 and I do away with the proposed amendment by the mover of the bill. The change that I make in section 14 is to change the effective date of the contract from the first day of the month following the closing date of the open enrolment period to the first day of the month following the application. It is as simple as that.

I am not going to debate, on this amendment, the matter of open enrolment periods. That has been decided. We have expressed our views. But, sir, notwithstanding that that has been decided, it is open to this House, in dealing with this section in the way I propose, to say simply that when a person wishes to enrol—and the hon. Minister has said time and time again that this bill is for persons, it is for individuals—the person makes the decision that he wishes to enrol in the government plan, then he goes down and he plunks down his money for his contract, and says to the issuer, like the issuer of licences, "Give me a contract."

We on this side do not believe that he should have to wait two, four or six months, or a year, or that he should have to wait until another enrolment period is designated by the government. But within a reasonable time he is entitled to be issued his contract of medical insurance. As to the reasonable time, one must more or less pick it out of the hat in regard; one must select a date.

We think it eminently fair that the date on which the services become available to him should be the first day of the following month. There is a nice, even place to start—the first of the month. Many decisions are made on the first of the month. It is a time of new beginnings, the time of resolution and determination, the first of the month—

An hon. member: The rent is due.

Mr. Sopha: The rent is due, for one thing. Perhaps it is pay day for another thing. And we feel it is as good a time as any.

On the other side, there will be those accustomed to dealing with the picayune, the trivial, those who elaborate the obvious, and distend the trivial, who will say that a person will wait until he gets sick, or will wait until he feels the pangs of sickness coming on and then will go down and enrol in the government scheme. I would submit that if you thought about it for a little while, that would apply to only a very small minority of the great number of responsible citizens in whom we can trust and who reside in this province.

Furthermore, under my amendment, if he is sick, if he has broken his leg, if he suddenly discovers he has a herniated disc or something else, or his gall bladder needs removal—if it is a choice between the highway and the mother-in-law's gall bladder—he is going to take out his gizmo and he is going to have to wait at least until the first day of the following month. So, if it is the second of the month that he applies, he has 29 days to wait and the corresponding lessening number of days as the end of the month approaches.

To sum it all up, if, in the words of the hon. Minister the purpose is to bring to our people adequate health care—and he has said that and I have underlined it and I have written it down that he has said it—and we want to bring adequate health care to people who otherwise cannot get it, then we take him at his own word. We simply do that; we take him at his own word and we say that we believe on this side of the House that the best way to get medical treatment for him is to enrol him in the government plan as soon as possible.

At the other extreme, we do not want the individual in hospital suddenly deciding that the government should start to pay his doctor's bills when he has not taken any steps at all to provide those services for himself. To obtain a happy medium, a reasonable compromise between the two, we intend to take the reference to the open enrolment period out of section 14 and substitute for it "the first day of the month following the payment of the subscription."

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps I should read this amendment to members. It has been moved:

That section 8, subsection 1, be amended by striking out all the words after "1965" in the second line thereof and substituting the following:

Is amended by striking out in subsection

1 of section 14, all the words after the word "paid" in the fifth line and substituting the following: And the effective date of such contract shall be the first day of the following month, so that the said subsection 1 of section 14 shall read as follows: Every resident who is not a dependant or where such a resident is the head of a family and has not applied for a standard contract, his dependent spouse is entitled to have a standard contract issued to him if the application therefor is made and if the subscription therefor is paid and the effective date of such contract shall be the first day of the following month.

This is if 2, section 3, of the said section 14 is repealed.

I think it is on a thin line as far as the acceptance of this particular amendment in some parts but I am prepared to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, may I respectfully disagree with your opinion in this matter? This is exactly the same argument as I put forward before. Just because we used the words: "Notwithstanding subsection 1." This certainly does not give a member the right to bring in an amendment to a part of the Act which has already been passed and has been considered law by this Legislature. It would be necessary again for the member to bring in a bill to amend the section which he chooses to amend.

The amendment we proposed, sir, is an additional paragraph. We could have started this paragraph out, I feel, by saying, "where an application is made," but to make it simple for us we have put in "notwithstanding subsection 1."

But it would seem to me, sir, that that indeed, is a very fine line. Again, I must bow to the superior legal knowledge of my hon. friend, but in my opinion I think this is a very, very thin line indeed on which to stand and say: "This gives me the right to propose an amendment to a part of the Act that became law last year."

Mr. Chairman: I appreciate the comments of the Minister, but I have already given a ruling in connection with this.

I recognize the member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, having established the "thin line," I appreciate that ruling and I would also say that the remarks of the hon. member for Sudbury have demonstrated his concern for the welfare of the people of this province in trying to get

a little thinner line between the time of payment and the time of operation of the contract.

It seems to me that even down to one day—I have no objection to that—because it seems to me that what we are trying to do with this bill is to meet a fundamental human need, the need of our people for medical care. This is a fundamental thing and we should be searching for ways and means by which those needs can be met effectively and as soon as possible after the date when the person pays his amount of money.

Now it seems to me that the sensible thing would be to establish a date. If it is July 1, 1966 and if we could have said that on that date everybody is covered and our people will start to pay their premiums, this would have been, in my opinion, the proper solution to the whole problem.

Since it is not, then the sooner the contract takes effect after the premium is paid, the better. It seems to me that the hon. member for Sudbury has brought forward a sensible arrangement here.

I am sorry he has gone, because I want to make a further suggestion to him, because section 14 of Bill No. 136 did lay down a pretty fundamental thing which is simply an extension of what the hon. member has outlined.

Subsection 3 (a) said:

A standard contract issued under this section shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition.

It seems to me that perhaps the hon. Minister himself might be willing to bring this within the scope of the Act and it might be that the hon. member for Sudbury would include in his amendment that very idea, that no standard contract issued under this section shall provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition. Because after all, people who are now suffering from physical or mental infirmities or whatever it may be and have some deterioration of the body, these people need help at the earliest possible moment.

I do not think in this case, that any of us would say that there should be any waiting period. I am wondering if the hon. member for Sudbury might be willing to include this within the scope of his amendment because I think it is very important. I wondered if anyone can speak for him—

I see that the hon. member for Sudbury has just come back and if I could repeat my request of him—

Mr. Thompson: I will relay it to him.

Mr. Young: All right, if that could be done, I would pass this to him and suggest that this might be done. It is simply a matter of incorporating section 3 (a), the general idea of it, within his amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, this would be totally redundant. We have already said in section 5:

Standard medical services insurance contracts shall be made available for residents and their dependants without regard to age, physical or mental infirmity, financial means or occupation, only by the medical services insurance division.

We proposed in our amendments that subsection 3 of 14 be deleted because this called for waiting periods and we have decided to cut out waiting periods.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, could I ask—section 5 does not guarantee that such people will not have to wait the regular waiting period. You say that it is not in there?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, you do not repeat the terms of the Act in every paragraph. These terms are laid down and we have already made the point clear on this matter.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, does it not mean that a person with a physical infirmity, if he pays his subscription today—according to what you have said, if I understand correctly—he has the services immediately? He does not have to wait until the first—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I did not say any such thing, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member is putting words in my mouth. I have stated already in this debate that if the subscriber enrolls during an open enrolment period, his contract comes due on the first day of the month following payment of his subscription. If he does not enrol during an open enrolment period, but enrolls any other time, there is a waiting period for all conditions of three months.

This subsection which we are proposing now under section 8 of the amendment, simply spells that out for the initial enrolment period, because again, as I explained this afternoon, the open enrolment period we hope will close two months before the

first day on which benefits become available to subscribers.

This two-month period is needed by the administration to get the machinery in operation so that there will be no disappointment and we will be able to carry out our contract. This section 8, section 14 1 (a) simply has reference to the initial open enrolment period and will have no effect after that initial enrolment period is over.

Mr. Bryden: But, Mr. Chairman, I do not think the hon. Minister has yet appreciated the point. He also—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me for just one moment. The Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) tried to get my attention earlier. You were on the floor before the member for Woodbine.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Chairman, I was going to speak on a point of order, but on that very thin red line. Thank you.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, may I say this on a point of order? We are getting into far too much legalism here. Let us get on with the discussion of the principle of these amendments and let us not get down to pettifoggery and cavilling about the procedure of the House. We waste more time in ruling whether these amendments are in order or not, than we do in discussing the principles involved.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister has missed the point, and I think it is a very valid point that the hon. member for Yorkview has raised and on which he would have proposed an amendment if he had managed to catch your eye before the hon. member for Sudbury.

The proposed section 8 of the bill will amend section 14 of the Act, first of all by putting in a new subsection which has been discussed to some degree. Secondly, it will strike out the subsection 3 now in there. We submit to the hon. Minister that although we certainly would not want clause (b) of subsection 3—we fought it like steers last year—there is in clause (a) of subsection 3, an important point which is not covered by any other part of the bill. The important point is that a standard contract, if this part of the thing were retained, shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition.

I submit to the hon. Minister that section 5 of the Act, as it is re-enacted, does not change its basic import at all; section 5 of the Act does not cover that point. Indeed, if section 5 did cover it, why did the hon. Minister bring this clause in last year? Section 5 was in the Act last year—the same in principle, but changed in words in order to fit into the new framework of the Act. Section 5 just gives a general guarantee that standard medical services insurance contracts shall be made available. But it does not say anything about limitations that may be imposed.

But, if one goes over to the regulations section of the Act—section 28 of the Act—and looks at clause (k), which even under this amending bill is still to stay, it provides that the Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations prescribing limitations on benefits under standard contracts.

Put those three things together and I submit to the hon. Minister that there is a guarantee contained in clause (a) of subsection 3 that he wants to repeal that should be there, and that is that neither the Lieutenant-Governor nor anybody else can monkey with this thing so as to impose a waiting period or other limitation, because of a pre-existing condition. If he takes that section out of the Act, then there is no guarantee against that.

It may be that the government would not do such a thing, I do not know, but I think when we are dealing with laws we should have a right to expect guarantees on certain matters and not have to rely on the goodwill of the government. I submit to the hon. Minister that he put that section in last year and he had a section 5 that *pari passu* was exactly the same as it is now. He considered it necessary last year; I suggest to him that it is still necessary this year and that we should make it absolutely clear that the people are not going to be limited because of pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition. This is all we are asking for.

It is almost 10:30 now, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) has been following the procedure of adjourning at 10:30, but if that is his plan now, I would suggest you let this section stand overnight and perhaps the hon. Minister can think about the representations we have made to him.

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to the amendment

as proposed by the hon. member for Sudbury, I would like to bring in the problem of the immigrant.

Under the amendment as proposed by the hon. member for Sudbury, the immigrant would be covered on the first of the month following the payment of the premium. The immigrant coming into the country has had to pass a medical exam, so we would assume that he would be perfectly physically fit, and would not be requiring medical services to any extent. Under the scheme as proposed by the hon. Minister now, there would be a waiting period unless that immigrant were to come in at the time of an open enrolment period. I do not think this would be fair to the individual.

The other point that I would bring up is the person covered by a family coverage. They may have a youngster at the age of 19 or 20 who shortly will reach adulthood. Where does that youngster stand in relationship to coverage? Will that person now have to have a waiting period before he will be covered by the medical services?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, in respect of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville: The immigrant has to be a resident of Ontario for three months before he is eligible for coverage at all under any of our social legislation—certainly under our hospital plan and under this plan.

The youngster who becomes of age outside of an open enrolment period is covered under subsection 2 of this section.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, in what way is he covered?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Every dependant who becomes 21 years of age and every person who qualifies as a resident after the expiration of an open enrolment period is entitled to apply for a standard contract, if the application therefor is made and the subscription therefor is paid within 30 days following the date on which he so qualifies, and the effective date of such a contract shall be the first day of the month following the date of application and payment of subscription.

This would cover the immigrant. As soon as he became a resident and enrolled, whether it was in an open enrolment period or not, he would be covered on the first day of the month following the payment of his subscription.

Mr. Newman: If I can ask the hon. Minister a question, what happens to the student? Does the student now have to pay a premium

or is the student covered under this free medical? The student more than likely does not make earnings that are taxable.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If he does not make earnings that are taxable, he has a right to apply and get free coverage.

Mr. Newman: So all students then—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If he has taxable earnings and he is over 21 years of age, then he will be treated the same as everybody else.

Mr. Newman: Then all students would be eligible to obtain the free medical plan?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If they are over 21 years of age, yes.

I cannot understand why the hon. member for Woodbine should be worrying about the guarantee. It is here quite clearly in section 14. It is not spelled out, but it states that the subscriber shall be eligible in an open enrolment period for coverage. The coverage is spelled out already in the definition section of the Act, and under section 5, as the hon. member points out, it was spelled out in the Act before. That is the guarantee that there will be no discrimination for age, state of health or financial status, and section 14, subsection 1 states that he is eligible for benefits on the first day of the month following the payment of his premium in an open enrolment period.

Mr. Bryden: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. It is not quite that simple, because the Act, assuming that all the amendments that the hon. Minister is proposing are carried exactly as they are, will still contain a provision whereby the Lieutenant-Governor in council will be able to alter.

To go back to the bill of last year, or the bill as it was passed by the committee of the whole House, in section 28, which is on page 14 as it was printed here, the Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations. Then you go down to (k), prescribing limitations on benefits under standard contracts, respecting any matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the intent and purpose of this Act.

These are the things I am worried about, Mr. Chairman. I am not saying that he has in mind using that power for the purpose of putting some special limitations on persons suffering from physical or mental infirmity or condition, all I am asking is the quite harmless request—it would not hurt his bill any—to just leave that guarantee which he saw fit to put in last year. Why did he put it in last

year if it is unnecessary? He has not made any material change this year that renders it any less necessary now than it was last year. I submit he just should do what he did last year on that point.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the limitations referred to in section 28 are the limitations in schedule A.

Mr. Bryden: It does not say that, but even so you can put it into schedule A. If you left in the guarantee you had then, there would be no question that any limitation could be imposed with respect to these people.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would just like to follow on the question asked by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville. I notice in the answer that the hon. Minister referred to when the immigrant is a resident. By that I had a feeling that he implied that after three months he becomes a resident, but this is not quite correct, sir. An immigrant becomes a resident—has the status of a resident—on the first day he arrives off the boat. Because of this I think that to say categorically that after three months he can have all the social benefits that Ontario provides, is questionable. It seems to me there is a period of adjustment during those three months where it is pretty severe for the immigrant.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: As far as this Act is concerned, Mr. Chairman, “resident” is spelled out in the definition section and this is what it says:

An individual who is legally entitled to remain in Canada who has ordinarily resided in Ontario for a continuous period of at least 90 days immediately preceding the date on which an application for a standard contract is made by him or on his behalf, but does not include a tourist, transient or a visitor to Ontario.

It is spelled out here. I may have been in error, and I think I qualified my statement with respect to his eligibility for all help under our social welfare. But certainly under our hospital insurance plan and under this plan this is the definition of a resident. In the first three months I believe there is an arrangement with the department of immigration that looks after some part, at least, of the hospital and health care.

Mr. Thompson: There is, and I would like to guarantee that very definitely, because the hon. Minister is speaking of a large number of people. There is a more active

immigration policy in the Ontario government, and when you are trying to attract people to come to the country, you talk about the benefits which they may have under Ontario and your human betterment programme. I would hope that this is not always going to be a practice, when the hon. Minister is saying that it becomes effective after three months, just because you had that under the hospital insurance programme. I would hope that immigrants would be given equal opportunity with anyone else immediately after they arrive.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to come back to a point that my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, made to the hon. Minister and ask him if he would hold this over and let his law officers take a look at it, because with respect, if I may repeat this and draw it to his attention, section 28 does not have reference only to the schedule. When section 28 spells out with regard to regulations, and in subsection (k) says, "prescribed limitations on benefits under standard contracts," that applies throughout the whole bill.

If you come back to the section that we are now dealing with, and if you strike out section 3 (a) which now says "a standard contract issued under this section shall not provide any waiting period or any limitation of benefits with respect to any pre-existing physical or mental infirmity or condition," and you leave subsection (k) of the regulations, then under this bill it is possible to put limitations on in this way.

I do not think the hon. Minister wants that; he told us that this is not the case. But I submit to you that under the bill, legally it can be done. I repeat, let us have the law officers have a look at it and see whether they concur and we can vote on it tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am deeply saddened that my hon. friend has suspicions of me at this late hour. However, I will bow to his wish and I will have the law officers look at this.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee of the whole rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will commence the Budget debate and we have a night session tomorrow night. When the two financial critics have spoken, we will revert to Bill No. 6 in committee.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.40 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Second report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Reuter	521
Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davison, first reading	521
Resumption of the debate on the Budget, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Bryden	524
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. White, agreed to	549
Recess, 6 o'clock	549

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Lawrence Heights junior high school, Downsview, and in the west gallery, Bramalea secondary school, Bramalea and Don Mills junior high school, Don Mills.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South) from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's second report which was read as follows and adopted:

Bill No. Pr2, An Act respecting the Kenora Rink Company Limited.

Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Port Arthur.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the Toronto aged men's and women's homes.

Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting the Strathroy Middlesex general hospital.

Bill No. Pr14, An Act to establish the Guelph district board of education.

Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting l'Institut Canadien Français de la cité d'Ottawa.

Your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the Toronto aged men's and women's homes.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): **Mr. Speaker,** I have a question of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). Now I am nonplussed for I notice he is not here.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member to hold his question. If the Provincial Treasurer comes in before the end of question period he may ask it; if not, the Provincial Treasurer can take it as notice for tomorrow.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): **Mr. Speaker,** I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), a copy of which has been submitted to him.

In view of the strike in the building construction trades in the city of Windsor, what efforts are being made by the hon. Minister to bring about a settlement?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): **Mr. Speaker,** the department is in close touch with the situation in Windsor and is seeking to create an early favourable opportunity for the parties to come together to resolve their dispute.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): **Mr. Speaker,** I have a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) notice of which has been given him.

Would the hon. Minister tell the House whether any convictions have been obtained under section 27 subsection 1, of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act within the last 12 months? If convictions were obtained, would the hon. Minister name the municipalities or persons involved?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): **Mr. Speaker,** I am sorry I am unable to give the hon. member an answer to his question today. The senior solicitor for the Ontario water resources commission was out of his office this morning, appearing before the standing committee on government commissions.

I will be pleased to give the hon. member an answer tomorrow, sir.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): **Mr. Speaker,** I have a question of the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld).

Is the hon. Minister alarmed about the effect of press reports of pollution in three small areas in Muskoka being detrimental to the whole Muskoka area this coming tourist season? As a supplementary: Are steps being taken to correct this impression left by this reporting, in view of the subsequent statements in the OWRC report that the quality of surface waters in the Muskoka lakes is entirely suitable for recreational uses?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, I think my hon. friend's supplementary question answered his first question. Actually, I presume he is referring to a story which is in this morning's *Toronto Globe and Mail*. On reading the story it appeared to me that the head on the story was to be the problem rather than the story itself.

Of course, the Ontario water resources commission is under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. I obtained a copy of the press release this morning which the commission produced last week when the survey was made public and I would like to read the first paragraph of it:

The bacteriological quality of the main bodies of water in the Muskoka lakes district of Ontario is excellent, it is stated in a report "Water Quality and Pollution Control in the Muskoka Lakes" just issued by the Ontario water resources commission.

I understand that this press release was distributed around the province and was used as the basis of stories around the province and so I think that the report in this morning's paper was more alarming to those who only read the head than it was to those who read the body of the report.

Mr. Paterson: Supplementary to that, has the hon. Minister read the actual report of the OWRC on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I have the same problem as the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Everybody from the Ontario water resources commission was at the standing committee this morning so I have not had an opportunity to get the report.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett). Is the hon. Minister taking any steps with regard to the exhaust control systems on 1966 automobiles?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, all 1966 cars—indeed, all registered motor vehicles—are required under The

Highway Traffic Act to have exhaust control systems as defined by section 42 (1) *et seq.*

42 (1). Every motor vehicle shall be equipped with a muffler in good working order and in constant operation to prevent excessive or unusual noise and excessive smoke and no person shall use a muffler cutout, by-pass or similar device upon a motor vehicle.

Subsection 2. The engine and power mechanism of every motor vehicle shall be so equipped and adjusted as to prevent the escape of excessive fumes or smoke.

If the hon. member has reference to means for reducing the emission of air pollutants such as unsaturated hydrocarbons in 1966 cars, the answer is no.

Mr. Sargent: Is the hon. Minister aware that 1966 cars in California have them on them now? And what is he planning to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, the situation existing in California, especially in the city of Los Angeles, is very different from what we have here. If the hon. member had been present yesterday and heard my answer when I was replying to both the primary and supplementary questions of his colleague, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, he would have heard what we are doing and what we hope will be done.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). Has, or is, the government considering taking steps to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act, to require all trust and loan companies to have deposit insurance to guarantee and provide insurance on all deposits?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, a bill to amend The Loan and Trust Corporations Act will be placed before this House for consideration at this session.

Some of the provisions—most of the provisions—in that legislation will relate to the financial aspects of loan and trust companies. It is not our present intention to require insurance of deposits. That area, I believe you will find, will be dealt with by the requirements as to reserves, which will be set forth in the legislation.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question to ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). Will the hon. Minister advise this House the annual salary and annual allowable travelling expenses of the hon. member of

the legislative assembly serving on the Ontario hospital services commission?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I suggest that question should have been either a written question for the notice paper or, more properly perhaps, a notice of motion for return. If the hon. member would like to do this I will get the particulars and submit them as quickly as possible.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I have looked all through the public accounts of last year and I am unable to find this. Surely for a senior man such as the hon. member of the Legislature representing the Ontario hospital services commission, surely you can give the answer to that question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I will get the information for the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, there is no question about that.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information. Would the hon. Minister advise this House the annual salary and annual allowable travelling expenses of the hon. members of the legislative assembly serving on the St. Lawrence parks commission?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, I think probably my answer would be the same as that of the hon. Minister of Health. Although I do not have the public accounts in front of me, I know when I was a member of that commission, the amount was shown in the public accounts.

Mr. Whicher: Well, it is not there and that is the reason I am asking the question. Not one of them is there.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Speaker, if this could be a motion for return, I will endeavour to have the information for the hon. member.

Mr. Whicher: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management. Will the hon. Minister advise this House the annual salary and annual allowable travelling expenses of the hon. members of the legislative assembly serving on the following commissions: The Ontario Northland transportation commission, the hydro-electric power commission, the Ontario water resources commission—

An hon. member: Oh, oh! Hydro, that will be a good one.

Hon. Mr. Simoneff: Mr. Speaker, as I did not get notice of these questions until 12:30

today and to get the information that the hon. member wants I would have to get in touch with North Bay, with the Hydro office and with the OWRC—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order! Now the member has asked a question and I may say that in response to all of these questions I ask that they be placed on the order paper.

I understand the member wished to have this information to make a speech on the Budget and being unable to find the answers anywhere I allowed the question to be asked directly to the Minister.

If the Minister has stated that he will get the information for the member and make a return on the notice paper, that is his prerogative.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, you can always try again. I have a question of the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko). Will the hon. Provincial Secretary advise this House the annual salary and annual allowable travelling expenses of the hon. member of the legislative assembly serving on the liquor control board of Ontario?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I think that the reasoning followed by my hon. colleagues is quite proper. This type of question I think should form the basis of an order of return and I would take the same as such.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): If this is made in the form of a notice for return, I will undertake that the information will be here in time for the hon. member to use it in the Budget debate if that is what he wishes. We will get it and we will put it on the order paper.

Mr. Whicher: I have one more. Will the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) advise this House the annual salary and annual allowable travelling expenses for the hon. members of the legislative assembly on the following board and commission: the board of pensions and the racing commission?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would advise the hon. member first of all that there are no Ministers on those commissions—

Mr. Whicher: I did not say Ministers, I said members of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Allan: The question I have here says "Ministers." However, I am happy to take this as notice.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say—

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry, the member cannot make a statement.

Mr. MacDonald: There are a lot of things I would like to say, too, but I will not try to say them at this point.

My question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer. Has the government granted a temporary exemption on payment of sales tax to trucking companies involved in the labour-management dispute when they transfer their vehicles to another operator?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I say in answer to the hon. member's question that it has been brought to my attention that there has been a substantial number of transfers of vehicles reported to the retail sales tax branch by The Department of Transport. These transfers are being investigated by the retail sales tax branch and tax will be collected as has been our practice in the past.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Second order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and that the House resolve itself into committee of ways and means.

ON THE BUDGET

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I would like to start first of all by saying to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) that I appreciate the fact that he had wanted my reply to the Budget to be on Monday—traditionally I think it is on a Tuesday, but I appreciated the arrangement to have it on Tuesday. I had some personal reasons as well which made it very helpful for me.

Last week, sir, the people in three Canadian provinces got the idea of what was going to be in store for them in the coming fiscal year. In British Columbia, Premier Bennett brought down a sunshine budget; he lifted the 5 per cent sales tax from meals, from magazines, confections, school supplies and children's clothing and he increased grants to homeowners from \$100 to \$110. And he eliminated some property taxes.

Mr. Bennett's budget, it is interesting to note, called for a surplus of \$2.5 million, compared to our deficit Budget.

In Saskatchewan, in the Speech from the Throne there were indications that the prov-

ince's rural and urban homeowners would get an annual \$50 grant from the province. There have been promises that the province intends to reduce provincial income tax by about one per cent in its 1966-67 budget later this month.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all of this seems very normal. The times are good. The United States is already savouring the delight of a number of tax cuts.

And what is happening in Ontario—Ontario, which is Canada's wealthiest province, the so-called province of opportunity?

The government hits us with the largest wholesale increase in taxation in the province's history. And it set off a shock around this province. The hon. Prime Minister—and he suggests that it is a fad that is taking place—he gets pickets. There were pickets last night in front of this Legislature, of people who are angry and annoyed. Not only have their rights been pushed around, but they are getting their pocketbooks pushed around as well.

The genial Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) raised the sales tax and for the first time I think this is significant, he has applied it to service industries. He raised the sales tax on the gasoline tax, cigarette tax, the land transfer tax, the highway diesel fuel tax, and then for good measure, he threw in the price of spirits and wine.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer smiled occasionally when he presented this Budget, Mr. Speaker, and we would like to smile back, but in smiling back he stole some of our gold fillings while he was at it.

Not including liquor, the hon. Provincial Treasurer jumped his tax revenues in this Budget almost 15 per cent. The hon. Provincial Treasurer has warned us that he is not even going to be satisfied with this 15 per cent. If Ottawa does not increase its abatement, he said the province is going to increase its income tax rate to produce an additional yield of four percentage points. This implied threats. I suggest it is not based on threats. He has tax committees which are yet to report and which never bothered this government, Mr. Speaker—you and I both know that. We heard the hon. Prime Minister—it was not too many months ago, when he was having a test in international relations, a blackout throughout the whole of the province—come out with a statement. He would move away from the international grid system. Because he had not got his facts, he had to find out later that Ontario was responsible for this.

I suggest the kind of implied threat by the hon. Provincial Treasurer also should only come after he has looked at the full facts. The federal Minister of Finance has indicated the provinces cannot expect Ottawa to keep reducing its share of income taxes to make it less painful for the provinces to increase theirs. Let me say that you cannot talk out of both sides of your mouth. We have this situation of saying that a strong central government is wanted. It seems pretty hard to maintain a strong central government when you get the kind of talk that we are getting from the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

For the moment, it would appear our people can look forward to a jump in provincial income tax next year. The question that we are all asking, Mr. Speaker, is why this sudden scramble for money? This is the question that the people of the province are asking. And their confusion about this is perfectly understandable. All that they have heard and all that we have heard in this Legislature over the years is that the province is booming.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall)—who appears to be not here—is a man who only modestly blows his moose horn, but he is always telling us that Ontario is booming as never before. You may have noticed this, Mr. Speaker, his department took up half-page newspaper ads. It happened to be during the federal election, but I am sure that was just coincidence and there was no particular reason for it. They were, of course, of a non-political nature, but they were saying how good things are in this province. Do you know what they said actually, in effect? That Canada is the number one boy of Ontario.

The hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Ward-robe)—and unfortunately he is not here either—I look on as the nightingale of the north, because he is always singing the happy song about how well things are doing in the mining industry. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, he sings it a little prematurely, but I do not want to go into that. Anyway, he gives the picture that everything is booming.

The hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) would have us believe that tourists are flooding in here, banging at the pearly gates of this Conservative heaven. We are going to have that looked into by our critic on tourism, which will show that we have lost many opportunities for revenue for this province by not having an aggressive, forward approach through the years.

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), who sounds like Paul Bunyan, introduces his estimates with the same flourish; all of them saying, Mr. Speaker, that everything is rosy and wonderful.

And of course the Provincial Treasurers, over the years, are the ones who did this best. They are the genial gentlemen who seem to have the sun on a string. They could pull it down with every Budget day, Mr. Speaker. In good years and in bad years, they would always tell us there was a surplus. This was established in the days of Mr. Leslie Frost, and although the book-keeping has always left much to be desired, they always did show a little bit of surplus.

Budget day, as far as the government went, was like a Broadway opening. The hon. Provincial Treasurer stood up—I sat and listened to the hon. Provincial Treasurer year after year, with that kindly smile on his face, standing up—and he verbally clothed our citizens in tuxedos, and in the finale he rang down the curtain amidst a shower of surplus cash.

But this year, a very funny thing has happened. On the hon. Provincial Treasurer's way to the bank he seems to have taken some side road and he seems to be ending up at Ottawa's almshouse. And why? That is what the people are asking. Why is he displaying now such a beggarly attitude, as though he had a tin cup in his hand?

My answer, sir, is going to detail this 15 per cent hike. As far as I am concerned, it is the cost which we, the people of Ontario are having to pay for mismanagement, for inept management, for lack of planning on the part of this government every year. Let me perhaps establish my main point by a text which I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer will understand: "They have sown the wind; they shall reap the whirlwind."

And for the hon. member—he may be a Minister one day taking over from the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond); he should, he gets more at the crux of the thing, in my opinion—who thought he would like another kind of quote, I would say:

Gather ye rosebuds while ye may,
Old time is still a-flying,
And that same sun which shines today,
Tomorrow may be dying.

For the sunshine Treasurer, I would say that the sun is not shining very much over there. If I could have afforded to buy a black suit, I would have. But with the way the sales tax is going up on clothing, I did not make that investment.

Sir, I want to take the first example of bad planning, and it is education. I do not want to go through the list of those who have been Ministers of Education, but I think they will know themselves. There are few things in government that are easier to predict than the costs of education. Children are born—we know how many—and they have to be educated. And this means schools. The shelves of this government are piled high with reports warning the government to start building more schools—technical schools, community colleges and universities—and I do not mean just yesterday, I mean year after year as we go back.

In the last 15 years we can count the number of university presidents who have tried to sound alarm bells in graduation day speeches; the number of schoolboard chairmen who have stressed the same theme in inaugural day addresses; the number of newspaper editorials. I could quote from the speeches of the former leader of the Opposition as he tried to plead with the government to start recognizing that it has to look ahead through the years, by seeing the children moving up through grade school and moving on in the hope that they can get into technical schools and into universities, if they want.

I am glad, sir, that from a previous plea I made last year, the government has now decided it will have a bureau of statistics, because that is something that is badly needed.

For too long, this government has resisted. It was wedded to an old-fashioned "three-R" approach to education. It turns its back on the challenges and changes of the future and with a single-minded—or simple-minded—devotion to the past, it has defended the little red schoolhouse to all comers.

I noticed recently in one newspaper—you may have seen this, Mr. Speaker, for there was a picture of one of these schoolhouses—I thought it was most appropriate that the name of the school was "Drew." It could have been "Frost" or "Robarts"—it still would have applied.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: And that schoolhouse should be preserved as a monument to show the inactivity and ineptitude of the government over the years. And this old "three-R's" mentality has cost us and our children dearly, and I do not mean just in the massive increase in taxes this year. You and I both, Mr. Speaker, read the hon. Provincial Treas-

urer's Budget statement and I am quoting from it:

Ontario could have achieved greater growth if a larger supply of qualified labour had been available. The limiting factor to Ontario's rate of growth in 1965 was not capital, but qualified managerial, professional and skilled labour.

What caused this was government's old fixation with the "three-R's". The hon. Provincial Treasurer's message is simple; this province did not supply the necessary educational facilities for children it knew would need them, and as a result we have a shortage of skilled man-power and this shortage has cut the efficiency of our economy and the province has had to increase taxes to get the necessary revenue.

The result of a Conservative philosophy of financing education—pay now and go later—and this short-sighted government has not spread the costs of education over a number of years. I repeat, and I will repeat it again and again, it knew the number of children that would have to be educated and so now we have a crash programme. In the hon. Provincial Treasurer's own words: "The government has supported accelerated programmes to upgrade existing and potential labour supplies."

Crash programmes mean that the government is mismanaging the affairs of this province; they are having to move in because of bad planning. Crash programmes cost money; they cost more money than currently planned expansion. Crash programmes cost more because of the hurry and the overtime involved.

Just this morning, we see where there is going to be another crash programme; another exposure of government inefficiency in the lack of libraries. The hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) has fought hard and continually about the libraries and had these kind of smooth answers in reply—and suddenly with the very able report that has come out from Mr. Francis R. St. John, we now realize that nothing has been done in six years on this.

What caused this "three-R" mentality of the government? Crash programmes at the present time are costing more because of interest rates and labour costs which have risen since the 1950's and early 1960's. The construction industry is booming now, so much so that Ottawa has announced a cut-back in public works, but in the 1950's and 1960's there were times when men were unemployed and were desperate for a job.

I can remember standing up in that back

bench, sir, during a period of tough unemployment for many people in my riding and trying to fight to get some kind of activity from the government, some kind of public works programme going for them.

The government, in the 1960's, when men needed jobs, the government did not employ them building the schools, and yet it knew that schools were needed; it left the unemployed to languish on welfare during that time and with the fiscal indecisiveness of a true conservative, it hugged its money like a crotchety old man in these bad years and announced budget surpluses. Every year a budget surplus, but what we really needed was to give some impetus to the economy through public works.

What price, in human suffering, these budget surpluses? I will give you some examples: The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) proudly announced last Friday a \$27 million expansion at Ryerson institute—this is going to be the first part of a five-year project which should be completed by September 1868—

An hon. member: 1968.

Mr. Thompson: 1968—they should have started about 1868. This whole project will double the size of the campus from 7 to 14 acres and it will increase enrolment from the present 4,200 to 10,000. "Another glory of the Robarts government" said public relations men—and there are enough of them. We are trying to find the answers to some of those questions as well, after we have found out how many of these men over there are what we call "moonlighting."

I was talking to a taxi driver about that, Mr. Speaker. He was horrified to think that they are getting two salaries for different jobs—but that is away from what I am questioning at the moment.

It was a glory that was late in coming—this Ryerson extension—but two years ago you and I both know that there were 1,000 students who could not get into Ryerson because there was not enough room. Where are these students right now? Some of them are unskilled or else they have moved away and they are spoiling the hon. Provincial Treasurer's boom.

What about the cost now to make this expansion of Ryerson? Construction experts estimate that Ryerson will cost about 12 per cent more in material and wages now than it would have in January 1963, and think of the employment a Ryerson expansion could have given men in the difficult years of the 1950's and 1960's.

Let me quote from a leading Conservative on this: "It is widely acknowledged that the pace of our economic progress depends to a large extent upon the provision of these services." Here he is referring to education, to health, and to job training, and he goes on: "Economic expansion depends on these and the availability of an educated and well trained labour force."

That quote is from the hon. Provincial Treasurer's Budget statement. What he was saying then, I only wish he had said in the '50's and '60's, when the province should have been making some of those educational investments.

Look at the thousands of students who took the four-year high school course and now they have nowhere to go, because we have not got community colleges.

Once again, when they could have been planning these over a period, we are going to hear from across there of a crash programme to put these community colleges out, that they are going to keep their word to the young people of this province. Another crash programme!

What is the government doing for these children, for example, who are going to community colleges next year? What was it doing when they first started school in 1953? They complacently ran a surplus that year of more than a million. And what about the government's much publicized on-the-job training and revamped apprenticeship courses? It is another crash programme.

For years this government was content to leave the apprenticeship programme time-locked in the 1920's. I sat on a manpower committee. The Apprenticeship Act, I think was 1926, it had not even been looked at until a few years ago. And even in the 1963 report of the select committee on manpower training, even when that report came out and showed the need for specialized training skills for men, there has been little done by this government. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) was talking about tool and die makers. That came up in 1963, a desperation on the part of industries to get qualified trained people. As yet, we have not had an answer from the government to this kind of qualified training.

Finally, in 1966, we are just beginning to get programmes that should have been started years ago, and the cost of this complacency is inflation, for one thing. A shortage of labour has bid up its cost. Public works programmes should be easy to spot in the right place and at the right time. Ottawa has

got a shelf of them and it is ready to go when the economy takes a down-turn.

But Ontario, Mr. Speaker, does things a little differently. It started the \$50 million Queen's Park expansion when the economy was nearly at full employment. What price this poor planning?

The three-volume report of the Ontario health survey committee was available to this government in 1951 and made specific recommendations with respect to hospital facilities and services, mental facilities and services, private nursing homes, dental facilities and the supply of doctors. I want to just re-emphasize that—the supply of doctors. It said such things as this:

If Ontario is to maintain its position of leadership in the field of mental health, action has to be taken to avert the present downward trend in the provision of mental health facilities.

That was almost a couple of decades ago. It laid down, for example, how many beds should have been provided in Toronto, and yet the government did not get around to providing low-cost loans until 1964. I can remember the fight that we had in the House to get the hon. Minister of Health even to recognize that there was a shortage of hospital beds.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): May I ask my hon. friend from what he is quoting, and its date?

Mr. Thompson: I am not quoting from anything, I am just talking. You mean about the health survey?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I understood my hon. friend to say that he was quoting from some report that had a date.

Mr. Thompson: Oh, I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I could not understand; I could not get the date.

Mr. Thompson: It is the Ontario health survey committee which was made by the government in 1951, and I quoted there that they had pointed out the need for—I will not repeat it—but it went into the need for doctors and so on. I would like to emphasize to the hon. Prime Minister it was 1951.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The year I came into this House; almost back in Hepburn's day.

Mr. Thompson: Perhaps I could just talk of that, since the hon. Prime Minister wants to know what I was quoting from. It struck me as odd, sir, that the hon. Prime Minister

told us he moved into a crash programme on medical schools, dental schools, and some other things, after the Hall report, and this, of course, is the tragedy of this government. It had these reports, pointing out the need for action, such as this 1951 health survey, and it was only because the Hall report created such an interest all across the nation and people recognized that there was a crisis in health and that we had to do something, that then, only after a crisis, we got some action from the government. But it is not aware of these surveys that have been done.

The hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) is an excellent example on that one. The select committee has been studying automobile insurance year after year, but I do not know how long he will be here before he will sort of cackle out on considering it.

One may say that perhaps in the past they did not have enough money to plan these, and it is only now they have got some money. May I say this, sir, that in the years between 1963 and 1968 this government's revenues will double from \$1 billion to \$2 billion. And the doubling of revenue in five years is a record that is hard to match in any part of this country. Yet the government demands more.

It demands more because it has to, because of poor planning that meant crash programmes. Poor planning has meant higher interest rates and construction costs. Poor planning has meant unemployment to some during the 1950's and 1960's and poor planning today has meant that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has had to get up and tell us that what we need to have expansion in, in this province, is managerial, professional and skilled help, and it is because of his poor planning that he had to make that excuse.

Let me get at what planning was involved with the present tax increases. The government, with a great deal of fanfare, Mr. Speaker, had appointed a taxation study committee. The committee has not reported. The excuse, I assume, is that it is waiting for the Ottawa tax study report. Of course, this is nonsense. If the government had wanted its committee to comment on the Ottawa proposals, it could have reconstituted at a later date. The Ontario committee was supposed to seek ways to make provincial taxation more equitable, and this 15 per cent jump in tax revenues makes the report, when it does come in, largely academic. It will be put on the shelf with so many other reports, to gather dust, with all the rest of them. The government, without that report, has drastically changed taxes and made massive taxes obviously while it was flying blind.

Yet you can look at other provinces. The New Brunswick Royal commission on financing municipal taxation reported in early 1964. Several of its recommendations are being carried out by the government. The Manitoba Royal commission on local government and finance reported in mid-1964. The Saskatchewan Royal commission on taxation reported in the fall of 1964, and the Belanger report in Quebec came in about three weeks ago. But this government just put on these massive taxes, without even hearing from the tax committee group that had been set up.

The committee remains silent and the public is unable to judge the real impact of this huge tax increase. We know some of the impact all the same Mr. Speaker. One that is obvious to all of us is that the tax increase comes on April 1, April Fool's Day, and it is very appropriate because this government over the years with its Budget speech has tried to fool the people and it is not succeeding.

Why the delay to April 1, before the taxes are going to be implemented? Whom does the delay benefit? It does not benefit the wage earner and the farmer; I do not see the average citizen of Ontario being able to go out before the taxes come in and stockpile clothes for himself, being able to buy new cars and get a stockpile before the taxes take effect. The only people who are going to be able to do that as far as I am concerned are those who are wealthy, and it seems to me that the kindly hon. Provincial Treasurer has always done this, letting the wealthy stockpile the good things in life. He is hoping, perhaps, that will not make them quite as angry.

Every one of those new taxes is a consumption tax, and yet it is well known that consumption taxes hit those with incomes of less than \$4,000 to \$4,500 a year harder than they would have been hit if we had had an income tax. The economic council of Canada recently estimated that 71 per cent of Canadians earn \$4,000 a year or less and the percentage would not be much different in Ontario. The hon. Provincial Treasurer has raised all this new revenue in areas which hit the vast majority of people hardest. His Budget hits the wage earner and the farmer a whopping sock in the belly.

I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer hears the same stories as I do about this Budget. I am just going to quote some to him. It seems to me we are more closely in touch with the people than some of the government.

Here is a man on Asquith avenue, he is

a hard-working truck driver with three children, his take-home pay is \$71 a week.

An hon. member: What is his name?

Mr. Thompson: Ed Duggan. His take-home pay is \$71 a week, but a disability pension helps make up the difference between that and his \$115 a week expenses.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Any garnishees?

Mr. Thompson: That is the hard sort of remark you get, "Any garnishees?" That kind of smug remark about the working people of this province. Who was that?

An hon. member: The hon. member for London South.

Another hon. member: Very typical of him.

Mr. Thompson: May I say, sir, that Ed Duggan is very typical of many of the people throughout Ontario and they are getting fed up with snide remarks made by complacent government spokesmen.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Does the member have a point of order?

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, the last time we were given an illustration like this, it turned out that the person concerned had a half dozen garnishees, which reduced his net income.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Will the member please be seated. If the member has a point of order he may rise or he may rise to ask the leader of the Opposition if he will answer a question, but otherwise he cannot make any statement while the member speaking has the floor.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. leader of the Opposition tell us why the man's gross income is \$115 and the net income is \$71?

Mr. Thompson: I said his take-home pay is \$71 a week, but a disability pension makes up the difference between that and his \$115 a week expenses.

He figures the extra taxes will take \$1 a week from his purchasing power. Now, that does not sound like much to the hon. members on the other side but it is about all the

money that Mr. Duggan had set aside for holidays and entertainment and the hon. Provincial Treasurer has in effect taken away his holiday and entertainment money. And I could go on. Oh, the hon. Minister can say little things.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): This is a little thick, I said.

Mr. Thompson: I got a call the other day from an elderly lady. She and her husband are trying to keep a house on a small pension—it is a little thick on them—and they are proud people, they do not want hand-outs. When she called, she called me about the increased tax and I assure you that her voice was filled with anxiety and concern.

Now take a family, the Adams family, one of the poverty families interviewed in Lanark county. They are not yet middle-aged and they have two young children. Their home is an eight-room log house about 100 years old and in poor condition. It is heated by a box stove and a wood-burning kitchen stove.

Water is obtained, according to the report, from an outdoor hand pump. There are no indoor toilet facilities. There is electricity and telephone and the family has a car. The high school is 20 miles away as are the doctor and the hospital.

He needs a car to get to work. The income of the family is \$35 per person per month. And this family is going to have to pay for clothing as much as Mr. Millionaire will in an increase. It is going to be hitting him as hard as it will be hitting someone living up in Bayview. It is an indiscriminate kind of tax and the government, of course, is not concerned, it says it is a little thing. It is a mighty big thing to take an interest in the people of Ontario.

There are nearly a million people in this province, or nearly a million people, who do not earn enough to pay income tax and there is nearly another million that have taxable incomes under \$1,000. And these people are trying to fight their way out of poverty. This Budget makes you wonder which side of the fight in the war on poverty the government is on.

I could go further with many other examples. I know a widow in Toronto in a small rooming house and she is wondering—the government may laugh at these things—she is wondering about the cost of shoes. She is having a tough time in getting by.

In the hon. Provincial Treasurer's own riding—this is why I thought he would be sensitive—in the hon. Provincial Treasurer's

own riding he has been blind to the fact of the condition of many of his constituents.

His riding was shown up as having one of the worst poverty conditions in this province and surely you would think when he brought in a budget, even for the sake of his constituents, he would be aware of the harshness of the effect of this kind of budget on the poor as well as the rich. It is an indiscriminate kind of approach that is being taken.

The hon. Prime Minister tried to excuse himself to the working man and the farmers by saying that the big boost in taxation will help their children go to school and university. And to date generally it is the children of the more wealthy who go to university after finishing high school. It has been estimated by one educator that about 80 per cent of the teenage education leavers in Toronto in 1963-64 were from the low income group, primarily the poverty class. And is the hon. Prime Minister going to tell Mr. Duggan and these other people: "You are going to have the advantages of higher education"?

In most of the cases where these people are in poverty circumstances, or very low income circumstances, in many cases their children are not going to finish high school because their parents cannot afford it. And the 15 per cent interest in tax revenues, all based on consumption taxes, is certainly not going to help those people.

The hon. Prime Minister may talk about the colleges of applied arts and technology—it was in the Throne speech—but you know you get a little nervous just because something is in the Throne speech. We learned something two days ago, or was it yesterday, on Medicare. Because it was written in the Throne speech, he was quite legitimately allowed to say "done." The people are getting concerned that it is just words and not action on the part of the government.

But I come back to this again: why the crash programming and the inequality in getting the revenue?

Metro Toronto Chairman William Allen pointed out that the land tax, which again is regressive, is going to hit this municipality of Metro Toronto as well as many other municipalities. Yet we heard from the hon. Provincial Treasurer that the municipalities must be getting greater help.

Then we go to look at the figures and we see that as a percentage of the total expenditure, the municipalities despite the increased costs are getting less than the previous year.

In 1965 there was a brief from the association of mayors and reeves and it said—and I quote this, sir:

Our difficulty to a large extent has been that the financial capacity of the municipality has not been expanded to keep pace with our increase in responsibility.

Government in a vague way finally says what it is going to do with the funds in the Canada pension plan. Quebec long ago explained what they were going to do and the private sector there was able to adjust knowing what they were going to do.

We have heard that some of the Ontario funds will be used in such a way as to make it easier for the municipality to borrow. The interest rates are not made clear, neither are the premiums for the medical insurance plan, but this is the practice of the government here.

I would be surprised, sir, if many of the large municipalities realized the substantial savings on interest rates. It must be noted that this is only helping some municipalities with some of their debts. It does not take the squeeze off them for current expenditures.

The tax that is typical of the backward thinking of this government is the increase in this land transfer tax. Toronto, according to the latest bureau of statistics figures—and I need not add that this would apply to places other than Toronto; it is just easier for me to get the figures from Toronto—has the highest consumer price index of any regional city in Canada. The comparison sought to measure food, housing, clothing, transportation, health and personal care, recreation and reading, tobacco and alcohol. This made up the index. In all these Toronto was tops in two categories—in housing and recreation—but the city was so far above on these two categories that it was tops over all the other regional areas throughout the province.

It shows, therefore, that the cost of housing is extremely high in Toronto and Ontario. In a survey by the Toronto real estate board, 1,000 new homes sold recently in Metro indicate an average price of \$23,800. A year ago new houses were going for \$21,914, and two years ago \$21,312. The average price—

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): That was because of the federal sales tax.

Mr. Thompson: The average price of 15,000 existing houses sold recently was \$18,883. The point I am getting at—I do not care whether it is because of, I think the

hon. Provincial Treasurer said, the federal building tax figure—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Federal sales tax.

Mr. Thompson: All right. I would suggest that when the government had this land transfer tax it should have realized that it is getting very tough for the average working man to buy a home. I would suggest that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should have had an exemption from the total tax for the person buying a private home that was valued at less than \$20,000. This would have put the tax on the land speculator and also on the higher income homeowner and that is where it belongs.

I think the hon. Provincial Treasurer owes us an explanation, Mr. Speaker, on another count. He told us in the House last year that the reason for the change in the method of collecting the tobacco tax was—I want to be very careful and therefore I am going to quote him—as of last year “surely an administrative point.” This was in reply to a question by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) who had asked whether the government was considering a future increase in the tobacco taxes. Well, the tobacco tax has gone up and I think that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should tell us what he meant by administrative changes. They seem to be very expensive.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Drove the price up two cents a package.

Mr. Thompson: Another point that I would like to ask is that the hon. Provincial Treasurer should tell us whether or not—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the members to refrain making many interjections while the member is speaking; I would like to see a little more co-operation in that regard.

Mr. Thompson: I will make this a rhetorical question to the hon. Provincial Treasurer in view of your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to know from the hon. Provincial Treasurer whether or not Ontario should still collect its own succession duties. It must be cheaper and more efficient to let Ottawa do the job and repay our share to us. It is again of the little person that I am thinking. One can argue that the federal tax on an estate is more equitable. I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer has ever thought of the poor

widow who has to fight two sets of tax collectors. It can be a long-drawn-out business for people who do not have adequate funds to hire a high-powered lawyer.

Since I am asking the hon. Provincial Treasurer a rhetorical question, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask him this: When is he going to start—and I am not sure what his future plans are—reporting to the Legislature in a suitable fashion? Every year the *Financial Post* runs a competition for the best annual report, and this Budget and the presentation of the hon. Provincial Treasurer—if he had the gumption to put it in and I do not think he would—might just squeeze in ahead of Atlantic Acceptance.

In 1965-66, 53 per cent of capital expenditures came from current revenue and then—

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it did not.

Mr. Thompson: And then, lo and behold we have this little parlour trick each year—in 1966-67, by some magic it became 61 per cent. The province, as you know well, Mr. Speaker, starts with the assumption that it has been politically attractive to have a surplus and then it has changed this surplus by varying amounts of current revenue used to finance capital expenditures. I call this cooking the books. It means that no one can predict with any accuracy what the province will have to borrow, and this causes some dismay, I may say, in the bond markets of the nation.

The book juggling by the master juggler—I understand he is going to be another kind of master in a little while, but the master juggler is perhaps what fits him right now—means that the hon. Provincial Treasurer, when he feels like it, can come along with his nice little surplus, a meaningless surplus.

For some years, Mr. Speaker, the chartered banks have been criticized for wasting money in and out of inner reserves. The result of this money shuffling gives the bank a steady growth and profit. It does not allow the shareholders to know what the exact financial status of a chartered bank is. The province is doing somewhat the same thing. It hopes to make the people of this province think that things are better than they are, but this year's tax boost is going to shake the people's faith in the province's books.

Looking at the Budget, Mr. Speaker, you would never suspect Ontario Hydro exists. It was never mentioned as far as borrowing is concerned. One of the big moves, Mr. Speaker, in the financial field this year is to get companies to include in their annual reports the operations of subsidiaries.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Like Loblaw's.

Mr. Thompson: Most good companies have gone along with this idea, but the province and the hon. Provincial Treasurer are above all that.

In the estimate book, and we have this this year, there are no comparative figures, a very routine measure which most annual reports except those of any mines would include. The hon. Provincial Treasurer in his Budget has a habit of underestimating revenues. He did it again last year in his Budget. This year's actual figures show that he underestimated revenues in 1965-66 by \$56 million.

Mr. Whicher: How could he make that big a mistake?

Mr. Thompson: This is revenue from taxes and liquor and it takes into account federal government tax rebates during the course of the year.

Let me say as well as underestimating, Mr. Speaker, he has the propensity for overestimating. Government overestimates spending by about eight per cent according to Professor Schindler, and I am hoping that the hon. Prime Minister has been able to get his books because they will be well worth reading. Certainly as far as I am concerned it would be well worthwhile. I will even buy a copy for him if he will read it, because it is good reading for the government.

As far as forecasting goes, Mr. Speaker—underestimating, overestimating—this government appears to be run by a ouija board.

The public accounts do not come in soon enough; we asked about this last year. The accounts for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1965, are dated November, 1965, and for the same fiscal year British Columbia got its public accounts in July. Alberta, as I pointed out last year, also gets them three months ahead.

And then we come to the provincial auditor's reports, and let me just read this from the provincial auditor's report on page 20:

Few critical observations concerning expenditures are made in the annual report of the provincial auditor, for the reason any accounts questioned in the course of the pre-audit are directed to the attention of the responsible departmental offices with the result that the transactions in question are adjusted and corrected before the accounts are closed for the year.

Well, I have two comments to make on that, Mr. Speaker. First, the provincial auditor's involvement in the pre-audit makes him a

servant of the government, not a servant of the Legislature. The pre-audit is like management's internal audit. The shareholders should be entitled to know if something is going wrong with management and the shareholders of the company demand something more than just a management man in there. They want an independent outside audit, and the citizens of this province should demand the same.

Secondly, it is not good enough for the auditor to say that adjustment had been made; that is not his job, it is the job of the Legislature. The auditor-general in Ottawa conducts an independent audit, his report contains more than just a few critical observations. I was looking at his report yesterday; it is a report that shows that they are on the job of a full scrutiny of what is going on in the government. But this government does everything behind closed doors.

It interested me to see one hon. member get up and ask questions of how much a member in some particular mission gets, and I saw the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) sitting right next to the man who could have told him how much he got, and yet we have this kind of a lonesome approach. Hide it from the Opposition; hide it from the public. This is what is wrong with this government.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I do not really think I can allow that to pass. I know the hon. leader of the Opposition is trying to demonstrate that we hide everything but I stood at the time and said that this information would be placed on the order paper in the form of a return, so I hardly think it is fair to say that we keep the information from him or from anyone else.

Mr. Thompson: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister has assured us we will get the answer. But it struck me as passing odd that a Minister could not answer the question himself when he is right next to the member who is on the board. And another thing that struck me—the whole of the Crown companies, the whole of them, we cannot find which Minister is responsible.

Yesterday we saw what I think is a denial of responsibility on the part of government. We asked about the Niagara parks commission, and the hon. Provincial Treasurer looked puzzled, as though he felt how dare we ask about the Niagara parks commission. He did not even tell us which Minister was responsible for this.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, there was no question about the

Niagara parks commission put to me yesterday. That was a question about the employees of the Niagara parks commission negotiating, which has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Thompson: He is only making his case look worse by saying there was no question about the Niagara parks commission, he said it was about the employees of the Niagara parks commission. It is a crucial point with us, sir, the Opposition and the people of this province are not told enough about the operation of the government.

There is a great irony in the hon. Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart's) plea to companies to report more adequately to shareholders while for years this government has sought to bamboozle the electorate with either no information, a little information, or misinformation. I have seen them announce projects three or four times.

The government should take a stiff dose of the medicine that it is recommending for investor-owned companies. This province is run by what amounts to an invisible government, a government of closed meetings, a government of the civil service.

I would like to give an example—I could give many—of how this government muddies policy statements. I want to state that in connection with education here is the reply which we get and I am quoting:

On the recommendation of the committee on university affairs it has been decided that the amount required by the universities and colleges of Ontario from the federal government and this government together for 1966-67 is \$122 million. The portion of this being provided by our estimates is \$91.4 million, an increase of \$26.8 million or 41 per cent over the present year.

This is the hon. Provincial Treasurer making this statement, and that is about all the hon. Provincial Treasurer says on this point. He does not explain how the province arrived at the \$91.4 million.

Well, for the information of this House it is done this way, Mr. Speaker. The federal government gives Ontario a \$5 per capita grant for universities and on a population of 6.8 million this works out to \$54 million. It is estimated that 10 per cent of the federal money will go to non-provincially assisted universities, and that leaves \$30.6 million for the universities which are provincially assisted. Then the government simply subtracts \$30.6 million from \$122 million and it arrives at \$91.4 million.

In other words, it uses the federal funds to offset its own contribution to universities, and as the hon. Provincial Treasurer must know there has been some agitation for the province to consider the Ottawa money as extra money. Educators and newspapers have argued that the province should not decrease its grants for 1966-67 by amounts received from Ottawa, and the Minister talked of the Deutsch report, and says, and emphasizes—

Hon. Mr. Allan: What do you say?

Mr. Thompson: The Minister talks of the Deutsch report and emphasizes that education is an investment, and these people, the educators and also the newspapers and others, are arguing that universities are so strapped for funds that they need the extra Ottawa money.

I am going to clarify the hon. Provincial Treasurer's position for them. He is not going along with their requests. I have indicated how with government bookkeeping and secrecy they make it difficult for the people to know how the government is managing its domestic affairs.

I would like to turn to another area where the water is even muddier. I am thinking of the important field of economic nationalism—and again statements by a Minister to confuse.

The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar) on February 8, asked the hon. Minister of Economics and Development: "Will the Minister table the so-called secret report by his department concerning U.S. action on guidelines with respect to U.S.-controlled companies in Ontario?" And a second question: "What steps does the Minister propose to take as a result of this report?"

I think the reply of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development is a classic of subterfuge for all of this government. He replied, Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member's question: "A report will not be tabled. I note that the hon. member referred to the so-called secret report concerning U.S. guidelines policies, which does not exist. Therefore no action is contemplated at this time."

Mr. Speaker, there is a report, it is called "Forecasts for 1966" and it is 11 pages long.

I do not want to get involved in semantics with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. I think he objects to the word "secret." The report has been shown to four or five people in his department, so he

no longer considers it secret. It bothers him not a whit that the people have not seen this report on this important topic. He has seen it, several civil servants have seen it, and that is enough. The public be damned! He has seen it and some civil servants, and I demand that he table that report.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: I do not know what is in the report. I would imagine from its title it takes into account a number of factors affecting the health of the economy in 1966. I know it says something about the U.S. guidelines and its effect on investments in Ontario. It is about time that the government started taking the people of this province into its confidence.

I asked the hon. Provincial Treasurer what he thought about the U.S. guidelines. And his reply was, in effect: "I have faith in Ottawa." Well, he sings a different tune in his Budget when he is talking about the Ottawa agreement, and I quote on this occasion:

The free trade agreement with the United States concerning motor vehicles and parts was a welcome development, but Ontario manpower policy appropriate to the new development could have been initiated at a much earlier stage through collaboration in the general lines of the agreement.

Hon. Mr. Allan: We want to co-operate.

Mr. Thompson: Surely no agreement got more advance notice. You had the Bladen report coming out, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and the hon. Provincial Treasurer must have been two of the very few who did not know what was going on.

I do not think it is any excuse to come out and say; "No one asked us about the agreement." Ontario should have demanded—you should have demanded—to know!

On the question of guidelines, we have heard from Ottawa and we have heard from Quebec, we have heard nothing from Ontario. And why does not Ontario take the initiative and hold discussions with Quebec and Ottawa?

At the discussions this province could suggest that the three governments amend their various companies Acts to ensure that U.S.-controlled firms act as good Canadian citizens. I am thinking particularly of the exporting policy and the buying policies of U.S.-controlled firms in Canada. I wonder if

the hon. Provincial Treasurer, or the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, has a secret report on it. I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows that U.S.-controlled companies are now raising large capital funds right in Ontario.

Let me explain this. The voluntary guidelines put limits on the amounts that U.S. companies can raise within the States for investments in foreign countries. As a result, at least 20 large U.S. companies have set up new subsidiaries to raise money outside the United States in U.S. dollars for their operations in Europe.

These companies include General Electric, Amoco Oil, Phillips Petroleum, B.F. Goodrich, Monsanto Chemical, General Foods, Bristol-Myers, Warner-Lambert and some international oil companies. Total borrowings for the past five months come to at least U.S. \$300 million, much of it raised in Ontario.

This borrowing has put pressure on our bond market, raising our interest rates. It has taken dollars out of the country at a time when we need them desperately for our own development. This borrowing makes our dependence on U.S. funds the greater because big corporations are siphoning off U.S. funds from this country to Europe.

I would like to know from the hon. Provincial Treasurer how much is being taken out of the provincial economy in this way. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development must get his nose into that \$9,000 book he has got—Ontario 1966—

An hon. member: \$90,000.

Mr. Thompson: \$90,000. I would like to see him start telling us some of the facts. The people of Ontario can face facts if they are told them, and we need to have a government that has respect for the people and tell them what the facts are. The hon. Provincial Treasurer of this province must tell us what steps he is taking to protect this province from the bad side-effects of the voluntary U.S. guidelines.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words about the subject of government efficiency, a crucial topic considering the large tax increases this year.

The chambers of commerce have suggested a Royal commission into government efficiency. Our civil service has grown 433 per cent in 20 years between 1944 and 1964. The government is the second largest employer in the province but I do not think it is as concerned with efficiency as it should be.

Why have we not more of the recommendations of the Gordon commission on government organization of 1959? Why have not more of those recommendations been implemented? Surely, even this government has studied that report long enough. Specifically, I am thinking of the commission's suggestion that a number of government departments should be reduced. Why has not the hon. Provincial Treasurer learned more about the Glassco Royal commission? I wonder if he has even read the Glassco commission report? What about the massive report of the Royal commission of the Saskatchewan government tabled in 1965? It is a very, very heavy report, I am intending to read it—I have a copy at home and I have looked through it but I wondered if you had—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): I can get you a copy of it.

Mr. Thompson:—you are honest when you say you have not read it yet because it is an extremely heavy document. But if you do not read it, get someone in your government to start reading those efficiency reports.

That report is recommending that provincial government should have a management adviser responsible for the continuous assessment of the management process. The report says that this management adviser should also try to stimulate innovations—and he would have a tough job with this government on that. It suggests government motor pools, a central information agency for smaller departments and commissions, central buying, improved methods of inventory control and a compact records centre for government documents.

There is much we could learn from every one of these reports—these commissions studying government. I am concerned that there is a lot of flabbiness in this great growth of bureaucracy that is taking place and I would like to see a Royal commission doing a study on it.

I notice a new item in the civil service estimates this year for a trainee programme. How much did this nearly \$2 billion organization set aside for a new trainee programme? A puny \$75,000. What this government needs, Mr. Speaker, and we will do this when we become the government, is to have a 10 BX programme for the whole outfit.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Thompson: In 1964 the government spent more than \$300,000 getting legal aid from just 22 Toronto legal firms and our hon.

members have talked on this, time after time. This is our calculation based on questions asked by the hon. member for Downsview last year. The government does not hand out this information voluntarily.

Mr. Sopha: He was in the courts himself recently with a downtown firm.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Thompson: The government does not hand out this information. When we tried to find out, for example, what were the expenses permitted for members of Parliament who were on Crown corporations, I had my executive assistant telephoning the auditor's department and a number of other places and he was told that he would have to go to each individual department to get this information.

We have studied the estimates—it is hidden inside them carefully. In fact, let me just mention about the estimates themselves. The estimates of each department are broken down much more thoroughly when they come before the government for its analysis, but then quickly they are blanketed over again and covered up. We do not get the same analysis of estimates and breakdown of estimates in this Legislature as the hon. Provincial Treasurer gets in making his judgment.

And so, sir, with this \$300,000 fee, naturally we have to dig this out ourselves and work it out, but surely it might be more efficient to expand the hon. Attorney General's staff rather than to have to hire so many outside legal counsel.

I will go into a whole number of fields: Our municipal governments are not as efficient as they should be and the government adamantly refuses to take the necessary action. We have 2,000 expropriating authorities in the province—a red tape mess that is costing our citizens dearly. Our mental health agencies are being called a disjointed, entangled jungle; our hospitals have been criticized for wasting manpower and high staff turnovers.

I suggested just previously that a Royal commission might be the answer to shake the government up, to give it some guidelines so that it can work efficiently and properly, and so that the people can feel that instead of aspiring to carry on from day to day this government might look up a bit and ask for some kind of excellence now and again.

I said, sir, that a Royal commission might be the answer. I do not think it is. I think

that the government is overweight; it is overweight and it has to start peeling off layers of fat and the people will peel it off when it comes to an election.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, there has been a lack of planning. The government has permitted situations to develop into crises and then we have crash programmes. Because of this, sir, at this time, after coming to us year after year blandly, with smiles, once again we have a crash programme. A day of reckoning has come in this Budget and the government has had to put in a crash programme in getting taxes, as it has done with the police bill and as it has done with the Canada pension plan. We have one Minister arguing with the hon. Prime Minister about which policy they will take. As it has done with those, it is doing in this case, not thinking of the effect that it is having on the little people. We have a massive tax approach which is affecting the wealthy just on the same basis as it is going to affect those widows and others and the average working man.

It is for these reasons that I move, seconded by the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) that the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee of ways and means be amended by adding thereto the following words

But this House regrets

1. That the government by its many years of neglect, inefficiency, misleading accounting and lack of plans has brought Ontario to the position where further taxation has been forced upon it.

2. Further regrets the decision of the government to levy oppressive unplanned taxation that will greatly increase the heavy burden already carried by the wage earner and farmer.

3. Further regrets that the government has failed to include action on the realignment of municipal taxing obligation in order to relieve the already overburdened homeowner from oppressive and inequitable and increasing local taxes.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Thompson moves, seconded by the member for Grey South that the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into the committee of ways and means be

amended by adding thereto the following words:

But this House regrets

1. That the government by its many years of neglect, inefficiency, misleading accounting and lack of plans has brought Ontario to the position where further taxation has been forced upon it.

2. Further regrets the decision of the government to levy oppressive unplanned taxation that will greatly increase the heavy burden already carried by the wage earner and farmer.

3. Further regrets that the government has failed to include action on the realignment of municipal taxing obligation in order to relieve the already overburdened homeowner from oppressive and inequitable and increasing local taxes.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, although this is the first time I have participated in a general debate this year, I am not going to indulge in the usual pleasantries about yourself, the Deputy Speaker or the newly elected members and sundry others. This is not because I lack respect or goodwill for the hon. gentlemen concerned, but because in my opinion the whole routine is a lot of twaddle—a meaningless ritual we have all permitted ourselves to fall into.

I assure you, however, of my enduring esteem, Mr. Speaker.

Before I make my usual friendly remarks about the Budget—characterized as they are by generosity severely tempered by honesty—I would like to make a brief reference to two other matters.

First, I would like to pay my respects to the mandarins of the national hockey league who exercise a stranglehold on Canada's national game to the point where our international teams are deprived of players they badly need and where a distinguished former player like Carl Brewer cannot now associate himself with organized hockey in any capacity at any level without the permission of the ruling Toronto mandarin.

I regret that this clique of monopolists have decreed that the flourishing and highly sports-minded Canadian city of Vancouver is not fit for inclusion in their league, an opinion shared by very few outside its august circle. It has been said in their defence that they are businessmen, motivated by business considerations, and I suppose that is true in a sense, Mr. Speaker, in somewhat the same sense as the slave traders of old could be described as businessmen.

I think it is high time that their monopoly

was investigated, with particular reference to its effect on hockey as a sport and on the many players they hold in a form of peonage from a quite early age. This, however, is probably a federal rather than a provincial matter, and I will not deal with it further, for the present at any rate.

The second preliminary matter I would like to refer to is the recent poll of the Canadian institute of public opinion, popularly called the Gallup poll, which was alleged by its sponsors to indicate Canadian public opinion on so-called voluntary versus so-called compulsory Medicare. It should be stated that CIPO is a private business organization and not an independent research agency as the term "institute" might suggest. Its Medicare poll casts serious doubt on its scientific integrity.

Its procedure is to ask one or two questions on the matter on which it conducts its poll. This procedure can conceivably be satisfactory when the issue is simple, clear-cut, easily defined and readily understood. Thus it should be possible by this method to produce reliable results on a straightforward question, such as one relating to voter intentions. The CIPO's poor performance in the recent federal election raises considerable doubt as to the adequacy of its sampling procedure even for this relatively simple type of poll. Its entire methodology is manifestly inadequate for anything more complex, and if it had any integrity at all, it would not even attempt a more complex type of survey, much less publish the results.

It need hardly be said, Mr. Speaker, after the hours of debate we have had in this House, that Medicare is an exceedingly complex issue. It may be possible to arrive at meaningful results even on so complex an issue, but only if a series of painstakingly framed questions are asked by well-trained interviewers of a carefully selected sample of respondents.

What did the CIPO people do on their Medicare poll? After a preliminary question to sift out people who admitted to no knowledge of the issue at all, the CIPO asked one question only as follows:

Do you think the Medicare programme should be a compulsory one in which every Canadian would have to join, or do you think it should be a voluntary plan, in which Canadians themselves could decide whether or not to join?

Mr. Speaker, this was a loaded question. "Voluntary" and "compulsory" are emotionally charged words. I have no doubt at all,

that other things being equal, the overwhelming majority of Canadians will always plump for voluntary as opposed to compulsory, but on complex issues other things are never equal.

On Medicare many other questions are relevant, as for example: "Should equals receive equal treatment, should everyone be covered, should costs be as low as possible?" and so on. I have no doubt that if any of these questions had been asked singly, the result would have been quite different from that produced by CIPO.

My point, however, is that no single question can produce reliable results on a complex issue. A great many questions would have to be asked before any attempt could be made to assess public opinion accurately. The most remarkable thing about the CIPO poll was that so many Canadians resisted the seductive word "voluntary," and opted in favour of what the CIPO decided could be adequately described as compulsory Medicare—41 per cent in the country as a whole, 40 per cent in Ontario and 47 per cent in Quebec. And in that province, that was one per cent more than supported the so-called voluntary type of approach.

These people were more sophisticated than the CIPO bargained for. Notwithstanding the concerted campaign of obfuscation of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), sundry other Tories, the Social Credit Party, the insurance companies, the medical profession and now the CIPO, a remarkably large percentage of the people of Canada and Ontario see clearly that it is impossible to provide medical care insurance for all the people at costs they can afford, except through a compulsory plan.

The hon. Prime Minister suggested the other day that I attacked the poll simply because I did not like its results. I have too much respect for his intelligence to think that he really meant that. Unless I have gravely overestimated his capacity, he knows as well as I do that that poll was deliberately biased. It was an attempt not to arrive at objective facts, but to promote a point of view.

Apparently the CIPO, which is under the direction of a well-known Conservative, has decided to cast its lot with the forces of reaction in the great Medicare debate that is now taking place in Canada. It differs from other participants in the debate, however, in that it does not honestly proclaim its partisanship. Instead, it tries to hide behind a disguise of phony scientific objectivity. It

attempts to win its point by trickery rather than by honest argument.

With those preliminary remarks, Mr. Speaker, I now wish to turn to the Budget, but before I get to the essence of the Budget itself, I want to refer to a little incident that occurred just before its presentation.

The hon. Prime Minister, I have a recollection, has been described in this House as arbitrary and dictatorial, but I must say that from my point of view I have found him very easy to get along with in many respects, not necessarily in trying to persuade him how wrong he is on Medicare, but in many other respects.

I find him very courteous in providing advance copies of important documents to the Opposition. There was a time, you know, when we would not know a thing about what was in the Budget until we heard it in this House and after all—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): We are proud of our Budget so we are happy to give it to you.

Mr. Bryden: I see. Well, I take it your predecessors were not proud of theirs.

But anyway, I do not want to inject any sour notes here. I personally appreciate this form of courtesy we receive from the hon. Prime Minister. It is difficult to absorb a complicated document like that, simply by listening to it, and since the press comes to us almost immediately to comment on it, I am happy—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): If not before.

Mr. Bryden: If not before, my hon. leader says. I am happy to be at least on a par with them, with having the same chance as they have had to read it. And I want to make that clear before I go on to the rest of what I have to say at this point.

Now, there was a little difficulty in this connection in relation to the current Budget. I understand that it arose because tax changes were contemplated in the Budget, a matter about which I will have something further to say a little later. The hon. Prime Minister, however, intervened and arranged that we, and I have no doubt the Liberal Party, or the hon. leader thereof (Mr. Thompson), would get the Budget first thing on the morning of the day on which it was presented.

I was a little amused, however, at the way in which it was delivered to us. It was brought to us by the hon. Prime Minister's

representative, and I am not going to mention his name, because I am sure what happened was not his responsibility.

He insisted that it had to be placed personally by him in the hands of the leader of the New Democratic Party, no one else could deliver it to him. In fact, if it had not been for the rather decrepit condition of the floors on the third floor of this building, I might even have expected that he would have brought it along in a Brinks express truck. So secret was this document.

My hon. leader—I hope he did not violate a confidence, but he let me look at it in his office.

But what did we discover? All these tax changes that required such heavy security measures were not going to come into effect until April Fool's Day anyway, almost two months later. Indeed, I do not think the security was very good because I read in several papers the day before the Budget was presented a forecast of the tax changes that turned out to be remarkably accurate. They certainly hit all the important ones right on the nose.

Now, this is not a matter that is of any significance one way or the other except in this respect, that the hon. Provincial Treasurer by announcing important changes in consumption taxes that will not be in effect for roughly six weeks yet, produced two undesirable consequences, in my opinion.

First of all, he created a situation whereby those with funds at their disposal can stock up in durable consumer goods and thereby escape the tax, whereas the poor fellow who is living from hand to mouth will feel the full impact of the tax from the very beginning. That is the first undesirable consequence.

Mr. MacDonald: Legalized profiteering.

Mr. Bryden: The second undesirable consequence is that this method of procedure skews the curve of retail sales in a quite undesirable way. I happened to have occasion, apropos of nothing in particular, to look at the figures for retail sales in Ontario back at the time when the original sales tax was introduced. It was introduced in much the same manner as the recent increase is being introduced, and it was remarkable to look at those figures. Retail sales shot up inordinately in the six weeks preceding the effective date of the sales tax, then they plummeted away below the regular level and slowly picked up again. Now I suggest—well, I looked at a graph of it just the other day; if

I am wrong the hon. Provincial Treasurer no doubt will correct me some other day—

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): We had expected that but it did not happen.

Mr. Bryden: It did, though.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, it did not.

Mr. Bryden: Is the hon. Provincial Treasurer telling me that the—

Hon. Mr. Allan: It went up.

Mr. Bryden: And then it went down.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It went down some.

Mr. Bryden: If you put it on a graph, it went down below the general line of retail sales; it certainly did. And I am suggesting to the hon. Provincial Treasurer that that sort of thing is something that should be avoided. It is not a desirable way to juggle with the economy, and I suggest to him that he has created a grave danger that something similar or even worse will happen once again.

Even if he is right and I am wrong that there was merely an upward bulge and not a downward bulge, he certainly has no firm reason to believe that there will not be the full impact of an upward bulge and then a downward bulge this year. Frankly, I would suggest to him that he should not play with the economy in that way. However, I am not going to belabour the point. This was purely a preliminary remark.

I would now like to approach the meat of the Budget, unappetizing as it may be. I think its most notable feature is that once again it fails to disclose any willingness on the part of the government to plan, or even any comprehension that planning and foresight are necessary. Oh, I know the hon. Provincial Treasurer keeps talking about planning but my statement was not that he did not talk about planning—I am not sure if he did this year or not, but he usually does—all I said was that he failed to disclose any willingness to plan or any comprehension that planning and foresight are necessary.

This is a problem I have dealt with at considerable length in speeches in the Budget debates of previous years. I was never so optimistic as to think that I would convince the slow learners on the Conservative back benches of the need for planning. But I had hoped that the government would be convinced—if not by my words, then at least by the clear needs of the situation.

This year's Budget shows how forlorn that hope was. I will not go into the question in

detail now, since I have dealt with it so extensively in the past. I will merely refer anyone who might happen to be interested, to my speeches of previous years and to speeches of other members of this group in previous years. I will content myself here with quoting one paragraph from my speech in the Budget debate of last year:

The government does not plan; it simply reacts to stimuli like Pavlov's dogs. A bell rings, signalling an acute social emergency, and it jumps. In view of the frequency with which emergencies arise in this era of rapid change when foresight is not exercised, it jumps with about the same rapidity and about the same sense of purpose as a Mexican jumping bean. A crisis in higher education develops, which was foreseeable for years in advance, and the government jumps to provide additional facilities—not enough to meet the need but enough to prevent the whole system from collapsing.

I then went on to discuss a number of other important areas where lack of foresight had produced similar acute emergencies. I will not take time to deal with them now but I would like to refer briefly to one emergency which has perhaps not received adequate attention in this House in recent years. It used to be debated at great length some years ago but it has not been dealt with nearly as extensively in recent years. And that is the emergency in municipal finance.

In his Budget statement of this year the hon. Provincial Treasurer said piously: "We will continue to revise and expand our aid to local authorities in keeping with the growing responsibilities and financial needs of our municipalities and local boards."

That did not produce much response when the hon. Provincial Treasurer said it, and I could not get any response to it either. I used to make a habit of quoting from the hon. Provincial Treasurer's Budget and trying to get a little applause for it. When he gives it himself, his own backbenchers go sound asleep and I always like to take some of his bon mots and see if I cannot stir up a little enthusiasm for them. However, I take it the backbenchers on the government side are as unenthusiastic about that misleading statement as I am.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Well, as one hon. gentleman said, very few of them are here to find out about it, but I never believe in berating the people who are present for the absence of the others, and those who do not wish to hear

me are perfectly welcome to stay away as far as I am concerned.

At any rate, if this statement which I have just quoted represented the policy of the government, it would undoubtedly be a new department. But in actual fact nothing has been revised and expansion has not been the result of conscious policy.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer has not indicated any changes at all in the formulas under which grants are paid to the municipalities. Even worse, the government is apparently still unwilling to rationalize its confusing mish-mash of grants programmes which take a thick volume to describe—and I mean thick. There is it, Mr. Speaker, and that is two years out of date, it is probably even thicker now.

Worst of all, the government clearly has no intention of facing up to the real problem, which is to reconsider the whole basis of municipal responsibilities and resources and the relationship of one to the other.

True, the amount paid in grants to local authorities will increase quite dramatically in the coming year, if the hon. Provincial Treasurer's estimates are correct. This, however, does not arise out of deliberate policy but from inadvertence.

Our grants programmes are so structured in most cases that grants go up when local expenditures go up. That is about all that is involved in it; the grants go up this year because local expenditures are going up. Local expenditures are now shooting up like a rocket and the hon. Provincial Treasurer being firmly hooked to the tail of the rocket is shooting up, too.

This, he would have us believe, is evidence of his high aspirations. Actually it is merely evidence of the endemic disinclination of the government to deal with problems before they reach crisis proportions. There is a crisis in public services today and the municipalities are bearing the brunt of it. Some of the most costly programmes which modern communities demand are still left wholly or partly in their lap. Yet with their narrow tax base and limited borrowing powers, they are the government least able to meet these demands. As a result, the pressure on the essentially regressive property tax has passed the point of being merely acute.

The day is long since past when it is adequate merely to tinker with this problem. No one would deny that the multitude of grants programmes which the government has devised, revised, reformulated and generally fiddled around with over the last decade or two have offset some of the pressure on the

municipalities. At least they have prevented total collapse, but they have not tackled the problem at its roots.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer said, by implication at least, in his Budget address that the federal government is going to have to take a more realistic attitude to the financial pressures on the province than it has in the past, and I agree with him in that. What is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. The province, for its part, is also going to have to take a more realistic attitude towards the pressures on the municipalities.

Municipal responsibilities and resources must be brought into greater balance. Either the municipalities should be relieved of some of the responsibilities that are now overwhelming them or else their revenue sources should be broadened—one or the other or both. Intimately related to this essentially financial problem is the whole problem of the reorganization of the structure of municipal government. The Department of Municipal Affairs is beginning to approach this problem, but in the manner of a porcupine making love—very cautiously.

Unfortunately that department is probably the weakest in the government from a policy point of view.

Mr. MacDonald: I never saw the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) look so startled before.

Mr. Bryden: I mean no offence to porcupines.

Unfortunately, as I was saying, the department is probably the weakest in the government from a policy point of view. One could readily name half a dozen departments that play a more dynamic role than it in relation to the municipalities. That is not as it should be, Mr. Speaker.

Pious platitudes, such as the statement of the hon. Provincial Treasurer in the Budget speech this year that the municipalities "have an important contribution to make to our economic and social progress" are simply not good enough. The need is for major municipal reorganization and major reallocation of provincial-municipal responsibilities and resources. Unfortunately neither the government nor The Department of Municipal Affairs has today shown any real capacity to meet this challenge.

In past years, Mr. Speaker, I have always been able to say, without fear of contradiction, that the budget of the year was really just a rehash of the budget of the previous year, with some upward revision

of figures. In fact, I was easily able to demonstrate that the budgets of the hon. Provincial Treasurer of the 1960's were really just warmed-over versions of Mr. Frost's budgets of the 1950's. Such comments always seemed to irritate the hon. Provincial Treasurer, notwithstanding their manifest truth, and he will be happy to know that I am not going to make them again this year.

Why? Because, though there is much of the same old sameness in this year's budget there is also a strikingly new feature. I can give a hint as to the nature of this new feature by reading one sentence only from the Budget statement of last year and I now quote these immortal words of the hon. Provincial Treasurer from the antiquity of 1965: "I am pleased, therefore, to announce that there will be no increase in taxation."

A prize is offered to the Conservative backbencher who, with the help of that clue, can identify the new feature of this Budget. The prize will be a slightly used set of false teeth, last year awarded to the hon. Provincial Treasurer.

The jumping bean has jumped out of its skin and it wants to take the people's skin too. It is hard to conceive of our benign Provincial Treasurer saying to his Cabinet colleagues as he hones his knife, "Let us skin them good this year so that they will have got used to it by the time we call an election." Yet, clearly, Mr. Speaker, something like that must have happened.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer has lunged out in all directions: sales tax and related tobacco tax up by 67 per cent; land transfer tax doubled; liquor prices up seven per cent; gasoline and diesel fuel taxes up by about the same percentage. And to complete the carnage, property taxes too will probably increase sharply, notwithstanding the claims of the hon. Provincial Treasurer of enduring benevolence to the municipalities.

Only the rich have escaped with their hides; two of the three main progressive taxes are unchanged, and the third, the succession duty, is actually being decreased.

Year after year in the past the hon. Provincial Treasurer has blithely waved aside warnings of growing crises in many fields. Now, suddenly, he has panicked and he has produced a panic budget. He has attempted to communicate his own sense of panic to the public by sternly predicting that without increased taxes, the shortfall in revenue in the coming fiscal year would be \$281 million, meaning that expenditures for all purposes would exceed revenues by that amount.

This, no doubt, was a very sobering thought to the uninitiated, but those of us who are familiar with the little tricks of the hon. Provincial Treasurer cannot help but remember that he has an engaging habit of underestimating his revenues and thus of overestimating his shortfalls. Let us take the last two fiscal years as examples.

On February 12, 1964, he presented his budget for the 1964-65 fiscal year and in it he estimated that his shortfall would be \$104.9 million, for practical purposes \$105 million. Actually, it turned out to be \$20.6 million, or practically nothing at all in a budget of well over \$1 billion. Moreover, in that year the government overspent its original budget by over \$40 million.

If the hon. Provincial Treasurer had kept his colleagues within the appropriations voted to them by this House on which he based his estimate of a shortfall of \$104.9 million, there would have been the reverse of a shortfall. That is the fiscal year before the one which is just coming to a close now.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at his record as a shortfall predictor in the current fiscal year.

On February 10, 1965, he forecast a shortfall of \$141.1 million in presenting his budget for the 1965-66 fiscal year. He now says on the basis of eight months' experience and forecasts for four months that it will be only \$98.8 million. When the final figures are in it will probably be substantially less even than that, because past experience indicates that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has a penchant for overestimating his shortfall even when he has eight months' experience to go on; I refer him to his statement based on the eight months' actual that he made with regard to the 1964-65 fiscal year, the last one for which we have complete figures.

Moreover, he has advised us that once again the government will be overspending its Budget, apparently by about \$35 million, although I am not completely sure of that. It is impossible to arrive at precise figures on the basis of the information now available but it is more than likely that when the hon. Provincial Treasurer forecast a shortfall of \$141 million on the basis of the expenditures he then had in mind a year ago, he would have been much closer to the truth if he had said \$40 million.

So why the panic, Mr. Speaker? If the hon. Provincial Treasurer is no better as a forecaster this year than he has been in the past and if the government for once stayed within the appropriations voted to it, it is

probable that the estimated shortfall of \$281 million, which the hon. Provincial Treasurer said would arise without increased taxes, would be more like \$100 million without increased taxes.

What is wrong with that? Our net capital debt at present is about equal to one year's revenue, give or take a few dollars. We can easily absorb an increase in it of around \$100 million. Indeed, I believe we could readily absorb a considerably greater increase if the government was willing to undertake the programmes needed in the measure in which they are needed.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): I thought you were a Keynesian. That is about 25 per cent.

Mr. Bryden: If the hon. member is talking about counter-cyclical budgeting—well, I believed in that when I was a student at Oxford about 30 years ago and I have since learned that it is not too applicable.

Mr. White: The hon. member does not believe in contracyclical budgeting, then?

Mr. Bryden: No, I do not, so I am glad that little point is settled, but do not get me off on that, or you will regret it.

Mr. White: I think not.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Provincial Treasurer should cure himself of his fixation, and it is getting to be a fixation. He used not to suffer from this but he now has developed a real fixation about shortfalls and the net debt, really the same thing.

His real objectives should be to maintain growth at a high rate and to provide in adequate measure the facilities the province needs—and I emphasize "in adequate measure"—educational facilities, houses, hospitals, highways, and so on.

These two objectives are closely inter-related. Provision of the facilities we need will stimulate a high rate of growth. A high rate of growth in turn will provide the government with higher revenues and thus make it easier to provide the facilities we need.

Indeed, the main reason the hon. Provincial Treasurer has been so far off the mark in his recent forecasts of the shortfall—and I think he will agree with me on this if nothing else—is that growth has been rapid in recent years.

As a result, revenues have exceeded all expectations, and this is true not only in Ontario but in every province of Canada and at the

federal level, so that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has been able to spend considerably more money than he estimated and still experience a much smaller increase in the net debt than he anticipated.

One might have hoped that that would have indicated to him the vital importance of maintaining growth above all else. As long as growth is rapid, we will not have to worry about increases in the net debt. For one thing, we will probably be pleasantly surprised to discover, as we have been in the past two or three years, that such increases will not be as great as expected. In any case, as long as our revenues are buoyant, we will have no difficulty servicing the debt.

Any business firm that is growing and wants to continue to grow expects its debt to increase more or less in proportion to its growth.

Any province with the same expectation should expect the same thing. What, after all, does the net debt represent but investment in the province's future? I do not think that we should suffer from the extreme Tory timidity which has overcome the hon. Provincial Treasurer. I think that we should be prepared to invest quite heavily, quite as much as the need requires, in the future of this province. I am sure that the investment will be returned to us manifold and that a policy like that will ensure that Provincial Treasurers will have few problems in the future except problems of adding machines.

We will encounter real problems in our public finance only if growth slows down seriously. Yet the hon. Provincial Treasurer has presented a budget that is bound to militate against growth. His massive tax increases are mainly taxes on consumption. They will thus tend to restrict demand, and restricted demand will mean restricted growth.

Some people, admittedly, are now crying the blues about inflation but I think that the most competent authorities, including the economic council of Canada, still see growth as the No. 1 problem.

I submit that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has not made out a case, on the basis of any expenditure programmes he now has in mind, for his panic-stricken increases in taxation.

He could well have waited to see what light might be thrown on the whole vexed problem of taxation by both the federal and Ontario Royal commissions on taxation, as well as the tax structure committee. He could also have waited to see what results the

forthcoming round of federal-provincial fiscal negotiations might bring.

There is no desperate panic or emergency such as he talked about. He referred to these items I have just mentioned. He said he cannot wait, he is in a panic, he has got to jack the taxes up right now. He has got his knife sharp so he is really going to wield it.

Instead of taking a sober look at the whole situation, he has panicked, and as usually happens in a panic, the weak are going to suffer most. This, Mr. Speaker, brings me to my main criticism of the Budget.

For many years now, Canadians have been subjected to a mounting barrage of propaganda—from the Canadian manufacturers association, the Canadian chamber of commerce, bank presidents, the domesticated economists on the payrolls of corporations and other voices of the big business establishment—that taxes on the rich, both corporations and individuals, be reduced. I see that the other day Mr. George Hees added his voice to the clamour, as many other Tories have, Tories in both the Liberal and Conservative parties.

The argument on which this claim is based may be paraphrased as follows. The unfortunate, harried rich are having their incentive squeezed out of them by a crushing burden of taxation, while the poor are waxing fat on the avails of the welfare state. This unseemly state of affairs, it is argued, must be changed.

Accumulation of fat should be made the exclusive prerogative of the rich and the poor should be restored to a wizened condition that more properly befits their status. This is, shall we say, a free paraphrase of the type of argument that constantly appears in the financial press and on financial pages of the daily papers and sometimes finds its way even on to the front pages.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): I must catch up on my reading.

Mr. Bryden: It would be a very good idea. I will try to fill the vacuum in the meantime.

So it is suggested that relief of the rich can be accomplished in two ways. First there should be decreasing reliance on progressive taxes, that is, on taxes scaled according to ability to pay. Has my hon. friend never heard that suggestion before? If he has not, I suggest he look at the paper of yesterday or the day before and he will see that is what Mr. George Hees is advocating.

Taxes scaled according to ability to pay should be reduced and the notable examples of these, of course, are personal income,

corporation income and estates taxes. There are some others but they are of no great consequence.

Second, the decline in revenue that would result from this should be offset by a reduction in welfare expenditures—that was in today's paper, from the Canadian exporters association—and by increasing reliance on regressive and proportionate taxes, which bear more heavily on the poor than on the rich.

Now this is the proposal that day in and day out is hammered at the people to the point where I think some poor people are beginning to believe it. But what is it?

It is actually, Mr. Speaker, the posture of greed in all its naked ugliness. Greed has always existed in varying degrees among men and I suppose it always will, but only in this society has it been exalted into a major virtue. There was a time when it was regarded as one of the seven deadly sins.

The plain fact is that the rich, far from being oppressed or harried or crushed by taxation, have never had it so good. Even after allowing for all their taxes, the net income of both corporations and fortunately situated individuals, such as managerial personnel, professional people and the like, are immeasurably higher than they were even a generation ago. Why do organizations and individuals of such abundant wealth begrudge the poor the few morsels they are now receiving from the table of affluence? It is a question I am unable to answer, Mr. Speaker, and I suspect that many of these people do not begrudge what is being done for the poor. But their spokesmen of the business world invariably preach the unvarnished gospel of greed. Moreover, it is a greed that does not even make sense.

These corporations and individuals have achieved their present unprecedented state of affluence because of the general high rate of growth which was engendered by World War II and which, notwithstanding numerous interruptions, has continued ever since. Some elementary income, inadequate as it might be, has been guaranteed to most of the poor, and since there are so many poor, this has been an important factor, in fact I would say a critical factor, in stimulating and maintaining demand and thus in stimulating and maintaining growth.

The effect of restricting welfare programmes and/or of shifting the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor can only be to restrict demand and thereby to restrict growth. The rich will then suffer a restriction of total income far greater than any tax concessions they might gain. The

greed attributed to them by their business spokesmen is in the same category as the greed of the man who killed the goose that laid the golden egg.

Yet their propaganda is having an alarming effect on governments all across Canada. Admittedly, welfare programmes are not being cut back, that would be political suicide; although they are not being developed as much as they should, they certainly are not being cut back. But more and more the trend in Canada is away from progressive taxes, based on ability to pay, towards proportionate and regressive taxes.

In some provinces, as in all municipalities, this trend is inevitable, given the present intergovernmental distribution of responsibilities and revenue resources. Such provinces and municipalities have very limited taxation possibilities, in fact that is true of most of the provinces of Canada. In view of their present responsibilities, they have to exploit to the full such limited possibilities as they have.

The same, however, is not true of Ontario, which because of the luck of geography, is naturally the industrial centre of Canada, and therefore the most favourably situated province in Canada. Here we have alternative possibilities. We can choose among tax sources. It is therefore not good enough, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. Provincial Treasurer to justify his savage tax increases of this year by saying that Ontario's sales tax will still be no higher than that of most other provinces, or that the gasoline tax will be no higher than in the Atlantic provinces, with their much more limited resources.

I have already argued that the hon. Provincial Treasurer has not made out a case for any substantial increase in taxation at all for the present, but even if increases should be necessary, either now or later, I submit that we should first of all exploit to the full the progressive tax fields in which we still have considerable scope for action. The hon. Provincial Treasurer's insistence on increasing taxes on consumption makes him the leader, along with the government of Canada, of the current movement to soak the poor.

Ironically, the very welfare programmes which are designed in the main to help the poor are now being used in some cases as an excuse for shifting the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor and to the relatively poor.

There was a time when poll taxes were widely used in Canada. They were quite properly decried and few vestiges of the old

poll taxes remain. Now, however, new poll taxes are being devised on a scale never thought of before. Naturally, they are not called poll taxes. That term can never be restored to respectability. So instead, they are being given the semantically favourable name of premiums or contributions for social insurance. They are poll taxes nevertheless, and as such about the most regressive taxes devised by man, on a par with the salt tax of colonial India.

We in this group do not object to some use of premiums in financing social security programmes. We believe, however, that they should be small, even nominal, in the nature of registration fees. The main burden of financing social security should be borne by the progressive taxes. Otherwise social security programmes are self-defeating to an important degree. One of the major justifications of state intervention in this field is to effect some measure of redistribution of income from the rich to the poor.

To the extent that the programmes are financed by regressive and proportionate taxes, that purpose is defeated. There is then no redistribution of income, merely a redistribution of poverty. Money is taken from some poor people to be given to others. That does not effect any useful or socially desirable redistribution of income.

The outstanding example of a new regressive tax is provided—and a new poll tax I may say—by the Canada pension plan, which came into effect on January 1 of this year. That programme is financed by payroll taxes. Individual wage and salary earners are required to contribute 1.8 per cent of their income between \$600 and \$5,000 per year. Last year I demonstrated to this House in some detail the iniquitous effect of this provision. The matter is of sufficient importance, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to repeat now the main highlight of my analysis of last year. I will not go into the whole thing, but I would like to call attention to what I think was the main point in it.

For purposes of illustration, I will compare the case of a married man with two dependent children with a salary of \$5,000 a year with that of a man with the same family situation and a salary of \$20,000 a year—four times the salary, but the same family situation. Under the Canada pension plan as it is now in force, they will pay identical contributions, \$79 per year, though the man making \$20,000 a year clearly has a far greater capacity to pay than the man making \$5,000 a year. And that, I regret to say, is not the whole story.

These contributions are deductible for income tax purposes and the deduction that the \$20,000-a-year man will be able to claim will be \$32.50 a year, as compared with \$11.90 for the \$5,000-a-year man, almost three times as much. As a result, the net contribution of the former, that is of the \$20,000-a-year man, will be more than \$20 a year less than that of the latter—\$46.50 for the \$20,000-a-year man as compared with \$67.10 for the \$5,000-a-year man. And yet they will both qualify for precisely the same amount of pension.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member had better pause on that and let it sink into the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). He is trying to absorb it.

Mr. Bryden: I would doubt it. I noticed that he did not raise any objections with the federal government about it, even though he heard it and I believe he absorbed it.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: A brief was submitted.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, but I do not think it dealt with that point at all, although I believe that one of the government's economists on his own responsibility made a supplementary statement, which did not carry the government's authority with it, in which this type of point was extremely well made, if I can judge from press reports. I congratulate the government on having given that freedom of action to one of its civil servants. I think that shows a desirable attitude on the part of the government but I would have been much happier—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: He said the civil servants run the government.

Mr. Bryden: I will take responsibility for my words and let other people take responsibility for theirs. But I regret that these very sound ideas that the economist from The Department of Economics and Development presented on his own responsibility were not presented on the responsibility of the government; I think that is most regrettable. At any rate, as I said, Mr. Speaker—the hon. Prime Minister said I said it last year, and that is quite true, and I am saying it again and I will probably say it quite a few more times yet because I think it is an abominable state of affairs—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I am really quite interested. I enjoyed the hon. member's remarks in this area last year and I am enjoying them this

year. I do not want him to think that I necessarily agree with the federal government on the Canada pension plan, because we had many areas of disagreement.

Mr. Bryden: I will recognize that fact. I read the government's brief and I thought it was right in at least some of the points, in fact on most of the points in which it disagreed with the federal government, but it did not disagree on enough things.

This business of charging a \$20,000-a-year man more than \$20 a year less than a \$5,000-a-year man for exactly the same pension will obviously not, Mr. Speaker—at least it will be obvious to you and me—will not produce any redistribution of income from the rich to the poor.

On the contrary, what is happening is that a relatively poor man is being taxed to help to provide a pension for a relatively rich man. Now, that is precisely what is happening in Canada today. And what is almost as bad, the relatively poor man is being taxed to provide investment funds for the provinces and municipalities.

Under the partial funding of the Canada pension plan, contributions will exceed benefits for a number of years. The surpluses so accumulated are being divided up among the provinces for investment purposes in proportion to the total contributions made by their residents. The hon. Provincial Treasurer has said that over the next ten years the amount received by Ontario will average \$267 million a year, and I will take his figure, I am sure it is as accurate as anyone can make it at this stage.

He said further that the money so obtained will be lent to universities and municipalities, on the most favourable terms possible, for their capital expansion programmes.

Heaven knows, Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of assisting universities and municipalities in every way possible in meeting their urgent capital needs. I think, however, that we have reached the ultimate in intellectual and moral bankruptcy when we extract money from the pockets of the poor and relatively poor for that purpose. I am not directing these barbs at the hon. Provincial Treasurer, he is going to get this money in his hands and he is making the best use he can of it within the terms under which it is given to him. As he knows, I hardly ever criticize him and I do not want him to think I am criticizing him now.

An hon. member: What government dreamed up that programme?

Mr. Bryden: Apparently, the current official thinking—and perhaps I should again just say exactly what I am talking about, I am now referring to the current official thinking in the Liberal stratosphere in Ottawa—on how to fight the war on poverty is to make the poor poorer and the rich richer.

An hon. member: Where is the evidence for that?

Mr. Bryden: There is lots of it.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Give it to us.

Mr. Bryden: I have just been giving it, you should have been listening.

Mr. Sopha: We have been listening.

Mr. Bryden: You have not been listening, you have been—

Mr. Sopha: Listening with one ear.

Mr. MacDonald: Your own tête-à-tête there, obviously you needed both ears to grasp it. It was beyond your grasp.

Mr. Bryden: I will not bother to try to explain it to the hon. member. Either his ear is defective or that which is behind his ear is defective.

It is not a war on poverty at all but a war on the poor and the relatively poor.

Naturally, and I say this again—I have this in the text so I have to read it—I do not hold the hon. Provincial Treasurer responsible for the mysterious ways of the Liberal bureaucrats at Ottawa. I am sure that the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko) is going to applaud also my next statement.

I claim, however, that he has it within his power to offset to an extent the deleterious effects of their taxation policy—that is Ottawa's taxation policy—designed as it is to shift the burden of taxation from the rich to the poor. The hon. Provincial Treasurer cannot overcome that entirely but he could offset it to some degree. Not only has he not exercised this power, but on the contrary, he himself has joined with gusto in the war on the poor. And on that ground alone, Mr. Speaker, his Budget stands condemned.

Mr. MacDonald: Tories in Ottawa as well as here—

An hon. member: Two Tory governments.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, even the Liberals know that Sharp is a Tory. They will not say it publicly.

Mr. Sopha: The same as Douglas Fisher is a Tory.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Well—you are not too sure about that.

An hon. member: That is pretty weak.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, before bringing my remarks on this debate to a close, I would like to comment on the recent strike of newspaper staff in Oshawa, and I think I can just nicely get it in before 6 o'clock.

An hon. member: Why do you not let your hon. leader tell about it? He was on the picket line.

Mr. Bryden: Though less than 50 employees were involved, this strike evoked more than usual interest, as was evidenced by the attention given to it on the front pages. And why? I think the reason is pretty obvious. It brought into focus some of the major problems of labour relations in Ontario today.

I will preface my remarks with a famous quotation from Junius which the *Toronto Globe and Mail* daily publishes across the top of its editorial page, but which the *Globe* editorial and other opinion writers have apparently never read. It is as follows, and I quote: "The subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures."

The history of the struggle for human freedom could be aptly described as a history of resistance by brave men and women to arbitrary and unjust measures. The trade union movement of the western world has played an important part of the general struggle for freedom and its history could be aptly described as a history of resistance to arbitrary and unjust measures from the days when trade unions were held by the courts to be criminal conspiracies and those who had the temerity to take part in their activities were subjected by the courts to savage penalties normally reserved for felons.

I only regret that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is not here at the moment. Perhaps we could enlighten him to the degree that we would not again hear the pious platitudes that we heard from him the other day in answer to a question from the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick), most of which were out of order in any case.

This struggle of working people for freedom, like the whole struggle for freedom, has sometimes been marred by violence.

Rarely, however, has violence been initiated by the working people. Most often—and the history of the trade union movement bears this out 100 per cent for those who want to take the trouble to study it—violence where it has occurred has been provoked by employers who saw in it an opportunity to smash the aspirations of their workers for freedom.

An hon. member: Do you agree with White's story?

Mr. Bryden: In the past, employers have often resorted to direct violence—that is in the past, they do not do that now. In more recent times they have shown a preference for a more subtle device. Their favourite method now is to enlist the coercive powers of the state, which in themselves represent force, on their side against their workers; that is their method now.

Now let us consider the recent events in Oshawa against this background. Here a small group of grossly underpaid workers exercised their rights as free men and women to form a trade union for their mutual benefit. As it happened, they were employed in a newspaper owned by one of the world's great press magnates, Lord Thomson of Fleet, an expatriate Canadian who, as my hon. leader put it, went to England to buy a title and now wants to treat the Canadians who stayed here as colonials.

These workers observed the law to the letter. They organized, their union was certified under the law, and they tried to negotiate an agreement in accordance with the law. Their employer, however, did not show the same respect for at least the spirit of the law. The Labour Relations Act of Ontario clearly implies that an employer must negotiate in good faith with a certified union of his employ with a view to concluding a collective agreement or contract, as it is called.

Mr. Sopha: It says it.

Mr. Bryden: Well, my friend, the hon. member for Sudbury, says, "It says it." Okay, we will take his formulation. Then we will go on to the next point which is the vital one.

There is no way of enforcing this vital provision of the Act, absolutely no way at all. An employer who wants to ignore it can thumb his nose with impunity at both the Act and the trade union. Fortunately, there are not too many such employers in Ontario, but there are a few, and after all, laws usually have to be made for the few.

This was the course that Lord Thomson's representatives chose. They made no serious effort to arrive at an agreement. The employees had no option but to go on strike, and they did this, after having met the requirements of the law to the letter—unreasonable requirements, in my opinion, but I will not go into that now.

At this point, the standard technique of employers who do not want to accept the clear intent of The Labour Relations Act was brought into play. Lord Thomson's cohorts rushed into court in order to bring the coercive powers of state into play on their side in what had until then been a purely private civil matter. An injunction was directed to the union and its members, limiting them to a total of ten pickets at the premises of the Oshawa Times.

Mr. White: By agreement.

Mr. Bryden: The workers observed this injunction to the letter. Never at any time did they have more than 10 pickets at the newspaper plant.

Lord Thomson, however, had chosen the wrong ground on which to force the issue. In the fine city of Oshawa, there are thousands of people, I am glad to say, who are fully conscious of the need to defend the rights which workers have acquired at much cost over many years. The matter was no longer purely a labour dispute, it had become a struggle for civil liberties. Was a small group of workers to be deprived of its right of free association merely because an arbitrary arrogant baron did not see fit to grant it to them? The people of Oshawa said "no," and in doing so they struck a great blow for the civil rights of all working people.

Mr. Sopha: Besides, Lord Thomson is a Tory.

Mr. Bryden: The pattern of propaganda that followed was characteristic of such situations. Everything possible was done to create an atmosphere of hysteria, to convince the public that Oshawa was teetering almost on the brink of civil war. Actually, there was no serious threat to public order. My investigations lead me to the conclusion that the one incident that did occur was grossly exaggerated in the press. It was in any case a small incident in a struggle of truly major significance.

And what was the position of our friends on the Liberal benches in this House? They tried to adjourn the House on a matter of urgent public importance. Mr. Speaker ruled the motion out of order and it tended to be

lost in the confusion. It is well, however, to note it and call to the attention of all hon. members and all others who may be interested exactly what it said. I am now quoting it:

Moved by Mr. Thompson—

the hon. leader of the Opposition:

—seconded by Mr. Worton, that this House do now adjourn to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance in relation to a grave measure of civil disobedience and disrespect for the law in relation to the strike now in progress of employees of the Oshawa Times.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Whose side are they on?

Mr. Bryden: Could anything be better calculated to fan the flames of hysteria that Lord Thomson and his cohorts were so anxious to promote? What better support could the Thomson cohorts have looked for, for their alarmist propaganda?

Mr. Sopha: What was Reid Scott doing in Ottawa?

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest to the hon. member that Scott's motion was not in that form at all—it did not have this hysterical reference to a grave matter of civil disobedience and disrespect for the law, which was a complete misrepresentation of what was going on, but an accurate representation of what was going on in the minds of my hon. Liberal friends.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that one could expect nothing else from the successors of the government of 29 years ago that organized Hepburn's Hussars, in the hope that violence could be precipitated and used as an excuse to marshal the coercive powers of the state to crush the first major effort at industrial unionism in Ontario. It provides the final refutation to the claim of the Liberals that they are the friends of working people; friends indeed, who seek their votes at election time and would join the forces of reaction to crush them when the chips are down.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I did not think they were that bad.

Mr. MacDonald: They are not only that bad, they are just as bad as the government is.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Lord Thomson and his cohorts made one final move. The assist given to them by the Liberal Party actually turned out to be of no assistance, but they did make one final move. They applied to the supreme court of Ontario for incredibly extreme measures which would have brought the full power of the state down on the heads of the workers like a ton of bricks—all 36 of these poor struggling underpaid employees of the *Oshawa Times-Gazette*.

Fortunately, the court did not have to rule on this unbelievable application, because Lord Thomson and his cohorts settled. They entered into an agreement with their employees' union, as thousands of other employers have been doing for years. Does anyone seriously suggest that they would have settled if the small and struggling union at the *Times-Gazette* had been left to stand or fall on the basis of its own limited strength?

They thought they could break that little union like a twig and cast the pieces aside. What they failed to reckon with was the power of an aroused public opinion—a public opinion that was just as vital to civil liberty in Ontario as the public opinion which prevented the passage of section 99 or the nefarious police bill of a few years ago. I think the two things are almost on all fours, Mr. Speaker. They both represent a basic struggle for liberty.

I think three lessons should be drawn from this incident, two that are particularly relevant to the government and this Legislature and one—

Mr. White: Is he going to tell us about his leader's glorious role?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: It is getting very close to six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, and I have nearly finished.

I would say that I am proud to serve under a leader who is willing to identify himself with the struggle of working people for liberty when other people in this province wanted all the forces of the state brought down on them to break their liberties. I will state that on any platform in the country.

Mr. Speaker, in the next three minutes I think I can conclude. I think three lessons should be drawn from this incident, two that are particularly relevant to the government and this Legislature, and one that is particularly relevant to the trade union movement.

First, injunctions have little, if any, legitimate role in labour disputes and they are now posing a serious threat to sound labour

relations. They are handed out like shirts in a mail-order house on the basis of applications that disclose no danger that anyone is going to suffer irreparable harm.

In this context, they are purely and simply instruments for using the power of the state to tip the scale in a private dispute in favour of one party against the other. To put it bluntly, they are used to smash trade unions by those employers, fortunately few in number, who want to smash trade unions.

Second, the day is long past when employers should be able to decide arbitrarily on revolutionary technological changes without any consultation with the representatives of the workers whose livelihood is at stake. This, I may say, was the most important issue in the *Oshawa Times-Gazette* dispute, apart from the initial and prolonged failure of the employer to bargain in good faith at all.

Mr. Justice Freedman recently declared, in effect, that the traditional management's rights provisions of collective agreements are obsolete.

Technological change is now of such a revolutionary character that they can no longer be considered to be the exclusive prerogative of management. The interests of workers are vitally affected and, indeed, so also is the public interest. The law of Ontario should be changed to ensure that these legitimate interests are adequately safeguarded.

Third, and finally Mr. Speaker, the labour movement of Ontario and of Canada—and I would say of the world, of the free world—can no longer afford the luxury of particularism and divisiveness within its ranks. The day of the small, specialized union is almost over. Can anything be more ridiculous, yet tragic, than groups of workers of the same employer being played off against one another? One group of workers walking the picket line while others carry on as usual. The trade union movement must find the maturity and wisdom to solve this problem, otherwise it will be picked off, a section at a time, until it is no longer an important force in the community.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. White moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 15, 1966

Medical Services Insurance Act, bill to amend, in committee, continued	553
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	585

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1966

The House resumed at 8.00 o'clock, p.m.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to the House just for a moment about a matter of urgent public interest. Tonight on the CBC news was a shocking—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

If the member wishes to speak on a matter of urgent public importance, he has to give me notice in writing to that effect, in order that it be approved by the Speaker. This must be done before the orders of the day.

Mr. Sargent: I admit that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: There is no time available to do that.

Mr. Speaker: Well, that is the procedure. I am afraid we cannot depart from the general procedure at this time. However, if the member wishes to submit his matter of urgent public importance to me in the morning it will be considered.

Clerk of the House: The third order, committee of the whole House, Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

On section 8:

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned last night I had undertaken to ask the law officers to look at a proposal made by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) and certain concerns expressed by other hon. members of the Opposition with respect to the proposal under this section to delete subsection 3 (b) of section 14 of the Act.

You will recall, sir, the fear expressed was that the persons being admitted to this pro-

gramme might not be fully protected as to any pre-existing physical infirmity or condition. I am assured now by the law officers this is adequately provided for in section 5, subsection 1, and I am also assured by the law officers that (j) of section 28, or (k) rather of section 28, has reference, as I suggested last night, to Schedule A, since this is the only place in the Act that the standard contract is defined.

I give the House assurance that the law officers tell me that the addition of the amendment proposed would be redundant, that adequate protection is built into the Act.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 8 stand as part of the bill?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, is there an amendment from the hon. member for Sudbury before you?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): It almost got shuffled under.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What does the minister of Indian affairs say?

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment moved by Mr. Sopha, will please say "aye."

Those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment, will please rise.

Those opposed to the amendment, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 23, the "nays" 41.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 8 agreed to.

On section 9:

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am sorry the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr.

Connell) is not in his seat tonight, but I was very distressed coming up the walk tonight to note that the red light is not on. I think it is a great shame that the citizenry of Toronto, indeed of the province, do not know that the House is sitting tonight and cannot come in here and see the policy of deliberate obstructionism which is carried on by the Opposition parties.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The red light is appropriate.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview (Mr. Young).

Mr. McKeough: May I be sure that this will be drawn to the attention of the hon. Minister?

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Tell him yourself.

Mr. McKeough: Thank you.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Evidently the hon. member for Kent West regards our discussion of basic issues as obstructionism. We have certain very strong feelings about the Medicare issue, Mr. Chairman, and those strong feelings must be expressed and the people of this province must understand that there is a fight going on for the kind of Medicare which the people of this province actually want. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we do not regard this in any sense as obstructionism. This is putting the issue squarely before this House.

Mr. McKeough: On with the section! Come on, get on with it.

Mr. Young: All right, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member for Kent West was not on the section—

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): It could have been a quiet evening without the hon. member for Kent West.

Mr. Young: Without the hon. member for Kent West turning on the red light. We did not want that. We did not ask for it.

Mr. Chairman: Now we are going to carry on with section 9 before us. The hon. member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, dealing with section number 9, there is a very important matter which is dealt with in the original section 15 which I want to draw to the attention of the House. This is the matter of coverage of people whose contract may expire

on a certain date and making sure that those contracts can be continued. The fact is, in the case of the old bill, contracts under certain carriers might have to be transferred to other carriers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have already pointed out one of the problems, and that problem, I think, is one which we must face up to, that there are people who will be covered in group contracts and those contracts may terminate at a certain time. There is no open period and so they may have to wait perhaps one, two, three, four months—we are not sure yet because the hon. Minister has not definitely made up his mind exactly how often these open periods may come.

An hon. member: Three months.

Mr. Young: The hon. member has assured us that there will be open periods every three months. Well, we are glad to hear that.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): I have had a few cases where they have left employment and as a result of the employer or the employee himself not sending that transfer in they have been dropped, but I do not think anybody can show where the hospital services have not picked them up through that omission.

Mr. Young: I am not sure, Mr. Chairman. This is a question, and we are not talking tonight about the hospital services, but we thank the hon. member for Perth for his intervention here, though we are not particularly discussing this subject tonight, the Ontario hospital services commission.

Mr. Edwards: You do not consider it—that's for sure.

Mr. Young: In this case it is not obstructionism, this is good constructive criticism and we thank the hon. member for it. But in the matter we are discussing tonight there is the problem of the overlap of contract.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the hon. member would permit me to advise him, I propose to introduce an amendment to take out all uncertainty with respect to this. Unfortunately it comes in the next section, so either the hon. member will have to be permitted to have his say or take me at my word and believe that amendment will be introduced in the next section.

Mr. Young: Could we hear the amendment, Mr. Chairman? I would be delighted to listen to the amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think I would have to have a ruling from you, sir, as to the propriety of that. The amendment I am going to propose is where a resident who is not a dependant, or his dependent spouse ceases to be covered under a group medical services insurance contract after the expiration of an open enrolment period, may make application for a standard contract within 30 days of the date of termination of his group medical services contract, which standard contract becomes effective on the date on which the application and payment of subscription is received by medical services insurance division.

Mr. Young: Where does that come in, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The next section—section 16.

Mr. Young: No. We are on section 10. I would ask the hon. Minister about the 30-day period that is mentioned here. Is it within 30 days of the termination of the contract, or can he apply 30 days ahead so that it can come into effect?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: He can apply the very next day, but the benefits will come into force on the day that the payment is received by the commission. He has 30 days' grace if he wants to delay it for 30 days after his contract ceases. I would like to say, Mr. Chairman, that my own people devised that.

Mr. Young: Well, Mr. Chairman, in view of what the hon. Minister has just told us, and in view of the fact that he will be introducing this amendment, I think that what I have to say is perhaps redundant at this point. The amendment which I was going to offer is a similar amendment to this one. I think the point is now made and we thank the hon. Minister.

Section 9 agreed to.

On section 10:

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I move that section No. 10 be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

Subsection 2 of section 16 of The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, is repealed and the following substituted therefor: Where a resident who is not a dependant or his dependent spouse ceases to be covered under a group medical services insurance contract after the expiration of an open enrolment period, such person may make application for a standard contract within 30 days of the

date of termination of his group medical services insurance contract, which standard contract becomes effective on the date on which the application and payment of subscription is received by the medical services insurance division.

Mr. Chairman: You have heard the amendment by the Minister of Health, that section 10 be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

Subsection 2 of section 16 of The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, is repealed and the following substituted therefor: Where a resident who is not a dependant or his dependent spouse ceases to be covered under a group medical services insurance contract after the expiration of an open enrolment period, such person may make application for a standard contract within 30 days of the date of termination of his group medical services insurance contract, which standard contract becomes effective on the date on which the application and payment of subscription is received by the medical services insurance division.

Shall the amendment carry?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, where does the student who is in the programme and listed under The Medical Services Insurance Act, attending an American university for eight months of the year, fit in this programme? Is he covered by the programme?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No. If he is attending an American university he is not covered by the programme because he ceases to be a resident. This is a very difficult and sensitive area that we are trying to work out. We are trying to work it out with a reciprocal agreement between the provinces of Canada, but we can see no hope of working this out in the case of foreign universities.

Mr. Newman: But, Mr. Chairman, supposing the student does come home on weekends, but resides at the university for the balance of the week, would that make any difference?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If he is essentially living outside of the province he has ceased to be a resident.

I am advised, Mr. Chairman, that the great majority of universities have group coverage for sickness and hospitalization of their students and I understand—while I cannot say that this is a fact at all universities—that

this is a very common procedure in American universities and it is quite often part of the student fee structure.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I realize that there are a lot of technicalities in answers but I notice that some of the hon. Minister's advisers look puzzled at this. His definition of "resident" still concerns me.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is spelled out in the Act. This is clear already and is, I understand, the legal definition of a resident, is it not?

My law officers advise me that this is a legal definition of resident.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): May I have at least one question on this, Mr. Chairman?

The trouble is that when you have a bill that has been so chopped up—like Bill No. 136 is—it is awfully hard to follow the amendments. But I want to point out this: In section 16, subsection 1, which is not amended, they refer to section 14 or 15. We have repealed 15, and this will not really apply to the new section 16. In other words the reference should be removed. Would you check this with your drafters?

Subsection 1 should also be amended, Mr. Chairman, and this is why it is so hard to follow. We are going to have a new section 15; so, as a result, section 16 just is not going to make sense—like so much of the legislation of this government. This is just poor drafting. You should take a look at it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We are quite agreeable to removing 15, because 15 will not apply—

An hon. member: You have an amendment in there.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am advised by the legal people—and again my hon. friend ought to know that because he is a lawyer—I am advised that it automatically disappears.

Mr. Trotter: It is still sitting there.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because there is no section 15.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Trotter: You can understand, Mr. Chairman, as a result of the way they are redrafting this bill that was No. 136, that quite a chopped up bit of legislation is going to appear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This has nothing to do with the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: This gets so complicated it is very hard for a person to know where we are at. We have a bill that chops up an Act to a point where you can hardly recognize either the bill or the Act, then we have an amendment. I am just trying to figure out where we stand. If the amendment carries, then section 10 of the bill is still open for further discussion, is it?

Mr. Chairman: If the amendment carries, the section carries automatically with it.

Mr. Bryden: I thought it was the other way around, if the amendment were defeated. Surely, if an amendment carries, a section does not automatically carry.

I would like to make a proposal to the hon. Minister while he is in an amending mood. Apparently he does not have to clean up the words "or 15" which appear in subsection 1 or section 16, but I would suggest to him that there is another part of subsection 1 of section 15 that he could give consideration to. That is the provision under which an applicant under this section will have to wait—it says:

Where the application of a person entitled to apply under section 14 is not made and the subscription therefor is not paid within the period mentioned therein, such person may apply for a standard contract at any time and upon payment of the subscription, a contract shall be issued to such person, which shall become effective three months following the date of such application and payment.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that he can reasonably cut down this three-month period. I would suggest to him that while he is fixing up section 16, he could make that one month. He has now recognized that there was a big loophole in the bill, as he brought it in, under which a person who had been under a licensed carrier had no protection at all. He went under the three-months clause too. He is changing that to eliminate the waiting period altogether in that case, and I think that is right.

I am now suggesting that in the other case dealt with by subsection 1 he should reduce the waiting period from the unreasonably long time of three months to one month.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: These are two entirely different situations. The person who is to benefit by the amendment which I have proposed has already served his waiting period, all his waiting periods, under his previous

contract, and it is to ensure that he shall not fall out of benefits and have to go through all this again. I believed, and I still believe, there was within the Act power to do this. However, to make absolutely certain, I am proposing this amendment.

Subsection 1 of section 16 is to look after the person who has not troubled to insure. He has had the benefit of open enrolment periods, and he has not bothered to insure. I stated quite clearly, sir, and I think in unmistakable terms yesterday, that it is just so simple. If we do this, if we remove this waiting period, then we simply have to increase the price.

Mr. Trotter: On this matter of the waiting period, I think that we should, once again, under this section 16, or as it is in the amended bill section 10, come to grips with this matter, the waiting period. I know the NDP previously had a motion asking that this be reduced from a three-months waiting period to a one-month waiting period. Now, what is important in this type of legislation is that we move as quickly and as closely as we possibly can, under the restrictions of these various sections, to see to it that people have an almost immediate opportunity to become a part of this plan. There are many people who under this present enrolment scheme, if they are thrown out of work and want to join the plan, or if they come to this province, there are many circumstances where they want to reduce it down to a one-month waiting period, and I think this should be general throughout the plan.

The hon. member for Woodbine did not move a formal motion in this case, and I would like to put on record a formal motion reducing the waiting period from three months to one month.

Mr. Chairman: There is an amendment before us now and I am going to deal with this section of the amendment first.

Mr. Trotter: All right.

Mr. Bryden: Will the floor then be open for discussion on the section as amended?

Mr. Chairman: We will leave it; the section will not carry.

Mr. Bryden: I would like to advise you, Mr. Chairman, that I propose to move an amendment as soon as you have cleared out the existing amendment.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment, please say "aye."

Those opposed to the amendment, please say "nay."

The amendment carries and the section is—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Was it carried unanimously?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Section 10 is open for discussion, as amended.

Mr. Bryden: I move that section 10 of Bill No. 6 be further amended by renumbering the present section, that is what you just adopted, as subsection 2 and by adding the following subsection:

1. Subsection 1 of section 16—
and that is what is in the Act now:

—is amended by striking out the word and figures, "or 15"—

I am cleaning this up anyway while we are dealing with it, even though the experts say it is not necessary:

—in the second line, and by striking out the words "three months" in the sixth and seventh lines and substituting the words "one month."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine has moved that section 10 of Bill No. 6 be further amended by renumbering the present section as subsection 2 and by adding the following subsection:

1. Subsection 1 of section 16 is amended by striking out the word and figures "or 15" in the second line and by striking out the words "three months" in the sixth and seventh lines and substituting the words "one month."

All those in favour of the amendment?

Mr. Trotter: I was going to say in regard to this, Mr. Chairman, we in this party had a similar motion. We support what the hon. member for Woodbine has said. Again I say that the one-month waiting period is enough and the closer we come to having this universal scheme, and open to all, the better it is.

Mr. MacDonald: The only argument that has been advanced by the hon. Minister is that if this kind of thing were done it would raise the price—you would have to raise the premium. Now, quite frankly the hon. Minister has made this generalization at least a half a dozen times but he has come forth with no real substantiation of the issue.

Let me say this—even if it does raise the premium—if we are trying to provide coverage for people, why do you exclude them for some peculiar financial reason in the mechanics of the bill? The purpose of this bill, for those who finally decide that they want to seek coverage under the standard contract, is that they should have coverage. Why should they be excluded in this sort of mechanical fashion?

I suggest to the hon. Minister that his argument is really not a convincing one. In view of the fact that we were co-operative a moment ago, and voted for his amendment, I was just hoping that perhaps he is in such a mellow mood that he will co-operate and vote for our amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am always in a mellow mood in respect to my friend, the hon. member for York South, but I cannot hope to convince him. I am not going to give up trying, but I am despondent of any success.

But I do not pick these figures just out of nowhere. The whole programme has been based on the opinions of the economists and the actuaries, and our subscription or premium structure has been based on these computations.

To say that we are excluding anybody is quite wrong, because we have tried everything possible to make sure that every opportunity is given to people to come in. We have established first of all a lengthy initial open enrolment period, and we have made provision for the person who becomes of age between open enrolment periods.

We have just now made the proposition so kindly supported by this amendment, made provision for the person who, between open enrolment periods, must transfer from a group contract to the standard contract. We have made sure by this amendment there shall be no loss of benefits.

Now, I think we have done just about everything possible—

Mr. MacDonald: No! Not everything.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, just about. I did qualify it by saying just about everything possible. So I think that for the time being I would ask the House to indulge us in this regard, and recognize that we have strained every effort to look after the people. We are not deliberately excluding anyone and I think it is quite wrong to leave that impression.

Mr. Bryden: I suggest to the hon. Minister that we see this from a somewhat different

point of view. He has come forward with an amendment doing something that we were quite exercised about last night—it was either afternoon or evening, I cannot remember now—and he told us that this he could not do.

But he has now eliminated one obvious anomaly in the total problem we are talking about. He has plugged up a loophole. We suggest now that he has come this far, he might as well go a little further. His difficulty, of course, is the basic inadequacy of the bill to begin with. The open enrolment periods, three-month waiting periods and various exceptions, all arise because of the lack of universality of the plan.

Mr. McKeough: Nonsense.

Mr. Bryden: What does the hon. member mean, “nonsense”? That is exactly what the government has arrived at. No universal plan has any of this folderol in it. None of it at all.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that he is unduly impressed by the economists and actuaries. I do not know which ones he has consulted. I have no doubt they are well qualified in their professions, they are just like anybody else—they tend to get particular figures and then make them into fetishes.

There is absolutely nothing sacred about three months as a waiting period. It happens that somebody at some remote time in the past, in drawing up an insurance contract of some kind, hit on the figure 3 and ever since that has become sacred. Now the hon. Minister tries to put it forward to us mere mortals as something that could not possibly be changed without the whole course of the universe being changed.

Why? Because that is what his actuaries and economists have told him. And why did they tell him that? Because the actuaries and economists from whom they learned told them the same thing. If you get any of them to get down to real brass tacks they could not give you any reason; it is an arbitrary figure that they have chosen. We suggest that we should assist legislation; it should be patched up as much as possible by taking out, or by softening as much as possible, these arbitrary types of provisions.

I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that he has come a little way tonight. In relation to the bill as a whole he has come quite a little way from last year. I suggest that he come a little further now and change three to one. We will then be very satisfied with

this section, within the very inadequate bill in which it exists.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I can only say in closing, Mr. Chairman, that it is these persuasive tactics, which lead one to go a little bit further and a little bit further, that lead us into trouble. I do not want to get into trouble.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour—

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if in fact the cost of the plan will be so raised by lowering the period from three months to one month so that the hon. Minister thinks he will have to increase the premium, then let him inform this House precisely what the economists and actuaries have said. What percentage basis have they given? What figures were they working on? What did they estimate?

How can the hon. Minister simply come and inform this House that the economists and actuaries say three months instead of one? I think this House is entitled to a more precise definition of their terms. What did they use? What facts did they put before the hon. Minister that he can put before this House through the Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is bound to know that they do not put facts before me. They come to conclusions and they tell me that this is their opinion, that this is the advice that they give me, that this is the sort of programme they recommend to me on the basis of their study. I would not know what they are talking about. The hon. member for Scarborough West probably would, but I would not. I do not question them in respect of their own business. Nor do I pose as an expert in all of these things. These people are experts in their field and I take their advice. Why, in the name of common sense, would I waste the public money seeking their advice if I were not going to take some of it at least? I have not got the information the hon. member asks for, and I do not ask for the details. I tell them to study this thing thoroughly, tell them what we want, and ask them to recommend the best possible programme on the basis of their knowledge and study.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I would say to the member for Scarborough West, in connection with this particular section, because the section before us, number 10, was amended on clause number 2, that we have now gone into

clause number 1 of section 16, which has permitted some latitude. I was hoping that through co-operation we could arrive at some kind of an amicable settlement here.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, I was amicable, Mr. Chairman, and I want you to be assured of that. I simply want to suggest to the hon. Minister that it is perfectly within his compass to ask his actuaries and economists on what basis they arrived at their decision—not simply to accept the decision as an absolute truth, but to ask them on what basis. Second, if in fact that basis has validity, it should be possible, I suggest, sir, for a Minister of the Crown to extend it to this House; we are not, in fact, asking the impossible.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would draw to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the fact that we established yesterday, I think, that where no amendment had been proposed to a section or subsection it could not be altered at this time without bringing in a bill to amend that particular section or subsection.

Mr. Chairman: That is right. That is what I was trying to tell the member a moment ago, that actually it is out of order—but I have allowed some flexibility in connection with it.

All those in favour of the amendment will please say “aye.”

Those opposed will please say “nay.”

In the opinion of the chair the amendment is lost.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment will please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the “ayes” are 25, the “nays,” 51.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried as amended.

The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying that there is evidence, that in the eight months which have intervened since the passage of Bill No. 136 and the introduction of Bill No. 6, somebody in the department, one of the advisers to the hon. Minister, apparently read the debate.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What clause are we on, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Section 11.

Mr. Sopha: Because one can see, one can readily see, that in subsection 1 of the new proposed subsection 1 of section 17, the words "as to a material fact" have been added to the words "for misrepresentation or fraud." My first inclination was to invite the House to consider striking out paragraph 8, but on mature reflection I have decided not to move that that paragraph be struck out, for I might say I am hardly weathered to the use of the word misrepresentation because I wonder whether it includes an innocent misrepresentation as well as a fraudulent misrepresentation. Of course the layman will readily see, and the hon. Minister of Health will readily see, that there is a world of difference between the two.

It is perfectly possible that a subscriber to the plan could make a misrepresentation that goes to the root of the contract; perhaps, if one starts to conjure up an example, it will be a misrepresentation in respect of his age, misrepresentation in respect of his marital status, his relationship to the children within his household, and so on. That might be treated by the medical services insurance division as being a misrepresentation that goes to a material fact. However, one can assume that the medical services insurance division will exercise a goodly measure of common sense. And it is to be hoped that that division, before cancelling a contract, will adopt a rule of thumb that a subscriber is to be given the benefit of the doubt.

I am not entirely convinced that the citizen who comes in conflict with, comes up against, an agency, an emanation of government, is always given the benefit of the doubt. In the field of workmen's compensation I am not convinced that the workman always receives the benefit of the doubt. It is to be hoped that the civil service—bureaucracy is the word the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) likes to use—in interpreting this section and applying it, will exercise a good deal of latitude and broadmindedness, to the benefit of the subscriber, keeping in mind the policy of the legislation and the intention of this House that we want to give the best of medical care to the residents of this province who avail themselves of the government plan.

The subsection 3, the proposed subsection 3 as well as the present subsection 2 that is not interfered with—but the two may be read together—the new 3 refers to 2 as it is presently in the bill. I made some remarks last year which—whoever read the debates last year was not as persuaded in regard to this one as that person was persuaded in respect to the misrepresentation or fraud.

Last year I involved the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart), himself, in the debate; and, if I remember correctly, at this point he made a contribution to the debate. He drew upon his knowledge of such things to inform the House about the considerations that apply to appeals. What I said at that time was that when the division has cancelled, has taken the step of cancelling, the contract of the subscriber and the individual, the subscriber appeals to the council.

I am worried that the council might take the position of saying: "The onus is upon you, Mr. Subscriber, to show us that the division acted unreasonably." That is in accord with the jurisprudence in the courts. Where there is this type of appeal from an action of an administrative tribunal—a board, commission, licence granting authority—often the legislation is in this form. And when the individual gets to the courts, at great expense and great anxiety, as anyone evinces when being involved in litigation—the courts being such fearsome institutions in all their majesty and dignity—the court says: "You will have to show me that the agency acted unreasonably. You have the onus. You have to show us where they went wrong, where they went outside their jurisdiction, where they took into consideration things they ought not to have considered, where they exhibited a bias." And so on.

Of course, the subscriber, the citizen, is not within the four walls of where these decisions were taken. He is not present. He does not know what considerations were applicable to reaching the decision and it is virtually impossible for him, except in the most rare cases, to show where it went wrong.

What I prefer to see, and I hoped that it would be written into this section, is that where the subscriber has his contract cancelled, the council may review the decision on its merits. It was at this point that the hon. Attorney General got into the debate last year in which we discussed the differences in approach of an appellate tribunal, for that is what the council is in this section. It is an appellate tribunal in that sense, and it ought to have the power to review the action on its merits and substitute its judgment for that of the division, if it is so called upon, and the two are vastly different things.

In the second case, a subscriber gets a new trial, so to speak, of the whole matter before the council and that is the way I feel it should be. He ought to be able to come before the council and you will remember that early on in dealing with this

Act we advocated—the hon. leader of the Opposition moved an amendment—that it would require this council to meet in various regions in the province.

This is the very type of thing they would be dealing with. They meet in Port Arthur and hear a subscriber from Geraldton who has had his contract cancelled. He comes and complains to them. They hear the thing on its merits; they substitute their judgment for that of the division. No question of offending the civil service about it. They would not be offended. Their pride would not be hurt if the council said, in effect, that they had acted a little too hastily here, and to give the fellow the benefit of the doubt and to reinstate him.

Now look at the flexibility, if you will, that the hospital services commission exhibits. Almost all of us here—certainly I have, and I would venture to say that every hon. member of the House has had—a constituent come in and say he had forgotten to pay the premium for the three-month period, and had been in the hospital for a hernia operation, and was burdened with a bill of \$700 which he could not pay. The commission has shown a great deal of flexibility in cases like these.

They have accepted the premium retroactively and paid the bill. Where it is innocent, that is a good, flexible, broadminded approach and totally in accord with the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), who is not here tonight and who is an authority in such matters. It is the approach of the Good Samaritan.

Well, Mr. Chairman, this is Good Samaritan legislation.

I do not mean to offend the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Crossman) at all, and I hope that I do not, but in that sense it is Good Samaritan legislation. That is the direction we are moving in. We are far better Samaritans in 1966 than Macdonald and Brown and Cartier and Langevin were back in 1867. They tried, but they lived in a predominantly rural economy where the neighbours helped each other. Now we do it through the state. We use the state.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: That is my point in regard to that and I do not need to elaborate on it. I do not think the way 2 or 3 are written down are quite satisfactory, and they could be improved.

I move that section 11 be amended by adding thereto subsection 2 to read as

follows: "Sub-paragraph (d) of subsection 1 of section 17 is repealed."

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury moves an amendment to Bill No. 6, section 11. The member moves that:

Section 11 be amended by adding thereto subsection 2 to read as follows:

Sub-paragraph (d) of subsection 1 of section 17 is repealed.

Mr. Bryden: Why should not subsection (a) also be repealed?

Mr. Chairman: Do I understand that what the member for Sudbury is attempting to do here is to strike out sub-paragraph (d) of subsection 1 of section 17?

Mr. Sopha: That is right. The words:

"for misuse of services for which benefits are provided."

I think the inclusion of this one is totally inexcusable. I fail to comprehend—I may be obtuse in this, which is a synonym for the word "stupid"—but I am unable to see how a subscriber to a medical care plan could misuse services unilaterally. What services could he misuse unilaterally on his motion? I ask rhetorically. Certainly, to misuse services, he would have to have either the active connivance of a member of the medical profession, or he would have so deluded and misled the member of the medical profession that the doctor was giving him services under the honest belief that he was treating a condition that did not exist.

Now that is the only hemisphere in which I can see that a subscriber could misuse services. The whole point is, of course, that it is for the doctor to say whether services are being misused. It is not for the medical insurance division or the council to say so. Surely, if those charged with the administration of the Act suspect that a patient is misusing services, then it is open to them to write to the doctor—I understand that thousands of letters a day go out of the Ontario hospital services commission to doctors, asking them to justify treatment they have prescribed.

The doctors tell me they are flooded with requests for information and justification for the number of days spent in hospitals. Indeed, I am told, it goes so far that in cases of parturition, delivery, that there is a fixed number of days the woman should be in the hospital. I do not know how many days it is, but it is a fixed number of days and if the woman is in the hospital one day more than the fixed number of days, then the

doctor gets a letter from the services commission, saying: How do you justify the—

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): May I be permitted to tell the hon. member that he is away off base. That does not happen.

Mr. Sopha: Would you wait until I am finished? I am just fortunate that I saw such a letter from the hospital services commission addressed to a doctor, asking him to justify the number of days, in case of a delivery.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. The same thing applies here. If they feel the patient is getting some services he is not entitled to, obviously the thing to do is write to the doctor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If only one doctor is involved.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, if only one doctor is involved. There is a limited number of doctors one patient is going to see, only a limited number, because in a small community—maybe not in Metropolitan Toronto but in the smaller communities—the word will get around quickly to be wary of Joe McFunnel-cover when he comes in, that there is nothing really wrong with him; and he will get short shrift. The same word gets around among lawyers about certain types of individuals. But what I am merely saying—and I do not want to get into a quibble with the hon. Minister of Health—is that I think the subsection is totally unnecessary.

The vice will not be that great; the great majority of our citizens have common sense enough to use the services provided moderately and responsibly. For the small minority that might be so hypochondriac, if that is the word, to believe that there is something wrong with them that they have to rush to doctors—if that become such a problem then we can pass something to apply to medicine like The Vexatious Proceedings Act applies to litigants, which is very rarely used.

I am told that when that statute was passed by this Legislature a number of years ago, it was passed for one person in the province, one person out of five million. So for that reason, because the medical profession in the final analysis is the guardian of the use of the services, it is strange to me. Let me just say that it seems anomalous to me that the hon. Minister of Health should single out in his statute, point to the subscriber who might misuse the services provided, and impose upon him a severe penalty in the section, and the Act is absolutely silent about the

medical profession misusing it. There is not a word in the statute about any possible misuse by the medical profession.

An hon. member: Professional courtesy.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it might be, somebody said, the professional courtesy of one doctor to another. But if I were to reflect on it *a priori*, I would think the dangers would be far greater of a misuse of the services by the medical profession than they would by the subscriber. I do not know, but common sense seems to tell me that that is so.

For those reasons I invite the hon. Minister of Health—we have not had much success this year in getting him to adopt our amendments, we had more success last year than our efforts have had this year.

Mr. Edwards: What does the hon. member for Sudbury call success? How do you define success?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Will the member for Sudbury stay with section 11?

An hon. member: The question was in order; I will ask it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would rather the member for Sudbury stayed with section 11.

Mr. Sopha: Thanks.

An hon. member: Was the hon. member for Perth out of order?

Mr. Sopha: This temptation was great. I was not going to invite the hon. member for Perth to take his shoes off and get comfortable while I answered him; it might take me an hour or so. I have said at that point all that I want to say. I just hope that, before some of these sink in, we do not have to wait for another eight months for another statute. I just want to say this: The quality of exaltation, I say to the hon. Minister of Health, does not permit nor does it in any way compliment, an individual. It is not in a spirit of exaltation that I remind him, in respect of many proposals that we have put forward since we started the committee stage of this bill, that I was one that stood in my place last year and said, "I predict that before this bill goes into law there are going to be many changes."

How much change? Sixty per cent of the statute has been amended.

An hon. member: Every section but five.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: What clause are we on, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Section 11.

Mr. Sopha: Yes. So in regard to—

An hon. member: That is one of the 60 per cent that is being amended.

Mr. Sopha: So in regard to this, we are entitled to say to the hon. Minister that amendments such as this, when it is put forward in entire good faith and with the intention of trying to get out of his meat grinder here—if I may call it that, the best kind of sausage that we can—

Mr. Thompson: We do not want hamburger.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, my hon. leader says, we do not want hamburger; we want a product we can be proud of.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, the silence of the last five seconds is my comment on that intervention. I think it is a most appropriate one.

If I may come to the hon. member for Sudbury—about 20 minutes ago I think he made a point, and I thought at that point I agreed with him. Then he has poured such a Niagara of words upon me that I have swum madly to keep at the top. I still think I agree with the amendment that he has made. Indeed, upon serious reflection, Mr. Chairman, I really agree with him, and I want to support it in the hope that we might be able to persuade the hon. Minister. Unfortunately, I wish he had gone a bit further. Before I sit down I would like to indicate where I wish he had gone a bit further. But let us deal with what he has dealt with in his amendment.

Subsection 1 (d), for misuse of services for which benefits are provided: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Sudbury has made most of the points that need to be made in connection with this section. I think the hon. Minister is being very sweeping in the use of a great penalty by which he is going to deprive a person of his coverage and, indeed, his family of the coverage, for a misuse of the service.

Conceivably an individual can misuse this service; but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister, that if an individual is going to misuse the service, in 999 cases out of

1,000 he cannot do it without being in collusion with the doctor. I find it passing strange that the government should bring in an amendment which is going to penalize the subscriber and, as the hon. member for Sudbury has said, say nothing at all about misuse of it by the doctor himself.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, my second point is that if there is misuse of the service, then this comes pretty close to a fraud. I suggest to you that you have got, under the Criminal Code today, the necessary action to deal with fraudulent moves on the part of a person.

But my third and most important point is this: By using this rather drastic penalty, you cut off the service altogether. You are not only going to penalize the person who presumably is guilty of the misuse, who may be one individual, and he may or may not have been in collusion with a doctor. How you are going to prove this in many instances, with any great degree of certainty, I do not know. But when you cut his service off, you cut his family's service off, so that the rest of his family have not got coverage too. I suggest to the hon. Minister that if he were as full of the milk of human kindness, as he suggests to us on some occasions that he is, he would not be bringing in that particular kind of section in an Act. He would not be saying he is trying to give as much coverage to everybody as possible.

This is almost in the category of the fine print in private insurance contracts that we have had to deal with for years. Then, Mr. Chairman, the thing that I regret, that the hon. member for Sudbury did not include in his amendment—and unfortunately the rules do not permit us to include it, because I presume since he dealt with it and then dismissed it that he will not be willing voluntarily to include it—is back to section (a) for misrepresentation or fraud to a material fact.

Mr. Chairman, surely if a person is guilty of misrepresentation or fraud, he is guilty of an offence under the Criminal Code; therefore charge him and take him before the courts under the Criminal Code. But you penalize not only him once again, but his whole family, by cancelling the insurance. This is an unnecessarily harsh penalty, for which the innocent are going to have to suffer along with the guilty. You have got your courts now. You have got your Criminal Code now. If there is fraud, and I suggest to you that this is misrepresentation or fraud, this is where you should deal with it, and not use this as an excuse for cancelling coverage.

I do not know whether I have persuaded the hon. member for Sudbury to include a repeal of section (a) as well as (b), but I think both of them are in the same category. In both instances it is fraud. You can take it to the courts and settle it, and you can deal with the person who is responsible for the misrepresentation or the fraud, without penalizing others.

Therefore, I would hope that the hon. member for Sudbury would be willing to include a repeal of section (a) along with section (b).

Mr. Sopha: May I gladly show how broadminded I am? I will incorporate the repeal of sub-paragraph (a) and (b) of subsection 1 of 17.

Mr. MacDonald: I can give you a copy which would incorporate both of them.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by the member for Sudbury, now seconded. The member for York South has incorporated both (a) and (b) of subsection 1.

All those in favour of the amendment.

Mr. Gisborn: I think this section in this bill is a very important one and an awful lot depends on the administration of the principle implied in this section 17, that is—keeping people covered and finding ways to keep the plan rolling with the premiums coming in as they are due.

I would not be in favour of leaving any of the sections in there, excepting (c), which is logical. I do not even feel that I can agree with (d), for non-payment of subscriptions, unless we could have some indication from the hon. Minister as to what the attitude will be in the procedure for delinquency of payments.

I think we should have some understanding of how it is going to be administered. Is there going to be some sort of merit system—or a notice of delinquency of payment of subscription? Would they be given a month to pick it up or would they be cut off from coverage immediately that the subscription is not paid on the due date? Because I think you will find this type of a plan, where the insured is responsible for getting his payments into the department by cheque, or money order, whichever way it is devised, is going to raise many problems in this area.

I would like to hear from the hon. Minister, and maybe if we had some indication of how the department plans on handling these problems, it might give us an insight

as to whether or not we should vote for the sections implied in the bill.

Certainly, it might even come to the point where the administration of the plan would have to attach wages to get premiums to pay for the coverage for the family. We could cite several cases of where the moneys will not be forwarded to the department to pay for the premium.

We might have a case of the husband who is responsible for sending in the premiums. He might have it in his pocket today, then he decides to have some beer and forget about it. We might have the wife of the breadwinner responsible for making sure the premiums are sent in when they are due, and she may be applying the money to the horses.

I do not think we can just say that the family is cut off from their doctor coverage for these reasons. I think we have to have more knowledge of just how the department plans; what is their thinking in this area. It is an important one and I think the success of the plan is going to depend a lot on the continued coverage of the family in regard to having a prepaid doctors plan.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I cannot begin to answer the questions the hon. member who just spoke posed, because this is quite apart from this section entirely.

Surely, in the name of common sense, this House does not think that the government is bringing in a bill for the sake of ensuring that people are not insured. The purpose of this bill is to see that as many of our people as possible, and as many as need it, will be insured and will be kept in benefits.

Again I repeat what I said last year—that the hon. members of the Opposition cannot see evil, or do not see evil, in everything a government does. We are interested in what this is providing for the people, despite the fact that my hon. friends in the socialist benches do not think we are going far enough.

We are not going far enough to suit them. As I have already stated, we are going far enough. And there is protection, I would point out to my hon. friend for Sudbury, for the subscriber in subsection 2, which he wanted to amend. A contract cannot be cancelled without (a) the subscriber being notified and being advised that he has an appeal to the council, and that his benefits will remain in force until the council has given a decision and the council's decision shall be final and binding upon this administration.

If these things are not going to be needed, why worry about them? Let us leave them in, in the event they might be needed. We know that there are occasions when they are needed.

This I am told—and I am quite certain my hon. friend from Sudbury, who is certainly not obtuse, recognizes it—is standard inclusion in every contract, not only insurance contracts. I am advised that this is a standard insert in all contracts.

If it is not going to be needed, it will never be used. So why worry about it? We are not going out of our way to find ways and means—

Mr. Bryden: What an incredible argument.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course it is not an incredible argument. It is not nearly as incredible as the stuff that is coming from your hon. colleagues behind you.

If people do not abuse the contract, they are in no danger of it being taken from them. I would point out that as we go further along in the amendments, there is the same safeguard put against over-service by the doctors.

My hon. friend has said that misuse calls for collusion. This is ridiculous. There can be misuse if there is collusion, but then we are more inclined to think that is over-service and lay the blame upon the doctor, because he knows whether he is giving too much service, or whether the patient is demanding too much service.

If they are demanding too much service, then it is the doctor's responsibility to see that it is stopped. If it is not necessary, the responsibility would then be placed upon him. But it is quite conceivable that a patient can consult many, many doctors and of course each one would have to go through some preliminary type of examination to ensure that the patient was not complaining without foundation.

There can be many cases of misuse presented to you or demonstrated to you. But again I repeat if they are not there, if there is not evidence of misuse, this section of the Act will not be used. We believe that this is good business and I am advised it is good business, and I see no reason for it being deleted.

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the member for Parkdale.

Mr. Trotter: The hon. Minister said that this is good business. These clauses that have to do with misrepresentation or fraud

or misuse are hangovers from the private carriers' insurance policies.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I would have to disagree with that. I am told that this is even in the Saskatchewan contract.

Mr. Trotter: This type of wording is usually in the small lines of the private carriers that make the cash register ring. This is where an insurance company can get off the hook under many circumstances. I think a prime example is one we used last year. A man who is crippled and could not move lost the rights under his policy because he was moved out of his house in a wheelchair. Instead of staying in his house he was moved around the block in a wheelchair.

This was a type of wording that the insurance companies would use to get out of the responsibilities of their contract. Private insurance companies are old hands at this. This is why I do not want to see private insurance companies in the health field whatsoever, and I do not like seeing the government using the type of clause that the private insurance companies use.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions is all up on the private insurance companies, like the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling). It no doubt breaks his heart to see any type of government plan in force here, but again I say, Mr. Chairman, that I support what the hon. member for Sudbury and the hon. member for York South have said. But basically this clause, this section, has no place in government insurance. It is strictly a hangover from the private insurance companies and we should remove the clause completely.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, of course, the hon. member for Parkdale is perfectly right about what he says as to the origin of this language. It is applicable only to applications for insurance. This is the language you find, not in the insurance contract that you receive but in the application form. Over a long period of time they developed this language, which has a very technical and obscure legal meaning for most people, to provide that if you make an application for insurance and in the application make a misrepresentation or commit a fraud as to a material fact that will vitiate the contract; but of course, this section does not say that. This refers to the contract itself, therefore there must be some limitation relating this to the actual contract which has been issued to the person who subscribes

for it. If the hon. Minister—and I will leave it to one side—in fact is talking about the application, and in the application for the insurance there is misrepresentation or fraud as to a material fact, then I think the bill should clearly so state.

Leaving that to one side, because it does not now so state, if the proposition which the hon. Minister has tried to put before us is that the contract itself, when you have become a subscriber, is liable to termination because of misrepresentation or fraud, and if he has been advised that it is common in a contractual arrangement to put in a provision that the contract will be terminated for misrepresentation or fraud, I would suggest that he consult again because it is not usual to put such a provision in a contract. The usual recourse for a person who is a party to a contract and has been defrauded, whether it has been a misrepresentation or misuse of service, is simply to take his normal contractual remedies to the courts.

As the hon. Attorney General is well aware, there is provision in the courts—where there are two parties to a contract and one of them thinks there has been a breach of that contract in some way—to apply to the courts. And the courts, over many years, have developed fairly effective methods of providing for damages in cases of breach of contract of one kind or another. It is not absolutely necessary that it be a criminal offence, simply a breach under a contract which gives one party to it the right to apply in the court.

It would seem to me that if the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health is one party to the contract, that is no reason why they should not exercise whatever rights they think they have in the courts of this province. And if they exercise them I am quite content to let the courts of the province come to a decision as to whether there has been a misuse of services or whether there has been some kind of misrepresentation or fraud under the contract; but I am certainly not satisfied and, regardless of whether this section is passed or not, I will continue unsatisfied. To suggest that the medical council which is set up under this Act for an entirely different purpose would be in any sense a way in which a decision could be made on such questions as to misrepresentation or fraud as to a material fact—I would invite any lawyer in this House to suggest that the medical council could possibly make that kind of a determination.

It seems to me quite shocking that the government, on its own volition, would ex-

clude the courts of the province in a matter related to the civil rights, which arise under a contract the government is going to issue to a person who made application for it. It would seem to me the government should very well consider withdrawing the provision about the appeal to the council. This, of course, is the sort of specious way that the government now, every time it sets up a board, sets up some internal appeal procedure.

But this is not so in this case; and this should not be so because, if a person has in fact misused services—and we all agree as a result of this debate this evening, this is a very difficult question and may very well not occur—then I would simply suggest that in those circumstances the medical services insurance division should have its recourse to the courts for whatever damages may have been suffered by that division. But the government should not reserve to itself the guillotine decision that it is going to cancel that contract, or leave it to a body which in a very real sense is its own creature and is unqualified to make the determination on very difficult legal grounds as to whether or not the cancellation should finally become effective.

I would strongly urge the hon. Minister that he should consider seriously deleting these two provisions and, if necessary, seriously consider deleting the provision which suggests that the medical council is in any way competent to deal with this kind of question. And I would invite the hon. Attorney General to comment on what I have said.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I do not think we need the hon. Attorney General in this at all. First of all, I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, that I have ever listened to such a specious argument coming from a lawyer. Would not the medical services insurance commission have a real heyday throwing this open to the courts. Boy, the lawyers would really make a killing out of it. This is why we did it this way, to keep the law out of it and to keep these people out of the courts.

We are not interested in bringing people to court. We recognize that if they make mistakes they are usually made in relative innocence, they are not made with malice aforethought, and we are not interested in bringing them to court; and of course, Mr. Chairman, the council is a sensible way—just as the hon. member for Sudbury so well pointed out, the sensible and prompt and satisfactory way in which complaints are

dealt with by the hospital services commission. A committee of the commission would take the place of a committee of council here, and they deal with these things on their merits and they deal with them in compassion. Of course, we are not going to bring these things to court. This would be the worst possible thing that we could undertake. I still can see no validity or no worthwhile elements in this amendment, sir.

Mr. Renwick: I think that is an absolutely astounding proposition to come from a Minister of this government—to say that if the government in fact is a party to a contract they have no use whatsoever for the civil courts to determine a question of breach of contract.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member is putting words in my mouth. I never said any such thing. I said this legislation was never brought before this House, or brought to apply to the people of Ontario, with a hope of making a heyday in our courts for anybody. There is no intention, under any circumstances, to take matters of this kind to court. This is the sensible way of doing it. My goodness, cases could go on for months and months, and years, if I know anything about courts of law. Of course, I am not calling the courts in disrepute; it is ridiculous to think that we bring cases of this kind into courts.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I will be astounded now if the hon. Attorney General does not intervene in this debate, because what the hon. Minister of Health is saying is that this government is going to reserve to itself the right to cancel a contract which it has made with a citizen of this province and to leave him, as his sole recourse in a difficult legal question, to a medical council which is not competent to deal with it.

Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in getting into this kind of a legal argument but the points can be made backwards and forwards, in any way the hon. Minister of Health wants to make them; but if he is suggesting that the civil court procedure be entirely scrapped because of the delay which lawyers cause then I think there is something fundamentally wrong with the administration of justice in the province, and that is another question.

This evening, all I am saying is that the medical council is not qualified and not competent to deal with questions such as the misuse of the benefits of this contract, or for misrepresentation or fraud, any more than

the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons is today competent to deal with the question of exclusion of medical doctors who apply for registration in this province.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: May I say to this proposed amendment, relative to clause (a) and (d), whether we work too long hours or whether we should not have evening sessions, I think people are stopping being people, we are losing our grasp of things. Now I can tell you—

An hon. member: Speak for yourself.

Mr. W. B. Lewis: I can speak for myself and I hope hon. members think I am speaking for myself. The Ontario hospital services commission—if you take the Act and read from the front to the back, you will find there are clauses equally as restrictive, and maybe more so in many cases. But in the whole life of the Ontario hospital insurance commission never once has clause (a) or clause (d), in reference to hospital insurance, been exerted. I think we have to have a little more faith in people.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: I must say that the comments—I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that if the hon. member for Kent East wants to go home, he should go home, and those of us who are interested in the business of the province will stay here and conduct it.

The comments of the hon. Minister of Health lead me to the conclusion that the hon. member for Sudbury and the hon. member for York South still have not gone far enough in their amendment. I think they should strike the whole section out. His justification of it is the most appalling statement I have ever heard. What he is saying, in effect, is that he is going to reserve to his division the right to arbitrarily cancel contracts. He tries to tell us that this is an improvement over a situation where his division would have to go to a court, would have to take the initiative in going to a court, to get the court to cancel.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I never said any such thing. The retention of the section and the appeal to the council does not preclude a subscriber taking action in the court.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, but the onus is all on the subscriber now, whereas in my opinion it should be the other way around. If you want to cancel a contract, the onus should be on you. You should have to take the first step. You should have to go to court.

You cannot scare us with all this nonsense about cluttering up the courts with these cases, unless you intend to cancel them in great droves. If, as you say, cancellation will be a most unusual procedure—and I hope it will be—then there probably would not be more than one case go to the courts in three or four years. But I would say to you that it should be on the basis that the onus to obtain cancellation should be on you; the onus should be on you to prove that there are grounds for cancellation. It should not be on the subscriber to act, after you have arbitrarily cancelled his contract even without a hearing, as I read this bill.

I do not care if this provision is in a thousand different statutes in this country and throughout the world. As the hon. Minister has explained it, it now becomes more and more clear it has no place at all. I imagine the only reason there have not been great protests about sections of this kind is that they have not been used much, or perhaps those against whom they have been used have not been too well aware of their rights so as to protest.

The section leaves an arbitrary power that I do not think the medical services insurance division should have. Just because it is in another statute means absolutely nothing. One of the features of this type of legislation is that some provisions are carried over from statute to statute, from contract to contract, and heaven knows where some of them ever started.

They are carried over by the people preparing the next round just because they were in the previous round. The hon. Minister says that such a provision is also in the Saskatchewan Act. It could very well be. I had no connection whatsoever with the drafting of that Act but I suspect that the section went in out of force of habit—because that is the sort of thing that was in insurance contracts elsewhere.

The hon. Minister was putting forward a proposition of "Let the experts decide"—a thoroughly undemocratic proposition—with regard to an earlier section. He said the experts have told him that we, the mere representatives of the people, should not question the experts. Well, he heard an expert speak on this section, but he has some other experts, though, who will not open up to us. He will not tell us who they are, who he is relying on; but I suggest that his experts in this case have feet of clay. They have not given any more thought to this section than he has. They have simply carried over—

Mr. Chairman: I am going to ask the member to stay with the section.

Mr. Bryden: I am dealing right with the section and I am suggesting it is ill founded and has not been thought out. It has simply been carried over from some other bill without any thought at all and I think some of the dangers in it are now quite apparent. The greatest dangers, I submit, Mr. Chairman, are the dangers that the hon. Minister himself inadvertently disclosed in his lame, ill-conceived efforts to justify what is a thoroughly unjustifiable provision.

I would suggest to him, Mr. Chairman, that he should have another thought about this. He should ask his experts just what is the justification. Why should the insured be put in the position where his contract can be arbitrarily cancelled and then the onus is on him? If you want to cancel, then why not leave the onus on the medical services insurance division? I will support the amendment, but I am beginning to wonder if we should not have gone further and have struck out the whole thing. That might be a better way of doing it.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I am struck by the strange ambivalence of our hon. friends to the left here, with whom we join forces in trying to seek the best statutes we can have. But if I understood them correctly, that they would see an appeal right through to the courts—

Mr. Bryden: We suggest the onus should be on them if the need—

Mr. Sopha: That is what I said, and I was frightfully disappointed that the hon. Minister did not answer that; he did not deal with it at all. I tried to put it, in as simple language as I could, that there is a world of difference where the subscriber has the onus in his appeal and where there is a second trial and the matter is dealt with on the merits. Certainly, surely, the law officers of the Crown who are advising the hon. Minister must have considered these things before drafting this amendment. We raised it last year and I referred to the fact that the hon. Attorney General himself got into the debate last year.

Mr. Thompson: Maybe he wants to again this year.

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps he wants to intervene again this year. And these are not in any way unreasonable proposals that we make.

Let me give you an example, and it is only for the purposes of illustration that I use it,

not seeking to criticize any agency of government: The workmen's compensation board in recent years set up an appellate tribunal; and formerly we were able to write to the chairman and often obtain justice from the chairman, to obtain through his offices a review of the decision. A remarkable number of times the chairman used to change the decision.

All that went by the board. Now they have an appellate tribunal. One wonders really sometimes why they went to the expense of setting it up, because the attitude appears to be that, when a series of decisions have been made, the appellant must show that there was an error somewhere along the way. It is not really a review on the merits. He must show that somebody erred. Now if you show—if you have that onus to show—that somebody erred, then you are in danger of hurting that person's feelings. He does not like to have it demonstrated that he was wrong and have his decision reversed by a superior tribunal.

We do not know how close this council and the medical services division will be. Maybe they will be hand in glove. Maybe they will be buddies, palsy-walsies, go out to lunch together, have adjacent offices, belong to the same club, play golf. We do not know that. And the attitude might very well be that the appeal to the council from the decision of the division might be a very ephemeral thing, a very fleeting rite.

Mr. MacDonald: An appeal to your golfing partner.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, yes indeed. And, the way the section is written now, the council might say to the subscriber in effect, "Do not take up our time; do not bother us with this. Show us where somebody down the hall erred and if you cannot do that then we are not going to reverse the decision." On the other hand, if you worded it in such a way that it would be an appeal on the merits of the cancellation, then the onus would shift to the medical services insurance division. They would have to show cause.

Really that it what it is, to show cause. They would have to show cause why the subscription should have to be cancelled. This is a very valuable right the individual has. It is equivalent to a licence and surely before you take away his right, the right of an individual who perhaps is unable to obtain medical care insurance from any private carrier, that is the type. He cannot get it anywhere else. You take away his right here to get coverage. Where is he going to get it?

Furthermore, after his subscription is cancelled, do you expect that individual to go and retain a lawyer? No, of course he will not. The person he will retain, and I use that word in a very loose sense, the person he will seek counsel and guidance from, will be the member, will be us.

We will be ombudsmen, as we are in so many areas of governmental activity. If we are going to be that, I would be pleased on behalf of any constituent who has his coverage cancelled, to appear before this tribunal. But I would want to know what the ground rules are, and what the burden is that I would have to discharge on behalf of this constituent. I would want to know whether I had to dig into the matter to the extent that I had to show that the medical services division acted unreasonably. I would like to know—I have said this four or five times now, and I promise you I am not going to say it again—whether when we go before the tribunal, the onus is on the person who cancelled.

Let him come forward and show the reason, submit himself to cross-examination. Then have the council, the appellate tribunal, decide it on the merits, according to simple, ordinary horse sense. That is what justice is, in the final analysis. Ordinary common sense; a commodity that all men have a measure of. That is fine, if that is the intention. But let us not get involved in legalistic language in these matters, in the way this thing speaks.

May I appeal to the council as provided in the regulations, to spell it out? Put it in the statute. You know an appeal is a statutory right. At common law in the King's courts as they developed, there was no appeal unless it was given by statute. That is the place for appeals—in the statute, not in the regulations. Can the hon. Attorney General—I say this rhetorically, and I am speaking on subsection 2—show any place else in the statutes of this province, I cannot think of one, where an appeal is prescribed in the regulations?

This is a new venture, precedent making. I cannot think of one where there is any form of appeal prescribed by regulations, because an appeal is usually a right granted by this Legislature to the individual and the terms of his appeal are usually spelled out.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is what we are doing in the Act, granting an appeal to the person. This Legislature.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, as provided in the regulations. That is some appeal, I must say.

Mr. Bryden: If there are no regulations, there is no appeal.

Mr. Sopha: We do not even know what the regulations are. We will not know perhaps for several months, we will not even know. What is it? Government by regulation?

Mr. Thompson: A very good point.

Mr. Sopha: Is that what you intend? You see, your draftsmen did not even recognize the glaring deficiency there. Had that been drafted in the hon. Attorney General's department, by the hon. Attorney General's draftsman, that phrase would never have occurred in this statute, because they know that appeals are not granted by the regulations. They are not governed by the regulations. They are in the statutes.

Look at almost every statute where there is a decision-making power to them. Toward the end you always come across the appellate provision of it, and the ground rules are spelled out in it. On all sides of the Opposition here it has been put to you 65 different ways—

Mr. Bryden: We still have got the other 35 to do yet.

Mr. Sopha: —a reasonable proposition to rephrase this thing, the way that you took some advice and rephrased the first subsection. I am in entire agreement with the hon. member for Riverdale, and let me say this for the record.

When the hon. member for Riverdale speaks about insurance matters, he knows whereof he speaks. You are listening to an expert when he speaks, because he is thoroughly schooled in it and he is too well aware, having dealt in the subject, of the fine print in the statutory conditions in insurance contracts in this province.

If you have not got 20-20 vision or a good set of glasses, you will not get glasses from this legislation.

You are not aware of your rights, because in very fine print in contract—and it ill-behooves the government to use devices of insurance companies in a public statute such as this, and I do not care what you call this. Names do not mean anything.

You call this The Medical Services Insurance Act. It is not insurance at all. It is a misnomer. But I will go along with the misnomer, if you want to put the name on it. It is not insurance any more than unemployment insurance is insurance. It is

not based on insurance principles. Insurance has an actuarial base. This is a public statute, designed to promote the amelioration of the people of this province. It is a social welfare piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury, I would ask him to stay on the section.

Mr. Sopha: All right. I am right back to it. It ill-behooves the hon. Minister of Health to put that phrase in for misrepresentation or fraud as a material fact. I am not going to lecture my hon. friend from York South. He made a very valid point, he just did not have the nicety of being well rounded legally. The hon. Attorney General and I know, and the hon. member for Downsview knows, and my hon. friend from Etobicoke (Mr. Braithwaite) knows, and the hon. member for Riverdale knows, that you cannot put people in court for misrepresentation or fraud in all cases. You cannot do it.

The Criminal Code, thank heavens, is not that wide in its terms, or else none of us would be free. Everybody has been guilty of some misrepresentation, however innocent, at some time, in his life; innocent misrepresentation.

That word misrepresentation seems to include the innocent variety, the mere mistaken answer and when we get down to section—

Mr. Bryden: Are you suggesting that under this clause there could be cancellation for innocent misrepresentation?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. If it goes to a material fact. The misrepresentation could be perfectly innocent in its commission, that is without culpability, but it could be such a misrepresentation as to go to the very root of the contract.

Mr. Bryden: Well, but this is surely—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, it could. What it should say—the word fraud should be taken out as a noun and changed into an adjective, and it should say, for fraudulent misrepresentation as to a material fact.

Mr. Bryden: Well then, is that not covered by the Criminal Code?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, that is covered.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member for Woodbine to go through the chair, please.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed. I do not believe in these private conversations.

My final plea is this. As we come down to section 17, that is 17 of the old bill, the one that is being amended, on the home stretch, then let us not get any hardness, any strictness into the legislation. There is a vast difference, I point out by way of contrast, between section 5 and I am not going to read section 5, which is a very broad expression of social policy that does us all honour. It compliments us all, to have those words in section 5. When you get down to section 17, let us not import into it the strictness of a legalistic interpretation that would deprive the individual of that which is justly due him.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment will please say "aye." All those opposed to the amendment, will please say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment will please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 26, the "nays" 53.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and the section carried.

Section 12 agreed to.

On section 13:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, in regard to this section, there is one extreme objection that we have to this and that deals in particular with those people who are subsidized under the plan. There is no limit to what a doctor might charge. It is understood that a doctor is to receive 90 per cent of the OMA schedule under this scheme, especially applying to someone who is subsidized under the scheme. Anyone who is subsidized under the scheme as we understand it, is either an individual or more particularly a family where the breadwinner has an income of under \$3,600. But suppose a person or a family that is subsidized under this scheme have 90 per cent of the bill paid, there is nothing to prevent the doctor from charging them not only 100 per cent of the OMA schedule but considerably more.

There should be some protection. We have no intention here of trying to interfere with the doctor-patient relationship, nor do we have any intention of trying to interfere

with the amount a doctor charges providing a person is not subsidized. But where there is subsidization, where the doctor is receiving public moneys, there should be some limit as to what the doctor should charge. Otherwise, the person who needs the help has little or no protection under this Act.

I know that the vast majority of doctors would co-operate; it is very seldom you come upon any situation where a doctor does try to overcharge. But there have been some indications that make some of us worry—when, for example, recently the Ontario medical association sent out a letter under dateline of January 26, 1966, to all the doctors in the province of Ontario, trying to get them to do certain things.

If the doctors in Ontario ever try to follow the Ontario medical association you could see where we, as a government, would run into a lot of trouble. For example, the Ontario medical association urged the doctors as follows:

That the government subsidizing or purchasing the standard contract for the needy is a social responsibility, and that the financing of it should have no bearing on the formation of our fee schedule.

And again they say:

That our fee schedule developed by a responsible and autonomous profession is not open to negotiation or proration with any body or group except where the profession itself wishes to make some special arrangements.

Fortunately for the public of Ontario, I cite as an example the doctors in the Ottawa area. I think only about three of 65 were in favour of following the line that the Ontario medical association attempted to set down.

But if this particular group—and I am one who believes that the Ontario medical association is not a true representative of the doctors in this province. I think that the OMA has been extremely narrow. It is one of the groups, along with the insurance companies, that have tried to get a viselike hold on any medical scheme that would be or could be instituted in the province of Ontario.

But this letter of January 25 of this year is certainly a strong indication of how some of the leading men in the Ontario medical association feel, and it is my hope and this party's hope, and indications are that that hope will be fulfilled, that the doctors as a body will not follow their advice. But, at the same time, if a small narrow group so desires, under this Act it can accept the 90

per cent of its fee schedule even on our subsidized patients, and then go after as much as it likes. There is nothing to stop a doctor from suing a patient.

Mind you, it has been my experience in the last few years that doctors are suing patients far more than they used to. At one time a doctor considered it unprofessional to put his bills in the hands of a person to go out and collect them, or to sue people in court. But today they are doing it more and more. Yet, despite the fact that this scheme is bound to be subsidized with the taxpayers' money, we hope that the people, the so-called poor people or the unfortunate people, are going to get at least some protection under this Act. There is this loophole.

Therefore, I am going to ask this committee to consider, in section 13, to add in subsection 6; and it should read as follows:

6. In all cases where the covered person is subsidized in whole or in part by the medical services insurance division, payment for services rendered to the covered person by the medical services insurance division shall be deemed to be payment in full for the said services.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Parkdale moves an amendment to Bill No. 6, section 13:

I move that section 13 be amended by adding thereto subsection 6 to read as follows:

In all cases where the covered person is subsidized in whole or in part by the medical services insurance division, payment for services rendered to the covered person by the medical services insurance division shall be deemed to be payment in full for the said services.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the tone and spirit of this amendment is very good, and I can assure the hon. member that this has been given a great deal of careful thought. The reason we decided against it was because I have contended from the start that there should be no division of our population into classes. If a person needs to be subsidized, either in whole or in part, that is nobody's business but the person's and the person or the party subsidizing them—in this case, the state.

I am quite certain that we could get agreement on this, but we would have to identify these people. We would have to mark them out as particular people and this, to me, is far more odious than a means test. For this reason, Mr. Chairman, we did not

write this sort of thing into the Act. A section very much in this kind of language was thoroughly considered and rejected. On every count it is our intention to use, as our identification number, the person's social security number—social insurance number—and we shall urge every subscriber, if they do not have one to begin with when they enrol first, to get a "sin" number; and it, we hope, will be used not only in our programme but ultimately in the hospital services insurance programme so that this will be the only identification used. I do not think it is the doctor's business, or anybody else's business, that the person is being subsidized. I feel very strongly about this. I could not agree to the identification of people, and the pointing out and setting them apart, just because they are receiving assistance.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, could I just answer this argument, please?

First of all, I would agree with the hon. Minister that people should not be divided into classes but the only way you have any possibility of wiping out classes is to have a universal, overall scheme. And as far as trying to keep it a secret—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is no guarantee that they would not be charged extra billing.

Mr. Trotter: At least you could put a limit on it; but at the same time, as for the doctor not knowing what a person can afford or subsidize, the only person that knows more about an individual he is dealing with than a lawyer, is a doctor. And how can a doctor, in many cases, prescribe drugs for patients when sometimes the drugs are so expensive that they cannot afford them? Certainly the doctor needs to know these things; and as it is here, you have left the patient—be he rich or poor—and the taxpayer utterly and completely at the mercy of a particular small group of the medical profession that would like to give this plan trouble. I do not think you are dealing very fairly with the patient—or, particularly, the taxpayer—by leaving this gaping hole in this section.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I must say that the section which the hon. gentleman wants to amend stands in urgent need of a great deal more amendment than he is proposing. In fact, I am not sure that the amendment, as he proposes, is any great improvement on the section. I think there are much more urgent matters that ought to be dealt with. However, his amendment

blocks out any other formal efforts at change. It does not, of course, block out informal efforts.

I do not think that there should be any extra billing at all, although I am not sure that there is any effective way of preventing it. I would suspect that the people whom the medical profession would be most likely to extra-bill would not likely be the ones who are in the subsidized groups. They are more likely to be somebody who, they thought, had a little more money than those people.

I suppose that we will support the amendment. There are other features of this section to which we would attach a much higher priority for change and I would like to enumerate some of them, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, with regard to the proposal now before us, that the payments under this Act will be on the basis of 90 per cent of the fee schedule of the Ontario medical association in effect on the day that the Act comes into effect, or on which this section comes into force—I do not know that it is envisaged that it will come into force on a different day than the rest of the Act, but it is proposed now that they should receive 90 per cent of the OMA schedule of fees. This, I will concede, is an improvement over last year.

Last year the hon. Minister held out stubbornly for 100 per cent and would not consider any representations that we on this side of the House made in relation to that point. We are happy that at least he has brought the amount down to 90 per cent, but I would like to call to his attention the fact that, under the medical care insurance programme in Saskatchewan, the payment is on the basis of 85 per cent of the schedule of fees in that province—which is a lower schedule of fees than in this province—and the doctors of Saskatchewan are making more money than they ever made in their lives before. When they have an absolute guarantee that they will get 85 per cent of their schedule of fees in all cases, without any collection costs or anything else, it can be extremely lucrative to them. I suggest there is still a lot of water in the payments to the doctors when we leave the matter as high as 90 per cent.

I know the hon. Minister will heap scorn on my proposal that he should change 90 per cent to 85 per cent, just as last year he heaped scorn on the idea that it should be anything less than 100 per cent; but I am suggesting to him that here, as in many other aspects of this section I will come to, he is really offering a big bonanza to the doctors which they do not need—and which is more than should be considered for them.

Continuing with subsection 1 of section 20, Mr. Chairman, I note another change from last year which, in my opinion, is a retrograde step. The legislation we had last year envisaged that the schedule of fees—it was then 100 per cent—would stay in effect as a basis of payment under this Act for two years which is reasonable enough. The doctors have certainly gotten it up high enough, high enough to make themselves the highest paid group in the community.

It is envisaged that the schedule is not necessarily for two years. If they put enough heat on the hon. Minister behind the scenes, then the thing can be reopened, even within the two-year period. And it really does not say what is going to happen at all after the end of the two-year period—unless I have missed something I do not think it does. But even within that two-year period they can get the thing reopened.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that the section as it stands provides—and in this respect it is similar to the previous section—that the schedule of fees used for the purposes of this section will be the schedule in force on the date on which the section comes into force.

We do not know when the section is going to come into force, but I suggest to the hon. Minister that could very well be an open invitation to the medical profession to jack up its schedule of fees. I would suggest that, in his own interest, the Minister should put in a date that has already passed so that he will not be in the position of having the fee schedule suddenly jacked up and his whole cost structure thrown out by some action on the part of the Ontario medical association, which has a complete carte blanche to set whatever fee schedule it wants. There is nobody in the world they have to negotiate with. The government is putting itself in the position where it is very much at the mercy of this group which has certainly not shown any high sense of responsibility in the arbitrary way in which it has jacked up its schedule of fees in the past.

A further point that I think should be raised with the hon. Minister, is one that I alluded to briefly, namely: What happens after the two-year period? Is the medical association then right back where it started from, able to arbitrarily determine the schedule of fees in any way it sees fit? And is the hon. Minister then in a position where he simply has to accept whatever they do? As far as I can see, under the proposed section, that is the position he is in.

He did freeze the thing for two years. He has now permitted a thaw there. The doctors

can get negotiations opened up within the two years. After the two years are over he cannot open up any negotiations with the doctors, as far as I can see in the bill. I would suggest to him that he should have some protection for himself. He should provide in this Act—I do not care if he keeps a two-year freeze or not—that there cannot be any changes in the schedule of fees, as far as they affect payments under this Act.

What they do outside the Act is a different matter, but as far as payments under this Act are affected there should not be any change except by negotiation between the medical services insurance division and the Ontario medical association, as ultimately confirmed by order-in-council. If the hon. Minister is not willing to do that, then I would submit to him that he is leaving himself wide open to being stuck with paying quite inordinate fees at a later date.

Let us not forget, Mr. Chairman, that the doctors are getting a tremendous bonanza under this Act as it stands now. The people in the subsidized group, the people who are automatically covered, who do not have to apply, the people under various assistance legislation and certain people receiving old age security, are already covered now quite apart from this Act. They already have full medical services.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, no.

Mr. Bryden: The people receiving general welfare assistance and so on? They most certainly have. They have had medical welfare for 30 years, I believe.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is not so.

Mr. Bryden: It certainly gives them a pretty wide range of medical services.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, no, no!

Mr. Bryden: You mean you have been telling us all these years that you have been doing these fine things, and you have not been doing them at all? It certainly gives more than a third of what they will get under this bill. Would the hon. Minister agree to that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I would not.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister would not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is not a question, Mr. Chairman. This is not involved in the bill at all.

Mr. Bryden: I agree it is not a question and I do not think the hon. Minister is on

the bit at all, because the statement he just made is totally outrageous. I imagine the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) did not hear it or he could not possibly—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have stated this in the House on many, many occasions. Under the present medical welfare scheme which has been in effect in Ontario for some 30-odd years, the only provision for medical services made is doctors' services in the home or the office. That is all.

Mr. Bryden: There is some extension here, but the basic services are there provided.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is total provision here. There is a total comprehensive provision—

Mr. Bryden: All right, so there is a 90 per cent protection or 85 per cent under medical welfare, if that is what the hon. Minister means. A moment ago it seemed to me he was trying to imply they were receiving very little coverage indeed, whereas now they will receive very large coverage. If the only point we are arguing about is 10 or 15 per cent, we can forget about it.

So all along, for 30 years or more, they have been getting 85 to 90 per cent of the coverage they will now be getting under this legislation. The doctors, under medical welfare, have been getting about 30 per cent of the OMA schedule of fees. Now, they get 90 per cent. They get a tripling of fees and some increase in business, I take it. That is how it will work out.

So here they get a tremendous bonanza right off the bat, and the hon. Minister is so anxious to give it to them that he is going to bring that portion of the Act into effect on April 1, as fast as he can get it in. I know they are itching to send out his literature in the medical services division right now, and they are most upset about us holding it up here.

They have all this beautiful literature ready to mail out and they do not think it would look good if they mailed it out before we were finally battered down over here. But one of the reasons for that, no doubt, is that the hon. Minister has to get this extra melon for the doctors through in time for April 1.

In general, I think the section is objectionable on a far broader basis than is suggested in the amendment. We are in the position now where it is the amendment, yes or no, there is nothing else to be done. But,

I think the section is objectionable from top to bottom. The 90 per cent is too high. There is not sufficient protection against arbitrary increase in rates by the medical association.

The hon. Minister has opened up the one spot where he did have himself protected in previous years. Maybe that was a saw-off in return for the 90 per cent. I do not know. But for all of these reasons, I would suggest that this whole section should be worked over again, should be completely reconsidered. It is not adequate simply to add a subsection which would attempt to eliminate extra billing for the subsidized cases.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): I would ask the hon. Minister's indulgence. I was not in the House when Bill 136 was debated last year. I wonder if he would favour me with the answers to a few questions? I could probably ask other hon. members here, but I would like to get them from a person in authority, so to say.

As I understand it, the doctor is not obliged to accept 90 per cent of his fees as total payment. He can bill his patient for the other ten per cent. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Ben: Therefore, if my friends to the left here have their way and have it reduced to 85 per cent, then they would oblige the covered person to pay still an additional five per cent out of his own pocket. Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right.

Mr. Ben: Is that correct?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. Ben: Thank you. I just wanted to know where they stood on this matter.

Mr. Bryden: Well, you would like to have it jacked to 100 per cent, would you?

Mr. Ben: I want the people who cannot afford to pay, not to have to pay anything out of their pocket and you want them to pay more.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member for Bracondale has shown a genius for confusion that is incomprehensible. Last year his friends in this House—

Mr. Chairman: Order. No private conversations.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, I am sorry. I was just looking in that direction, but I was still speaking to you. I had you in mind, Mr. Chairman.

Last year his hon. friends in this House fought quite strenuously to have inserted in the bill a provision that the payments would be on the basis of 90 per cent of the schedule of fees. They fought quite strenuously and we supported them. We would have preferred it to be 85 per cent, but their amendment was 90 per cent and we proposed it.

Now I tell you from what my hon. friend from Bracondale says, he thinks they were totally wrong in that last year.

Mr. Ben: —90 per cent they—

Mr. Bryden: It was 100 per cent in last year's bill so that the doctors would then get their full schedule guaranteed to them. As to my hon. friend, I say we are going to have to take a couple of minutes to explain a few things to him, because he obviously has very little idea of how these things work. It is normal in plans of this kind—as indeed it is in PSI, where there is guarantee of payment in all cases—to make less than 100 per cent of the schedule of fees payable. Ninety per cent is now proposed. It is 90 per cent under PSI, 85 per cent in Saskatchewan, and so on. Now it does not follow from that, as my poor confused friend from Bracondale seems to think—

Mr. Ben: I am not confused. I know where you stand.

Mr. Bryden: —that the patient—

Mr. Ben: —the people pay ten per cent.

Mr. Bryden: The more you want to stick your foot down your throat, the better for us. I will be happy about it, Mr. Chairman.

In the overwhelming majority of cases when plans of this kind are in effect the doctors accept a percentage as full payment. It is merely a matter of whether we should pay the doctors 100 per cent or 85 per cent, or 90 per cent. It is not a matter of whether or not the patient will pay extra. Even if you have 100 per cent, it is still possible for the doctor to bill extra, and indeed that has happened.

The extra billing matter is totally unrelated to this section here, to this 90 per cent. I know the hon. member for Bracondale will never be able to understand that elementary point, but it is totally unrelated. What we are talking about here relates to the charge

doctors can make on the fund. If it is 90 per cent, that means their income will be approximately 5 per cent higher than it would be if it is 85 per cent. It is as simple as that.

We propose that the doctors will get 85 per cent of the schedule instead of 90 per cent. Now do not tell me the hon. Minister is in the same state of confusion as the hon. member for Bracondale. This would be too much. I can see that my poor friend, the hon. member for Bracondale, thinks he has a tremendous point—

Mr. Trotter: He has.

Mr. Bryden: He has not.

Mr. Trotter: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. He keeps talking about his confused friend, the hon. member for Bracondale—

Mr. MacDonald: But the hon. member for Parkdale was confused—

Mr. Trotter: Certainly not.

Mr. MacDonald: He was confused about last year's bill.

Mr. Trotter: I certainly was not. The hon. member for York South is crazy.

Mr. MacDonald: He thought it was 90 per cent last year.

Mr. Trotter: Oh no, it was 100 per cent last year.

Mr. Bryden: And now it has been changed to 90 per cent.

Mr. Trotter: And now it is reduced to 90; I am not arguing that.

Mr. Bryden: And he is objecting to us proposing that it should be reduced to 85; he says that we are thereby trying to put the charge on the patient. That is what he said. And he thinks he has scored a tremendous point on it. So he has put all you fellows behind the eight-ball, too.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Bryden: Well, there are two of them over here. It is really getting pretty late and I can see that these fellows are having trouble working their way through this, Mr. Chairman. But in view of the fact the matter has been raised, I would like to make it abundantly clear that when we are talking about 85 per cent, we are talking about the payment to the doctors under the plan. Extra billing is a totally unrelated issue that can

arise no matter what percentage is paid. It does not usually arise under these plans; it occasionally arises, but not usually. As a matter of fact, does not PSI prohibit extra billing, except for people in certain income categories? If they can do it, perhaps the hon. Minister should consider doing it here.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If a doctor enters into a contractual relationship with PSI.

Mr. Bryden: That is a matter between the doctor and PSI. Perhaps you could think about something like that in relation to your plan here, to try to eliminate extra billing. It does not occur often, I admit, but where it does occur I think it is really quite unreasonable.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I make no apologies for what my hon. associates did before I was here. I am not responsible for what they did and I am not responsible for what they did not do. But I resent very much my hon. friends to the left—and that is where they belong—robbing the poor because they hate the rich. And that is in essence what they were doing when they suggested dropping it.

They say I am confused? Well, they should not have had to ask the hon. Minister what the relationship was with PSI. I could have told them that the doctors enter into a contractual relationship and they agree to accept a specified fee. If there had been something in this bill which compelled the doctors to take 95 or 85 or 75 per cent of the prescribed fee, then I could go along with it, but it was not in here. And they should have looked after that last year but they did not; they did not.

Mr. MacDonald: What about your amendment now?

Mr. Ben: I have not made any kind of an amendment, thank you. That amendment, also, with all due respect to my hon. friend in front of me, is not the amendment I would have suggested.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! One at a time.

Mr. Ben: Why do you not just sit and listen? You have been wandering in the wilderness for so long you have sunstroke and you do not know what you are doing.

If there had been something in here which specified that any particular amount would have been accepted in total payment, I could go along with it; but I can find no justification for this House having reduced the

amount payable to the doctors from 100 per cent to 90 per cent, when there was not something in the Act which provided that that should be the total amount that would be billed to those patients. So, as I say, I suggest that the poor are robbed because of a hatred of the rich.

There was a statement made here about this amendment. With all due respect, I do not think the amendment as proposed would solve the situation. I suggest my hon. friend should amend it to read that those who have their subscriptions subsidized should have 100 per cent of the tariff of the OMA paid. In that way there would be more certainty that those people would not be obliged to pay that ten per cent out of their own pocket. Now it is quite true, as someone stated here, that there is no limit to what can be billed, but that is going on the assumption that every doctor is a heel, a thief, or an unscrupulous individual. I am willing to accept that, just as in the legal profession, the architectural profession, and the accounting profession, most stick to the tariff. There is a prescribed tariff and most stick to it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Why raise it to 100 per cent then?

Mr. Ben: Because then the poor would not have to pay that ten per cent, and you are the people who say you look after the poor. In this particular amendment here, I would suggest that my hon. friend amend it to read that where the subscriptions are subsidized to a certain extent then, under those circumstances, the medical services insurance division pay 100 per cent of the OMA tariff. Only in those circumstances.

Mr. MacDonald: I agree with the hon. member for Bracondale in one connection. I think the Liberal amendment is inadequate. He thinks it is inadequate. But he is so far above his own party that he does not even discuss it with his own party before he comes in and criticizes everybody, including his own party.

However, Mr. Chairman, let us get down to the basic facts of the proposition. As my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine, has pointed out, at 90 per cent the doctors are going to make more money than they are now. They are, because they are going to have no bad bills. They will all be paid; they will get 90 per cent of their so-called charity cases instead of now getting 30 per cent. Indeed, the experience where these plans have been put into effect indicates that they will get as much money or more money at 85 per cent of the schedule. What we should

be having in the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is 85 per cent of the schedule, and this government should have the intestinal fortitude to sit down with the doctors and get in the law that there shall be no over-billing. That is the second point that is important.

Mr. Sopha: That is what our amendment says now.

Mr. MacDonald: No over-billing at all?

Mr. Sopha: No. It says with regard to those subsidized.

Mr. MacDonald: There should be no over-billing, beyond the OMA schedule of fees. Why should you permit them? It is all very well to say they are all very good fellows. I was talking to a doctor who is very conversant with what is going on in the doctors' thinking at the present time in the medical profession, and his comment was that because this government had cut it down to 90 per cent of the schedule of fees, the likelihood is that there would be extensive over-billing. The government cannot assure us that it will not happen, but I think the government has an obligation to protect us from it happening.

But there is a third point, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to put by way of a question to the hon. Minister. That is: Has the hon. Minister any assurance—Or let me put it this way: Has the OMA the unilateral right to raise its schedule of fees at the end of two years?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the OMA, like any body or person, has the unilateral right to raise its schedule of fees. Whether this programme accepts such schedule of fees is an entirely different matter.

Mr. MacDonald: It says here that it takes 90. Is the hon. Minister, in effect, saying that at the end of the two years, if the OMA were to raise its schedule of fees, you will then come back with an amendment and pay 75 per cent to cancel out the increase?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It might very well be, Mr. Chairman. I do not know what will happen at the end of two years. But I do know that the matter will be reopened. I cannot say here that it will be reopened for negotiation because the OMA executive has already told me that it does not have the power or the authority to negotiate for the profession. So we will deal with each doctor who deals with us.

Mr. MacDonald: Just a minute now, Mr. Chairman, if I may. The OMA cannot commit what you do vis-à-vis each doctor but can

you sit down with the OMA and negotiate on the OMA schedule of fees?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have just stated that the OMA executive has advised me that it, the executive, does not have the power or authority to negotiate fees for the profession.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, who sets the OMA schedule of fees?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The OMA.

Mr. MacDonald: Well then, if the OMA is setting the schedule of fees, does it do it unilaterally or, when we get a plan, does this government deign to sit down with the OMA and discuss it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Of course, we will discuss it with OMA, Mr. Chairman, but this has nothing to do with setting the fee. We will discuss it, and then we will—

Mr. Bryden: Of course not—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, would you kindly ask the hon. member if he would refrain from comments for a moment or two? I do not want to be accused of being rude again, Mr. Chairman.

We will discuss it with OMA as we have done now, but we came to the point where we had to state that this is what the programme is going to pay. And I suppose this will happen at the end of two years when we sit down and discuss it with OMA again—if discussion is necessary, and should there be any upward or downward revision in the schedule. But this has nothing to do with the setting of the OMA tariff. It can set its tariff where it likes, as any person can set the fee schedule for their services where they like.

I do not know of any government action that sets any trade or profession or occupation fee schedule—call it what you will.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, the hon. Minister certainly will agree with me that there are many trades where they cannot set their fee schedule.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is quite a different thing, Mr. Chairman. The physician is self-employed and I suppose it could be considered that the physician does not set his fee unilaterally; he sets it, in effect, between him and each patient, if one were to take this to an extreme. But the OMA tariff committee draws up a schedule of fees which is passed or rejected by the council—ultimately

passed by the council of the OMA—and it is a guideline.

As I explained last year, this is why I recommended 100 per cent of the fee schedule because since it was not a price list and was only a guideline, I had hoped and would anticipate that it would become a price list. Therefore, we should do what the hon. member for Bracondale suggested would be possible—that there would be no extra billing of the patient, particularly those who were holders of standard contracts and, of course, in particular, those who were being supported in any way out of public funds.

This, on reflection, was still considered—that we should take it down to 90 per cent, but it is still, I want to make eminently clear, not a price list. It is a guideline, but we are taking it as a price list and we are going to pay as a benefit 90 per cent of that price list for the first year of the duration of the plan.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to say to you that this amendment that we framed arrived in its present form after a very careful consideration of the matters at hand—

Mr. MacDonald: Without the hon. member for Bracondale being present.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, without the hon. member for Bracondale. He can speak for himself; I am speaking for the party—

An hon. member: For the party?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, let us make that clear. I am glad the hon. member raised it. We will have it in the record that I am speaking for the party—the ball team on which I am playing with most other hon. members.

We cannot accept the suggestion of our friends to the left because the great schism between us and them is that we do not hate doctors. They hate them; they hate the profession as an institution and that, of course, is a reflection of the trouble they ran into in Saskatchewan and that has overlapped as far east as Ontario.

We do not have that view of the medical profession. We see them as an integral part of this community staffed by very humanitarian people who are very dedicated to their tasks. That is the position that we take.

We considered this matter very carefully in relation to the schedule of fees and the billing of people who pay their subscriptions *in toto*—this group, apart from the subsidized group—and in what is left of a free enterprise economy and here we are miles apart from our friends on the left—in what is left of it.

We did not see that this Legislature has any right at all to interfere with the freedom of contract by a doctor to charge what he feels is reasonable for his service—vis-à-vis the individual patient.

Now that is especially true in the realm of the specialty arts. For example, a plastic surgeon of the calibre of Dr. Farmer, the outstanding man on the continent—we did not feel that it behooves us in this Legislature to go into his field of operation and tell him what he should charge for the practice of that very special art, the benefits of which he confers on many people that come under his rubric.

We would not go as far as that; I say to the hon. member for Bracondale as well as to all other hon. members of the House, that in reference to those people where public moneys are being used to subsidize their premium, then it is eminently fair that 90 per cent payment should be deemed to be payment in full. That is the end of the matter.

A very valid point is made among an excess of other verbiage, by the hon. member for York South—

Mr. MacDonald: You are certainly an expert on excess verbiage.

Mr. Sopha: You have to dig through the—I was going to say the haystack, but it is often the manure pile—you have to dig through in order to find that one pearl. I mixed a couple of metaphors there, but he makes a valid point when he said that he did not need to be so trite as to teach us to suck eggs. Many of these things that he expounds, we know. We know that doctors have bad debts—they only collect 30 per cent of them—everybody knows that, and they are getting payment for all of the services.

Of course, one of the principles of this bill is that we take away the charitable aspect of it. People no longer are the recipients of charity at the hands of the medical profession. We answer one of the great criticisms offered by the medical profession of this bill—they will ask you, if you meet them in close contact, to name a person who has suffered for want of medical care. The answer is obvious; we tell them that we do not want them to have to confer charity on those people. We want a comprehensive plan where those people are looked after—according to the standard of the medical profession and the skills they have developed and for which they are paid. Of course that is the answer.

Now let me draw one more parallel. When the hon. Attorney General presents his legal aid plan—we have no way of knowing what is in the plan—but I venture to suggest from what I read in the newspapers, they are going to pay something like 75 per cent tariff of fees to the lawyer. Now, no one would ever suggest that above that tariff of fees paid by the state, the lawyer would be permitted to bill, in addition. That is going to be payment in full and it will be accepted as such by the lawyers.

There is no question of recovering something additional from the person. And if something additional is recovered, then I hope that the bill will require that the lawyer pay it back to the state, instead of putting it in his own pocket. That is the way it should be.

Now what is sauce for the goose—that is the lawyer—ought to be sauce for the gander—that is the doctor.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: You are going to identify the party—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, the doctor will accept 90 per cent if we identify the recipient of state aid.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, yes. But spell it out in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But this is odious to me—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, but spell it out in the bill. That is what our amendment says.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: But this is odious to me, as I said, identifying these people who are receiving help.

Mr. Sopha: Well, identify them. I am saying in reply, spell it out in the bill. Let us say it shall be deemed to be payment in full and there can be no dispute about it. There is nothing left in the nether region of misunderstanding then, if it is right in the bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think my hon. friend has lost the point. Unfortunately, he was otherwise occupied when I said previously that I am quite certain the doctors would accept what you have put in your amendment, provided I let them know who is being subsidized. But this, to me, is an odious principle. I do not think that it is anybody's business, as I have already said this evening, who is being subsidized by the state and this is all it means.

Mr. Ben: The NDP want a means test.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: And I speak from the depth of personal experience that this is far more odious than the means test. It is no one's business, as I stated, and we are using as our numbering system, the same number, the social security number and we will urge every subscriber to apply for that number, so that this will be his official number by which he will be known in all matters pertaining to the state at whatever level.

But if we are to identify them, I am quite certain we would have no difficulty arriving at this. We would not have to put it in legislation, I am quite certain we would get a general undertaking, but I have stated and the government has accepted this as policy, that we are not going to identify our people and separate them off into classes—a matter which is very odious to the hon. member for Sudbury himself.

Mr. Sopha: Well then, how do you take care of the situation, Mr. Chairman, where doctors, as they have said to me and they have said in the newspapers, will not bill the state at all? They are going to bill the individual.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The individual will bill us.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, and the individual who is subsidized in whole or in part, gets the bill according to the OMA schedule of fees; let us take an illustration, an appendectomy, say it is \$150. I do not know if it is, but let us say for a moment that it is. He gets the bill from the doctor. The doctors have told me they are going to send him the bill. Then he applies to you and he gets \$135. Why should not he then be able to send that \$135 to the doctor as payment in full? What is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There is nothing wrong with it, if the doctor will accept it.

Mr. Sopha: Well, how do we know he will accept it? And thus our amendment.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I think this matter will clear itself up, because if the patient forgets to pay the doctor, as occasionally happens, the doctor will very quickly learn to bill the plan directly and get 90 per cent of his fees.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, maybe that is a good way to handle it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Some of them will.

Mr. Sopha: I can see, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister has given this consideration.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Oh, I have given it a great deal of consideration.

Mr. Sopha: If the majority of patients who are subsidized in whole or in part are billed that way, and get \$135 according to my illustration, then those patients will want that payment to be payment in full. They will not be interested in tacking on the \$15; and indeed, in the great majority of cases, they will not have the \$15.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, that in the great majority of the cases, if they go to the doctor and say: "Well, here is what my insurance paid me," the doctor will accept it and that will be the end of it. They will get a receipt for \$135 and that will be the end of it—in the great majority of cases. Just as a few patients will forget to pay the doctor, so there will always be a small residue of doctors who will insist upon the pound of flesh.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has got himself into this wonderful dichotomy. In the first place, he says with emphasis and vigour, "We will not identify the people who are being subsidized. We will not tell the doctor whom he is working for, nor reveal to him a person who is getting aid from the state." Then, having established that postulant, he comes around full circle, and he says: "The patient getting the 90 per cent must go and beg the doctor to take it."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not say "must."

Mr. Sopha: He must go. He must go and plead with him.

Mr. MacDonald: As a matter of fact, he has got to pay the bill before he—

Mr. Sopha: That is precisely what the hon. Minister said. He takes the cheque in his grubby hand and goes to the doctor and says, "Doctor, I implore you to accept this payment in full." That is all they will give him. Now, that is the position he got himself into. On the other hand, I offer a simple solution to this. In all cases where the patient is subsidized by public money, when the invoice is received by the government and is stacked up against that person's enrolment, and it is seen at that moment that he is subsidized in whole or in part, then a cheque is drawn for payment and on that cheque the words appear: "This is payment in full."

That myriad of cheques coming into the doctor's office—you are not going to have the doctor down sorting through them, saying, "This fellow is subsidized. That fellow is not. I will send this fellow an additional bill." That will all be done by his secretarial staff. The doctor will not even know. He will not even know the identity of the people he is treating because he has not got time. Have you ever tried to get a doctor on the phone lately? You can call five in a row and the same answering service answers for all five of them. They are too busy to do the sort of things the hon. Minister envisages.

My final submission: We offer this as a reasonable alternative and it spells it out in the statute, in simple words. We will not go as far as the people from Threadneedle street, over to the left—who sometimes, I think, want to grind the medical profession down to pay them back for Saskatchewan. We will not do that to them. Many of the doctors are our friends. Those people are going to end up with no telephone service, they will not be able to get into Maple Leaf Gardens, and they will have no doctors.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this again is the problem that we face when we do things by halves—either on the part of the government or on the part of the amendment offered by the Opposition.

If we want to get out of this dilemma, and since the hon. Minister does not want to identify people who are on welfare, then the simple thing is for everyone to be covered in exactly the same way. In other words, the doctor accepts the 90 per cent, or 85 per cent as we think it ought to be, for everyone in full payment of the bill and that solves the problem. The hon. Minister of Health does not have to identify the people who are getting welfare, and the problem which the hon. member for Sudbury faces is overcome. This is the simple way and if that were added to the amendment then I think this would solve the problem.

But, Mr. Chairman, it just seems to me that these are things that this House has to face, that we are here giving the doctors a bonanza beyond reason. I talk to certain friends of mine who are medical men. I remember on one occasion, when one man had in his hand welfare cheques that had come in, he was delighted to get the percentage that was there. He figured that was clear gravy as far as he was concerned, because otherwise they would have been charity cases. Now those are going up to 85 or 90 per cent under the legislation, he is going to do much better.

As a matter of fact, that same man tells me that he has to take regular holidays now because he might as well be enjoying himself. If he did not, then his income would be so high that it would not make sense for him not to take the holidays. I was reading the other day about the privileged position of some of these people. I think that some of us ought to be in that position in this House, Mr. Chairman; it would be good to think about it, that the doctors are going this spring on a cruise to the Caribbean. It is going to be a study cruise. They are going to have a convention, and this is income tax deductible. I think that we in this House ought to have the same sort of privilege. We ought to have a political convention of some kind to study the process of the legislation that we are introducing. And this kind of a privilege would be right down the line. We ought to be getting it.

Mr. Singer: Are the fees you get from the North York planning board in your income tax?

Mr. Young: Yes.

Mr. Singer: Did you go down to the Caribbean this winter?

Mr. Young: I expect to go to the Caribbean very often; but I do not expect to go, unfortunately, and charge it against my income tax. I wish I could, Mr. Chairman, but it cannot be done. I expect to have plenty of holidays, I expect to enjoy life to the full, but also I do not expect to have this kind of privilege.

Mr. Singer: Do you pay income tax on the money you get from—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. If the hon. member for Downsview wants to start hurling personal remarks, maybe he should be just a bit careful.

Mr. Singer: That is a very good point of order.

Mr. MacDonald: I just suggest to the hon. member for Downsview that, living in a glass house, he should not start throwing stones at other members.

Mr. Singer: That is no point of order, at all.

Mr. Young: There is one further point that has been mentioned in this House which I want to stress—one further point, and I am sticking to the bill here. I am sticking to the whole matter of income that we are going to pay the doctors under this bill.

We should be negotiating—that is, the department should be negotiating—with the doctors in regard to fees, and it should be incorporated in this bill. If fees are to be raised or to be adjusted at any time, there should be power within this bill so that an agency of this government should be able to negotiate. This is standard practice today in plans across the world. It is standard practice in the trade union movement and in many other places. For doctors to be able to set their fees unilaterally is not a proposition which this House ought to consider.

So, Mr. Chairman, we think that certainly this amendment does not go far enough; it should go much further. There are many other things in this section which ought to be considered. If our hon. friends would consider these other amendments to the section, we would be glad to support them. We ask them if they will do this.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I agree with the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkview so far as they appertain to the question of universality. It is because we decided not to have a means test that we have a universal old age pension, and nobody screams more against means tests than do the hon. members to my left. The reason I rise, Mr. Chairman, is because I cannot swallow the inconsistency. I believe that people should not have to go through the means test, and this to me is a means test; and just as we pay the universal old age pension to people who are making hundreds of thousands of dollars a year—in a desire to protect those who need that money from having to go and answer these questions and beg for it and prove that they are destitute and starving.

I am willing that those doctors—those larcenous individuals described here by the hon. members to my left—get that extra five or ten per cent to protect those people who are destitute and needy from having to have their poverty thrown in their face every time a doctor would get a notice from the carrier saying: “This man is having his account subsidized; he is underprivileged; take it easy on him.”

Rather than subject him to that, I would rather pay the doctor the other 10 or 15 per cent, or what have you. To me that is a principle I believe in and I am not going to support this particular amendment.

Mr. Thompson: As I understand it—perhaps the hon. Minister of Health will correct me—the doctors made an arrangement with PSI and they were very happy to have 90 per cent of their fees paid. They recognized there

were administrative costs in looking after the sending out of fees and so on.

May I also state where the Liberal Party stands on this? Because of the well-prepared approach of the hon. member for Sudbury, who with other party members worked this out, and recognized the integrity of the medical profession—I know that as well as being able to make sane decisions as the member for Sudbury, that the medical profession may ask—I do not know what his inclinations are—but the medical profession may ask that when there is a change of government, that he should be the Minister of Health.

Mr. Sopha: I would be happy to be.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: I think we should try to be realistic about what, in fact, will happen. The hon. Minister of Health has tried to indicate that, in some way or another, by this bill he is protecting the people in the province of Ontario from being divided into two classes.

Just by the automatic fact of being a participant in this plan, one is earmarked in the first instance as a member of a plan who is not a participant in a group. Therefore 1,800,000 of the people in the government plan are going to be subsidized one way or another by this government in order to participate in the plan.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: There could be others in it.

Mr. Renwick: I only made the point because the hon. Minister is being ridiculous about it. The fact of the matter is that most doctors have a rather shrewd assessment of the economic circumstance of their patients, just the same as most professional men have a pretty shrewd assessment of the economic circumstances of their clients.

An hon. member: Including lawyers.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, including lawyers.

The significant thing that concerns us is not that a doctor may, if he so chooses to do so by supplemental agreement with his patient, arrange an advance for a higher fee than the OMA schedule. That is his privilege and if the participant in the plan wants to join in it, that is just fine. What we are concerned about is the extent to which this 10 to 15 per cent is going to be a deterrent to people who require medical care. This is the important and significant factor and I think because the debate—

Mr. Ben: Why do you cut it down to 90 per cent, then?

Mr. Renwick: —because the debate has strayed from the significant part of it, I think we could usefully quote—and I intend to quote about a page and a half of the Hall commission report on this very topic, and then I think we can deal with the specific point. In the Royal commission on health services in volume 2, starting on page 4, the report states:

This, however, raises the question whether a prepayment plan encourages or induces a substantial volume of demands for unnecessary medical care simply because of the removal of the economic barrier to a desirable service. Is the increased demand arising from the introduction of a universal prepaid programme a demand for unessential health services? There have been statements made recently by members of the medical profession in Canada, that the introduction of a universal, comprehensive, prepaid medical care programme, would lead to the unnecessary use of health services, and they advocate as a remedy the policy of requiring the patient to pay part of the fee at the time he receives the service in order to induce a greater sense of responsibility in his demand for care. But before applying such a remedy, it is essential that we be absolutely certain of the precise nature of the problem and if the problem is correctly defined—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is completely out of order. This has reference to deterrents. These are co-insurance and there is nothing in these amendments referable to that. Indeed, one of the amendments strikes out the co-insurance factor in the original bill.

Mr. Renwick: I would submit that it is quite on the point, because whether it is called co-insurance, or whether it is a deterrent fee, or whether it is a part payment, it is a number of dollars which the person covered by the plan is obliged to pay. The basic question is whether or not that is a deterrent to that person making use of the facilities which are available to him under the proposed plan, and to that extent it is perfectly relevant to the discussion which is going on in this chamber.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Let us take a vote, not stay here all night.

Mr. Renwick: That the problem is incorrectly stated can be seen from the observa-

tions of the medical director of Canada's largest medical prepayment plan, on the subject of use. He is Dr. W. B. Stiver, medical directors of Physicians' Services Incorporated, who wrote in the issue of July 13, 1963 of *News and Views on the Economics of Medicine*, a publication prepared by the department of medical economics of the Canadian medical association:

There appears to be a body of opinion in the medical profession, which is also shared by interested laymen, that over-use is entirely due to the programmes of our physicians' sponsored plans in Canada in which comprehensive medical care, including first dollar coverage, is offered to employed groups. If you listen to the proponents of this opinion you would think that prior to the advent of such plans that there was no such thing as over-use of medical care. We know that this is not so. We are all aware of the fact that the pattern of practice of individual members of the profession varies a great deal. We see every day examples of the possibly insecure physician who, in his enthusiasm, or for other reasons, over-serves the majority of his patients. This type of practitioner has been with us for many many years, long before comprehensive prepaid medical care on a service basis was brought into being by the profession. We also know that there has been a certain segment of the population which has always demanded a great deal of medical care and which will continue to make unreasonable demands if not brought under control by the medical profession. In my opinion there are the two basic factors in use.

And then it goes on:

The problem is also incorrectly stated in that it assumes that it is only the poor who use prepaid services. Obviously it is only those in the low-income groups for whom a part payment would have any economic significance and thus deter the use of health services.

I would pause there to indicate that this is the point which is of concern to us in this debate on this particular section. And I would repeat that, that:

Obviously it is only those in the low-income groups for whom a part payment would have any economic significance and thus deter the use of health services.

But surveys of the use of medical services show an extremely high co-relation between high incomes and high use of services. To the extent that over-use or demand for unnecessary services is a problem and

its existence though limited cannot be denied, it is one which cuts across all income groups and is not concentrated in the poor. Even so there still remains the question whether part payments are the remedy.

Again it seems to the commission that Dr. Stiver's views gained from his extensive experience are incontrovertible when he says in the same article: "We have in the medical profession today an opinion that the cure of over-use in prepaid comprehensive care is a combination of deterrents, deductibles and co-insurance now given the sophisticated name of patient participation."

It appears to me that the basis of this opinion is purely impression. I know of no published work, either in Canada or the United States, which would indicate that patient participation has any worthwhile influence on use. We are told that it has but I have yet to see a study that would substantiate such an impression.

And the report concludes, in no uncertain terms, that they are compelled to conclude therefore:

That a policy imposing part payment would simply deter the poor and have no effects on the unnecessary demands of those in middle and high income categories. Such a policy would mean that Canada was simply continuing to ration health services on the basis of ability to pay, a policy which was overwhelmingly denounced in submissions to the commission. The entire proposition must be rejected on the basis of an incorrect statement of the real problem.

I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the crux of the argument which has engendered the heat in this debate tonight, on this particular section, is because of the fact that it must of necessity follow that, to the extent that a 90 per cent provision is put in this bill, it must for all participants in the government plan be accepted by the doctor in full payment for the services which he has rendered to that patient unless the doctor himself chooses, before rendering the service, to make a supplemental agreement—which, in my opinion, he is entitled to make if he believes that his skill and knowledge and experience warrants it—for a higher fee. But to the extent that any person is a participant in the government plan, the payment by the government or by the patient subject to recoupment from the government, should be accepted in full satisfaction of the obligation under this particular standard contract.

Therefore I would ask that the hon. member for Parkdale accept the extension of the amendment which he has proposed to cover all participants under the plan, and not just those who are subsidized, and leave it entirely up to the doctors as to whether they will make a supplemental arrangement for any additional fee which they may see fit to charge.

Mr. Ben: Is the hon. member here suggesting that before a doctor treats a patient he should ask him what plan he is covered under, and put before him a contract and say, "Sign here before I treat you"?

Mr. MacDonald: That is what a lawyer does when he goes—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Ben: The hon. member had better start going to different lawyers.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I just want to say one short word in answer to what the hon. member for Riverdale has said.

When we presented—does the hon. member want to continue?

Mr. Renwick: Yes, I had thought, in the course of what I had to say, that the important point is to make certain that we do not ration the health services under this government scheme dependent upon whether or not the person has the ability to pay this additional number of dollars. The only way that you can get out of this difficulty is to require that all participants in this plan be entitled under this contract which they have bought to—

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Even if they are in a high salary bracket?

Mr. Renwick: —to be paid and to receive 90 per cent from the government that is running it, in full payment of that account rendered on that contractual arrangement. If they wish to receive more, that is a separate and different matter which they can negotiate clearly, and in advance or afterwards, with the particular patient. That is their privilege to do so. But every member participating in this plan should know that payment of 90 per cent of the schedule of fees—which, after all, is only a suggested schedule and is not a binding document on any doctor—should be full payment. And that is my answer to the hon. member for Bracondale.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I did want to answer very briefly to what the hon. member

for Riverdale has said, and I do not intend to regurgitate the argument which has gone on for nearly four years on this subject. When we submitted this amendment we looked over the whole section, as the government has brought it in or has amended it, and we are quite willing to admit that there are many things that over a period of time are going to have to be considered—as to how, as a government, we are going to get along with the doctors. But what is most important for any scheme, such as we hope to see in the future, what is most important for it to work, is that we do co-operate with the doctors and they co-operate with us.

If we go the extreme, as the NDP has suggested, or as was done in Saskatchewan, there is bound to be trouble. If we go to the extreme, as the Ontario medical association suggested in their letter of January 26, there is bound to be trouble. But we have seen the example of the doctors in Ottawa, not willing to accept the suggestions of the OMA. I think about three out of 65 doctors supported the OMA. This is a healthy sign for health services in Ontario, because the success of any scheme is going to depend upon the goodwill of everybody concerned. So we here, in the Liberal Party, have not wanted to try to put the lids on fees at this point because we believe that public opinion and the good sense of the medical profession will prevail.

If the OMA start to set exorbitant fees, it will become obvious to the public and the public will react accordingly. The amendment we did suggest covered a certain part of the population, where it would not become known to the public that they were being charged an excessive rate. Therefore there is not the glare of public opinion on any excessive charges. That is why we had the limited amendment we suggested. If, unfortunately, it should prove in the future that the OMA have become too strong, even among the doctors, or if the medical profession is going to an extreme, then obviously we are going to have to bring this section back into the Legislature to see to it that the public of Ontario is protected.

But then, let us hope and let us pray that that is not necessary. Let us say to the doctors that we are admittedly working for a universal, overall scheme; and let us hope and seek their co-operation. Let us by all means avoid the extremes that the NDP has suggested, and let us again avoid the extremes of the OMA. I think that the medical profession will see through their

own representatives, because the executive of the OMA, I feel, has been doing a great disservice to the medical profession. It has been making the doctors look like the bad men, and they are not. You talk to the average doctor today—he is not an extremist. There are some, but they are very much in the minority.

So, on this section, we of the Liberal Party have not tried to make political hay by saying that the doctors are gouging the public, or doing this or doing that. We are appealing for common sense from the medical profession, and from the public, of the province of Ontario. This, I am sure, if we look at the history of this province, is what we are going to have. And this is so abundantly, so obviously, necessary if we are going to have a good health service in the province of Ontario. So with that, I am asking the House to support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment, say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of Mr. Trotter's amendment, please stand.

Those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 18, the "nays," 44.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 14 is agreed to.

Section 14 agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee rise and report progress, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn; but, before doing so, we will continue with Bill No. 6 tomorrow.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.25 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 16, 1966

Discrimination in employment because of age, bill to prevent, Mr. Rowntree, first reading	589
Telephone Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	590
Statement re grants to establish classes for new Canadians, Mr. Davis	593
Medical Services Insurance Act, bill to amend, in committee, continued	595
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	619

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery Silverthorn public school, Toronto and Lawrence Heights junior high school, Downsview; in the west gallery Don Mills junior high school, Don Mills.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to prevent discrimination in employment because of age.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, may I give the House an outline referring to the background and the main purpose of this bill?

One of the principles upon which all the members of this House are united is the importance of assuring to the people of this province the fullest measure of equality of opportunity. This principle has been and is being forwarded in many ways, not the least of which is through the legislation now placed before the House.

The bill will prohibit discrimination in employment in connection with hiring, treatment, separation and so forth, against persons between 40 and 65 on grounds of age. It will also prohibit discriminatory treatment based on age in connection with membership in a trade union. The statute will be administered by the Ontario human rights commission.

With three and a half years of experience

behind it, the commission has developed educational and conciliation techniques that have increased understanding and respect for this province's human rights legislation. The enforcement scheme—conciliation, board of inquiry, and prosecution, if necessary—would be the same as is contained in the Ontario human rights code.

The bill will empower the commission, subject to the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in council, to establish exemptions from the coverage of the statute where the nature of the employment requires the exercise of an age specification or limitation.

May I say a few words about the need for this legislation? There are still, as hon. members are aware, a great many capable older workers, with many years of useful employment ahead of them, who have been denied the opportunity to work because of popular, yet negative, attitudes regarding chronological age and employment. We now have enough reliable information and studies from a wide range of agencies to indicate clearly that many of the myths and stereotypes held about the capabilities of the older worker are not only untrue but can have a deleterious effect upon our development and productive economy.

We have all had personal experience of older workers whose lives have been blighted by difficulties in finding employment and these difficulties have often been based entirely on age. We can ill afford to lose the skills and capabilities of our senior workers. Mr. Speaker, in terms of dollars and cents and considering the valuable contributions that older employees can make, it is wise to protect the employment opportunities of those older individuals who are capable and efficient workers.

This legislation will discourage the continuance of unfounded assumption as to job abilities based solely on age and will encourage to the greatest extent possible the practice of judging each individual applicant on his individual merits and with reference to particular standards of performance for the job in question.

The Age Discrimination Act can be used to bring about change for the benefit of the whole community without undue disturbance to any of its parts. In my view, sir, this legislation, accompanied by a strong educational programme, will win the approval and support of people throughout this province, for it contains the basic ideals of social justice and equality of opportunity to which we all subscribe.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

THE TELEPHONE ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Telephone Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, the purpose of the amendment is to permit subscribers to be released from certain liabilities when their subscription to the company is terminated.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to answer a question asked by the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) yesterday.

His first question was: Would the Minister tell the House whether any convictions have been obtained under section 27, subsection 1, of the OWRC Act within the last 12 months?

The answer is, "yes."

His second question: If convictions were obtained, would the Minister name the municipalities or the persons involved?

The answer: The Matspeck Construction Company Limited, Helmut Matthiss and John Krauter.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture, notice of which has been given. The question comes in two parts:

In light of the report by the scientists of the Ontario agricultural college at Guelph that mink fed on fish from Lake Erie are found to be sterile due to the use of certain insecticides by the agriculture industry, I would ask: 1. What steps is the hon. Minister's department taking to correct this serious problem, and; 2. What studies are being done to find what effect consumption of fish on Lake Erie could have on human beings?

An hon. member: A good question!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's questions, I would advise the answer to part 1. is:

In 1964 mink ranchers in southwestern Ontario, and in fact throughout Ontario, experienced low conception rates on their mink ranches. It is understood that Lake Erie fish were used to supply most of the protein requirements. The Ontario veterinary college carried out tests on the fish but the tests did not indicate that the fish were responsible for the low fertility.

Now in answer to the second part of the question: The food used in Canada is subject to controls set by the food and drug directorate of the federal Department of Health and Welfare. Some pesticides are very toxic to man and others are non-toxic, and thus various tolerances and levels are enforced in relation to food. But this is the responsibility of the food and drug directorate at the federal level.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

In view of the statement by a vice-president of the New York Central Railroad at a recent meeting in Windsor that his railway makes an effort to establish new industries and expects to increase its business in Ontario, will the hon. Minister make representation to this railroad and the Chesapeake and Ohio Railway to increase their grain-handling services, including boxcars, on behalf of the grain growers in Essex and Kent counties?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to say that any improvement in available services as provided by the two railroads mentioned by the hon. member is most welcome news to all of us in this House who are interested in the development of industry, and particularly the agricultural industry. It has not been brought to my attention that there was a shortage of grain-handling facilities in these areas or that there had been a shortage of railway cars. I suppose, at certain times of the year, such a shortage could indeed develop. No representation that such has been the case has ever been made to me nor, to my knowledge, to my department.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): It was in the OFA brief.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If it was I do not recall it. Frankly, we have not been aware that such was the case. However, if it is the case, we would do everything possible to see that

it is taken care of. I welcome the news that the vice-president has said he would be pleased to extend these facilities.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, my first to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart).

In view of yesterday's experience in evicting families from expropriated properties in York township, does the hon. Attorney General not believe that it would be possible to establish more humane procedures; and, if so, would he assure the House that the situation will be studied with a view to establishing improved procedures?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion that the sheriff for the county of York, and his officers, acted yesterday with great care and patience in evicting the families from these expropriated properties in York township.

I understand that these properties were expropriated in April, 1965. It was not until December of that year—last year—that the eviction notices were filed in the sheriff's office. All through this time, the property owners in question have been aware of the circumstances. I am advised that 51 of the 53 properties had been vacated prior to yesterday without any intervention of the sheriff's office of the county of York. The persons who were evicted have known since December of last year that February 15, 1966, was the last day they could remain on the property.

I can assure the hon. members of this House, as well as the citizens of the province, that every care is taken to ensure that the most humane procedures are adopted in such situations.

The sheriff went to the properties concerned, while the persons were there, to inform them that it was now time for them to leave. I think this is a much more humane procedure than having the sheriff enforce the writ of possession while the residents are absent from the property.

I would welcome any suggestions from the hon. members as to how the laws of this land can be upheld by the adoption of another procedure, in this type of case, where persons patently refuse to comply with the law.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): I would like to address a question to the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), notice of which has been given. The question is long and for those parts which the hon. Minister cannot answer now, I am quite content that he accept them as notice.

1. How many (a) nurseries, (b) child day care centres, are operated or subsidized by the provincial government in:

(1) Each of the member municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto; (2) Ottawa; (3) Hamilton; (4) Windsor; (5) London; (6) Oshawa; (7) Peterborough.

2. How much was paid to these nurseries or child day care centres?

3. What is the basis for contribution by the province?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to answer most of the questions from the hon. member.

Question 1: The municipalities of the metropolitan area: Toronto, 16 nurseries, seven of which include day care centres; North York, three nurseries; York township, one nursery; municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, one nursery; Ottawa, one nursery, including day care centre; Hamilton, one nursery, half-day programme only; Windsor, none; London, two nurseries, one nursery centre for crippled children; Oshawa, one nursery, half-day programme only; Peterborough, one nursery, half-day programme only.

Question 2: Toronto's grants for 1964-65 were \$280,348.35; North York, \$4,302.64; York township, \$6,000; municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, \$4,728.25; Ottawa, \$11,243.43; Hamilton, \$2,187.80; Windsor, none; London, \$7,909.49; Oshawa, \$804.34; Peterborough, \$1,742.02. The total provincial day nurseries maintenance grants for 1964 and 1965, therefore, for that group, would be \$362,729.85.

Question 3: The basis for contribution by the province is found in The Day Nurseries Act, chapter 87, RSO 1960. Section 21 reads:

The council of a local municipality within the meaning of The Municipal Act may, by by-law, provide for the establishment of day nurseries for the care and feeding of young children.

(2) A by-law passed under subsection 1 may provide for the establishment of day nurseries directly by the municipality or by any organization named in the by-law and approved by the Minister, but in either event, in order to qualify for a grant under this Act, the council of the municipality shall be responsible for the efficient and satisfactory operation thereof and for furnishing to the Minister such reports and other information as he may require.

(3) There shall be paid to every local municipality in respect to every day nursery established under section 2, and

which is conducted in accordance with the requirements of the regulations, an amount equal to one-half of the amount paid out or contributed by the local municipality for the operation and maintenance of the day nursery, computed in the manner prescribed by the regulations.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House, that one year ago there were 33 nurseries receiving provincial municipal grants, and at the present time there are 42.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Is it the intention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture to extend the programme of foreign students working in Ontario agriculture? Will foreign students be allowed to other areas, other than the 100 students coming to the Delhi area to work in tobacco?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I must confess that if the hon. member knows of these 100 students, he knows more than I know about them. Quite frankly, we have not been able to find any positive proof that there are 100 students coming from anywhere.

I would say this: Our department has been co-operating with The Canada Department of Agriculture for a number of years in locating a few students from Japan. These students are brought over here and are placed on farms where they have a particular interest, and then are taken to OAC, where they complete some training and are sent back to Japan. This is a part of their agriculture training provided through the Japanese government and our own government.

We have no knowledge of any other students coming. But I would say this: We would welcome the opportunity of providing jobs for these students, if they could be found and could be brought to this country through the offices of the federal government. We would encourage this, quite frankly; and we have proposed that students be brought in from some countries where we understand there is some desire on the part of the students to come.

Mr. Paterson: A supplementary question. The hon. Minister is aware that there were a couple of hundred students brought in on this programme into western Canada last year. Has he been made aware of this fact?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, I was not aware of that.

Mr. Paterson: I have another question of the hon. Minister. Will the hon. Minister

meet reasonably soon with Essex and Kent counties canned crop producers and canning firms to advise them of the department's plan for supplying labour, and thus allowing these producers and canners to plan this year's production?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to this question, I am sure the hon. member realizes the actual recruitment of labour is a federal responsibility, through the national employment service. However, for a number of years now, particularly last year and the year previous, we established what is known as a federal-provincial labour committee, headed by Gordon Bennett, our assistant Deputy Minister of Agriculture. Now we have worked with the federal national employment service, with other agencies, Indian affairs, through ARDA, in bringing people in from the Maritimes and from areas of lesser employment in Ontario to fill these jobs and we are continuing to do this, this year.

Right now I would advise the House through you, sir, that meetings are being arranged in Essex and Kent counties and in the tobacco areas to discuss with the local people the requirements for labour, so that we will get on with the job of trying to fill these requirements as quickly as possible.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan).

Can the hon. Provincial Treasurer explain why former employees of the Ontario government who are entitled to return of their contributions in the superannuation fund have to wait six months or more to get their money?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the hon. member that first of all the period of six months is a very unusual instance, and not the run of the mill at all.

I would like to point out to the hon. member and to the House, however, that before a refund can be made, it is necessary for the pensions funds branch to receive clearance from the department concerned, so that no moneys are owing to the Crown by the former employee. I think the hon. members understand that civil servants are paid in advance to a certain extent, that is on the 24th of the month they receive a cheque which pays them up until the end of the month. If someone leaves during that period, the money that has been overpaid must be returned.

There are also advances under accountable advance warrants, their uniform, any property

of the government, or of the department concerned, that are in the hands of the employee, and these must be cleaned up before it comes to the pensions funds branch.

Then we, in the hope of being of service to the person who is retiring, make sure that he wishes a refund of the money, because a great many are more anxious to transfer the money to another pension fund. As is well known, if the money is taken in one payment, income tax has to be paid on it at the time it is received, while if it is being transferred to another pension fund, there is no income tax charged.

So very often the employee's wishes are not made clear to the pensions funds branch, and as a result this may cause some delay. There is also the question of whether an employee leaves for health reasons. This is checked to make sure that he is leaving for health reasons and that the funds can be returned.

I may say that once the matter reaches the pensions funds branch it is then cleared up very quickly.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, I hope I can persuade him to look into this further, because I have had a number of cases. Furthermore, I was speaking to the personnel director of one department yesterday who said this is a common problem he has to face. So I suggest that it may be commoner than the hon. Provincial Treasurer realizes.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, it may be more common than I realize, but I would like to state again that once the clearance has been received from the department, there are no delays to any extent following that.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions, one of which is directed to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), notice of which has been given.

Have representations been made to the hon. Minister or his department from the Lakehead with regard to a community college? If so, by whom? And were the education authorities in Fort William consulted or involved in such representations?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, there have been representations from the Lakehead. Mr. Tambllyn, who is president of the new Lakehead University; Mr. Dalziel, who is the director of education for the city of Port Arthur; and by Dr. Johnston, who is vice-president of the Lake-

head chamber of commerce, which I assume includes both municipalities.

There is nothing in the brief to indicate whether the educational authorities in Fort William were consulted. I cannot tell the hon. member whether they were, but there is a letter on file addressed to the Minister from the business administrator of the Fort William board, requesting that consideration be given to Fort William as a possible location for such a college.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on my feet, before the orders of the day, just a very short statement.

As was indicated in the Throne speech, plans were underway to develop classes for our new Canadians within the school system, and I am pleased to announce today that grants will be paid to school boards in the province who establish classes for new Canadians. These expenditures are necessary. I think this is obvious, because in many cases the new Canadians cannot be placed in the regular classroom environment because they lack the ability to speak or understand the language of instruction. These classes will be in the same category as the auxiliary classes for, say, the emotionally disturbed, the hard of hearing, and will be treated in this fashion. The problem will not be resolved by additional payments alone.

The boards themselves still have, I think, a very complicated task to deal with, but we feel that the regulations that have been sent out to the boards—I believe they went out yesterday, and this was done after consultation with the citizenship branch of The Provincial Secretary's Department and with that of the Minister as well, because of his interest in this area—we think this will enable the boards to develop a more comprehensive approach to the instruction of these new Canadian children.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Could I ask the hon. Minister a question on that?

Does this mean that you will be taking over the whole of the new Canadian language training, or will the Provincial Secretary still look after the evening classes for adults?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear, this is part of the regular school programme. This will be done for the children, shall we say, in the school system itself. These will be auxiliary classes for new Canadians.

Mr. Freeman: Mr. Speaker, my second question is directed to the hon. Minister of

Labour and was inadvertently placed in the name of the hon. member for York South.

Has The Department of Labour authorized overtime hours for the maintenance crew of Caland Ore Company in Atikokan, which has been working 12 hours a day seven days a week, from May to December of last year? How can the hon. Minister justify such a serious breach of the law which authorizes only 100 hours overtime per year, and is he aware that this issue is one of the main reasons for the strike which has just begun?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I have no question from the hon. member for Fort William.

Mr. Speaker: The question was given to me as being from the member for York South but apparently it was a typographical error in the NDP office.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, we have not authorized any overtime hours with respect to this company. Therefore, paragraph two does not apply and would appear to be superfluous.

As to the third paragraph, I am now aware, but was not aware prior to this morning, that this issue is one of the reasons for the strike at the Caland Ore properties. The last investigation and inspection of the Caland Ore properties by the department indicated that the company was in compliance with The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act. Since then the department has not received any complaints from any employee with respect to overtime and hours of work at this operation.

In checking the matter of the strike, as stated in the question, I have looked into the labour relations matters with which this company is concerned, and I find that a conciliation board on February 2 of this year worked out a memorandum of agreement with representatives of both the company and the union.

The memorandum of agreement embraced 10 items, one of which dealt with overtime. The agreement was subsequently submitted to the union membership for ratification, but was turned down. The conciliation board report was released on February 7, leaving the union to strike seven days after receipt of the report. As to the actual causes of the strike and whether this was the main item or one of others, I have no information.

With respect to the dispute itself, and the fact that a strike is currently in progress, every effort will be made by the department and the conciliation branch to bring the

parties together to try to find a resolution of their difficulties.

Mr. Freeman: Would the hon. Minister tell us when the last inspection was conducted at the property?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It was in March, 1965.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given.

How many full-time psychiatrists are on the staff of the Ontario hospital at North Bay; how many patients are presently in the hospital, and what number of patients was the hospital originally built to house?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, 5, 715 and 720.

Mr. Ben: I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), notice of which has been given.

1. How many females during the last full year were sentenced to terms in prisons under the jurisdiction of The Department of Reform Institutions as would entitle them to apply for parole, either federal or provincial;

2. How many of the females mentioned in answer to question 1 applied for (a) federal parole or remission of sentence; (b) provincial parole;

3. How many of the females mentioned in answer to question 2 (a) and (b) were granted parole or remission of sentence; and

4. How many of the females granted parole were subsequently in breach of parole?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): In answer to question 1, every female admitted to a provincial reformatory is entitled to apply for a federal parole. In the last fiscal year the number was 576.

With respect to 101 of those serving indefinite sentences, the only ones over which the provincial parole board has any jurisdiction, there was no need for them to apply for the provincial parole. Any female serving an indefinite sentence is automatically interviewed by our parole board without any necessity for applying for parole.

The board had 156 interviews with females last year. This is somewhat higher than the actual number of inmates, but is accounted for by the same person being interviewed on more than one occasion, and a number of these cases would have been sentenced the previous fiscal year.

The federal parole board—or the national parole board, as it is rightly called—can deal with any sentence. Application must be made to the national parole board on behalf of the person concerned.

The Ontario parole board concerns itself with those serving indefinite sentences, which I have already pointed out are the only ones with which the Ontario parole board can deal. This board sees every person concerned without any necessity for applying for consideration.

In answer to question 2—"How many of the females mentioned in answer to question 1 applied for (a) federal parole or remission of sentence; (b) provincial parole?"—with reference to (a), I am unable to give figures, because applications may be made on behalf of the woman by her lawyer, family or friends, as well as by the woman herself. I am here referring to those eligible for national parole.

Members of our staff have a responsibility to assist those who wish to apply for national parole, and we have forms available for that purpose. However, we can keep no accurate record of applications for national parole, because these applications, of necessity, go through federal and not provincial channels.

In answer to (b) of that question—this was partially answered in reply to question 1. Every one of the 101 females receiving an indefinite sentence was interviewed by the Ontario parole board. It is interesting to note that of these 101, there were 50 serving a sentence of less than 6 months, and 25 of the 50 were serving sentences of 3 months or less.

On question 3—"How many of the females mentioned in answer to question 2 (a) and (b) were granted parole or remission of sentence?"—the reply is that four females were released on parole by order of the national parole board, and one by remission of sentence on their authority. Forty-eight were released by order of the Ontario parole board; 47 of these were authorized during the fiscal year and one had been held over from the previous year.

On question 4—"How many of the females granted parole were subsequently in breach of parole?"—the reply, as in answer to question 2, is that we have no figures with reference to breach of national parole. In respect to the Ontario parole, six females violated Ontario parole during the fiscal year.

Mr. Ben: Do I understand correctly that about 10 per cent of the female prisoners in custody in provincial institutions received

parole or remission of sentence—either provincial or federal—during the last fiscal year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have not figured out the percentages. I have pointed out that 48 out of 101 which were within our jurisdiction to grant parole, were released by our parole board. I pointed out, too, that the hon. member must remember that 50 of these were serving sentences of less than six months and of these, 25 were serving sentences of less than three months. Obviously there would be very little point in providing parole for those who were serving sentences of less than three months because it is obvious that the judges or magistrates who sentenced them to three months wanted them to serve for three months.

Mr. Ben: My question was this. As I understand from the figures given by the hon. Minister, there were 576 inmates within the control of the hon. Minister within the last statistical year. Of these, 53 were granted parole or remission of sentence; 48 under the jurisdiction of the hon. Minister and four plus one under the federal jurisdiction, which would appear to be 53 out of 576, which is in fact 10 per cent. I just want to know if my figures are correct.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course the figures are correct, but again just to get the record straight, we have no control of the difference between 101 and 576.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Third order, committee of the whole House.

Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

Mr. Chairman: On section 14:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Prior to section 14 being carried, I am sure the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) would want to clarify something which I think is of concern to the people. I am using section 14 for this, Mr. Chairman, because in the repeal of that section of The Medical Services Insurance Act, there would be a vacuum—apart from the fact of the hon. Minister setting up his own government insurance programme, and I wonder, sir, with the indulgence of the hon. Minister, could I read out a series of questions? I am not passing a motion.

My first question is that as I understand it the government has said that its Medicare programme is going to cost the province \$58.9 million over the first year. Assuming that is right, could I ask: Can the government estimate what the administrative costs will be; can the government estimate how much will be expended in wages, and on advertising the plan for enrolment?

Also, how much will be received in subscriptions from the three groups which will be participating in the plan—I am thinking of the fully subsidized, the partially subsidized and the non-subsidized? How many estimated subscribers are there and what is the breakdown? How many single persons are expected to participate and how many married couples?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I would be happy to have these questions asked and answered and I hope they will be at some stage, but for the guidance of the rest of us who also have many questions on which we want information, do these questions relate to section 14 which proposes to repeal section 21? It would seem to me it would be better if they were raised at some other time, possibly on the motion to report the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, in an endeavour to be helpful, I have to agree with my hon. friend from Woodbine. I cannot see, Mr. Chairman, where this falls within the ambit of section 14, but to be in a position to give the hon. leader of the Opposition some kind of reasonable answer I wonder if he would consider taking this up under my estimates? I can give some of the figures now but I cannot give all of them by any means.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear what the hon. Minister does answer. I realize that I am throwing these at him, but he has his advisers here and these are certainly of considerable importance.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My advisers are not here today.

Mr. Thompson: I beg your pardon? Are they going to be coming to the House shortly?

Well, with your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, I tried to get it in. I will hold off on the questions, although there is a continuity to them. I have only got about another three, if the hon. member for Woodbine would let me continue.

How many estimated subscribers, and then what is the breakdown? How many single persons are expected to participate and how many married couples; and would the government table its method of arriving at the \$58.9 million figure? Would the government table its claim breakdown? How much is estimated to be spent from public funds for obstetrics, and how much for office calls?

As I understand—and I would appreciate if the hon. Minister would clarify this—with the welfare recipients half is going to be paid by Ottawa, that is on indigents—half premiums are to be paid by the subscribers, and with non-subsidized individuals all is to be paid by the subscriber. For that reason, I wonder how the hon. Minister has arrived at the \$58.9 million figure?

May I say, sir, that one of the concerns I had is the question of the cost of administration for the first year. I have asked how much that would be, but I am wondering whether a large part of that cost of administration is not for the building which I understand has cost the government \$3.15 million. Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, to answer the last question first, not one penny of that is going towards the cost of the building. The building is provided for us by public works. We are not authorized, nor are we empowered, to buy buildings or to rent them. This is all done by our real estate agent, The Department of Public Works.

I would only be guessing at the figures the hon. leader of the Opposition has mentioned and I think it would be most unreliable to try to answer them from guesswork. I have none of that information with me because I could see nothing in these amendments which would give rise to a question of this kind. Nevertheless, at the proper time I will be armed with this information insofar as it is possible to give it, because a great deal of this, the hon. leader of the Opposition is bound to realize, would be estimates.

For instance, it would be impossible to give any reliable opinion or suggestion as to how much would go to office calls and how much would go for obstetrics. One could only judge from a sampling of the experience we have now and say this is a possibility. But it would be little better than, I do not even believe it would be, an educated guess; it would be a very bare guess to me. However, I can—with respect to the estimate for salaries, for advertising, for the potential number of subscribers and how we arrived

at the \$58.9 million—I can have those figures when my estimates for this matter are before the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, while we are still on section 14, I want to make a few comments with regard to it. We are going to oppose repeal of section 14 for this reason: I concede in advance that leaving this in the bill precisely as it is will be untidy in that it will continue to deal with certain sections in relation to private carriers which the government has struck out completely from their plan at the moment; but we are going to oppose it because I think it underlines once again a very serious defect in the whole approach of the government.

As we have pointed out many times before in the debate, and I just mention it in passing without going into detail, the government has now withdrawn from regulation of private carriers completely in terms of maximum premiums, and in this particular section in terms of that most serious abuse which was one of the motivating forces that got the government into action in bringing in its bill a year ago, namely, the prevalence of cancellation of policies by insurance companies; sometimes without valid reason, and often without notice. We have this problem in other insurance fields and have dealt with them under other circumstances in this House and we will come back to them. I am thinking, for example, of car insurance and the fire insurance field.

But I just want to draw to the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, the kind of situation which is going to be left completely unregulated by the complete withdrawal of the government from this particular field of coping with the cancellation of policies.

The government has fixed a premium of \$150 for a standard policy. We have argued, and I think with considerable evidence to justify it, that this is so high that in the instance of certain low income groups they are simply not going to be able to buy it. If they are not in a group, if they are individuals or individual families who are seeking coverage, they are in fact going to become the 12 or 15 per cent who will likely remain uncovered in Ontario. Experience in Alberta has proven that they remain uncovered there with premiums of approximately the same level.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, what is going to happen? These people are going to be driven to seek lesser coverage from the private carriers at lesser amounts, the kind of coverage that the government was willing, a year ago, to leave private carriers to provide. In

other words, the government established a standard policy that every company must meet, but they left them free to offer lesser coverages for lesser amounts. With a good salesman they will go out and persuade someone to buy what he thinks will be necessary to meet his health requirements, on a catastrophic basis only, for perhaps \$75. He will find, as experience has proven, that the very problem that he faces will not be met by the policy that he happened to have bought.

But, Mr. Chairman, since the government has left a certain number of individuals—and it may be a good percentage of this 12 or 15 per cent—as the ready victims of the private carriers it has not even gone forward to the point of protecting them from a cancellation of policy. In other words, a family that feels they cannot spend \$150 will become amenable to the plea of a salesman, from a certain insurance company to buy coverage at, say, \$75 a year. But it still leaves that company free to cancel the policy at will if perchance this family comes up with a claim that they think represents too high a risk. Now I think this is deplorable.

I think the government was quite rightly disturbed, even if somewhat belatedly disturbed a year ago, in moving into the field and making it impossible for private carriers to cancel policies for any other reason than non-payment of premium. But here they are, letting this continue; therefore the only recourse we have, to express our opposition to this return to an untrammelled and unfettered and unregulated free enterprise in the exploitation of sickness and illness—the only opportunity we have to voice our objection to it—is to vote against repeal of this section which dealt with the regulations or the statutory requirements which would block the cancellation of policies.

I would hope the hon. Minister might be persuaded; but apparently he thinks this is completely outside his purview. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, he is going to leave a lot of citizens—

An hon. member: It was not last year.

Mr. MacDonald: It was not last year—you are right. And it is going to leave a lot of citizens in the province ready victims to this kind of abuse that has grown up in the insurance field.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Chairman, there is no use of opposing this for the sake of opposing, or talking for the sake of talking; and it would not make sense in

drafting a bill to leave this particular section in the bill. We have said again and again that we do not want health insurance or medical insurance carried by private carriers. We want the private carriers out of the bill; and where private carriers still exist in the province of Ontario, we really do not want them. But they do not come under this department; they would come under The Insurance Act. Therefore, to repeal this section, as asked by the government, is the sensible thing to do.

Again I emphasize: We want the private carriers out of it completely. We are happy to see any section repealed that gets rid of the private carriers; therefore, under this section, we support the government.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is about the most complete capitulation to the position of the government I have ever seen, under the guise of a curious sort of shop logic. The hon. member says he wants to see the private companies out of the picture altogether, so the method by which he proposes to do that is to give them an untrammelled free rein in the field. They could carry on without any regulation at all, where we take the position that they should be regulated.

We agree that they should not really be selling insurance in this field at all; but the hard plain fact is that they are going to be, after this legislation passes. They are going to have a very large area in which they will operate.

We are well aware of the fact that, in their operations, they have engaged in practices—or many of them have engaged in practices—which are quite unfair to the policyholder. As far as we are concerned, we will do anything possible to limit them in that, and bring them under some sort of reasonable control as long as they are operating in this field, Mr. Chairman.

It is not our idea that they should operate. If they are there, we want something done about it. Here, at least, was a section—which is now to be repealed—which did provide for some regulation. Regulation as proposed in the old bill was to be by the superintendent of insurance; as far as we are concerned, let it carry on that way. It might be more logical and tidier to have it in The Insurance Act; but I would rather have the job done than merely cater to tidiness.

I think it is ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, that we should be so concerned about tidiness that we just do not do anything at all. At least we had something, in a law that was already in effect. That law is in effect. I do not

know that it has been proclaimed, but it certainly has been passed.

Here it is, right on the statute books, an important field of regulation. It is now proposed by the government that it should be taken out of the statute. I say: Keep it in the statute—unless and until the government is prepared to come in with something as good or better, by way of amendment to The Insurance Act.

I agree it would be tidier in The Insurance Act. I said that, back two or three years ago, when the government brought in its first bill in this field, which was mainly a bill to regulate private carriers, the best place to do it would have been in The Insurance Act; and it should have been done 30 years ago. You can say all that. The fact now remains that, if we follow the logic of the hon. member for Parkdale, we are now going to give away something we now have in return for absolutely nothing. What do we get in return? Nothing. They are operating; they will operate—

Mr. Trotter: Private carriers are not in the bill.

Mr. Bryden: They are in the legislation as it now exists. It is proposed in this bill—they are in it in the form that they are subject to certain regulations. Under section 21 of the Act as it now exists, they are subject to regulations in certain forms—not adequate, but better than nothing. If we pass section 14 of this bill then even that small amount of regulation goes down the drain.

This is what we are objecting to. We are not saying that section 21 of the Act is a very good section, and that it could not be greatly improved upon, but it is better than absolutely nothing. And the proposal before us is that in place of it there should be absolutely nothing at all.

I suggest to the hon. member for Parkdale that he give the matter another thought. I think he might agree with me. He is usually in the same position as we are—that Opposition groups are always in—that it is better to have a little bit than nothing at all. I think, if he would consider it further, he might see that it is better to keep section 21 than to repeal it, even though it would be much more desirable in our opinion to do a great many other things that are not contemplated in the bill at all.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I have to point out that the debate is completely out of order. We debated the principle of this bill on second

reading and it was carried by this House. May I read again from the explanatory note:

The first basic change is that the standard medical services insurance contract, the only thing to which Bill No. 136 has reference and the only thing in connection with which it gives The Department of Health any authority, the standard medical services insurance contract is to be supplied only by the medical services insurance division of The Department of Health. Accordingly, provisions dealing with the licensing and regulation of carriers in the medical services insurance programme have been repealed and complementary amendments have been made.

I am quite certain, Mr. Chairman, that my hon. friends from York South and Woodbine have not misunderstood the import of this section.

Mr. Bryden: The explanatory note has no special status.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: They know full well what this section means, and they know full well that it only has reference—that this whole Bill No. 136 only had reference to the regulatory powers over insurance carriers with respect to the standard contract. The standard contract is not to be sold now by private carriers. They are cut completely from the bill by virtue of these amendments. Therefore The Department of Health has no power or authority over them in any way. We went through all of this, sir, in connection with another section yesterday. We have gone through it in certain measure with several sections. Surely it is patent now that private carriers are out of the bill, and any reference to them must be taken from this bill, because we have to rewrite or prepare an entirely new Act to give us control over them.

There is a method, as the hon. member for Parkdale pointed out, Mr. Chairman, under The Insurance Act or The Prepaid Hospital and Medical Services Act. Those are the only legal instruments I know of, within the power of this Legislature, whereby these people now can be controlled. I therefore say that this debate so far has been completely out of order.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, I would disagree with the hon. Minister that the debate up to this point is out of order. It is perfectly clear under section 21 that what was being dealt with in Bill No. 136

was medical services insurance contracts. We agree with the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, it is a standard medical services insurance contract, a specific and peculiar contract.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister will read the subsection of section 21, which is now proposed to be repealed, he will see that an elaborate procedure is set out to cover those contracts which are non-cancellable, or which are renewable, other than standard medical services insurance contracts. That is what the section deals with.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member would also read the principle, inherent in these amendments, to rule out private carriers from this bill altogether. This has been debated and, I repeat, passed by this Legislature.

Mr. Bryden: That is not the principle enunciated even in the explanatory note, and after all the explanatory note has no official status. We are perfectly entitled to disagree with it. But if there is a question of principle involved here, the only question of principle, Mr. Chairman, is that private carriers will not now be selling standard contracts. That is the only question of principle.

It does not say anything about this ancillary matter that was dealt with in section 21 of the Act, and that is not affected by the principle that private carriers will not now deal in standard contracts. This was a further matter, dealt with in that old bill—it is actually an Act—which we think should be continued. Actually it does not say that the Minister of Health will regulate; it says the superintendent of insurance will carry on these functions.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on the same point, it has a very direct bearing on the bill which is before this Legislature, because of the extent to which the private carriers, who are going to have something between 60 or 70 or 80 per cent of the insurance in this field in the province, are going to be able to cancel the medical services insurance contracts under group plans. For example when a person leaves a group to the extent that he cannot carry that insurance forward, the only alternative that the person is going to have is to apply to the medical services insurance division for a standard contract. And you can well appreciate that it is this very section which will perpetuate the medical services insurance division administering

a plan for the people who are the high health risks in our community. It is because of this that in a very real sense this section, by its repeal, to the extent that private carriers are going to be allowed to cancel their insurance, is likely to turn the medical services insurance division into the equivalent of the assigned risk plan in the automobile insurance business.

Mr. Chairman: Shall section 14 carry?

An hon. member: No, no.

Mr. Chairman: Call in the members.

Shall section 14 stand as part of the bill?

All those in favour, please stand.

All those opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 79, the "nays," 7.

Section 14 agreed to.

Section 15 agreed to.

Section 16 agreed to.

On section 17:

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important section of the bill, dealing as it does with the provisions in the Act itself under which regulations are carried. You will recall that the provision of section 17 provides in subsection 3 a suggested—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, could we have order in the House? I am one desk in front of the hon. member and I cannot hear him.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I am going to propose is to the provision contained in subsection 3 of section 17 of the bill, which is the section of the bill which amends section 28 of The Medical Services Insurance Act.

Section 28 of The Medical Services Insurance Act is the section of that Act under which the Lieutenant-Governor in council may make the regulations which will, of course, in a very real sense determine the effective application of the bill. One of the matters—and there are many matters of concern under regulatory provisions such as are contained in that Act—is the provision proposed respecting the procedure for the acceptance by the Minister of charges in the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association. The proposed amendment is technical, but I will read it and then read

the section as amended, in order that it will make sense to the House:

I therefore move that in connection with section 17, that subsection 3 of section 17 of Bill No. 6 be amended with regard to the new clause (1a):

1. by inserting after the words "procedure for" in the first line the words "including arbitration procedures," and

2. by adding thereto the words "and thereafter."

so that that particular clause will read:

The Lieutenant-Governor in council may make regulations respecting the procedure for including arbitration procedures and conditions of acceptance by the Minister of any change in the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association respecting any new procedure or any incidental or ancillary matter during the two-year period mentioned in subsection 1 of section 20 and thereafter.

The purpose of the amendment, of course, is perfectly clear, and that is to provide a procedure by which the Minister will be involved in changes.

Mr. Chairman: Moved by the member for Riverdale that subsection 3 of section 17 of Bill No. 6 be amended with regard to the new clause (1a):

1. by inserting after the words "procedure for" in the first line, the words "including arbitration procedures," and

2. by adding thereto the words "and thereafter."

Mr. Renwick: The purpose of the amendment is simply to make certain that the Minister of Health is involved in any changes which take place in the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association, whether they occur during the first two years or at any time thereafter, and to make provision that if agreement cannot be reached between the Minister and the Ontario medical association on the schedule of fees, that the matter should be referred to arbitration and settled by arbitration.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, there are other matters that arise in connection with section 17 of the bill, and I would like to direct some questions to the hon. Minister in regard to them.

Included in the new clauses that are to be added when section 17 is carried—assuming that it will be—will be the power to prescribe subscription rates. I think that was probably

in the old Act in some other form, and it is in here now. The hon. Minister has, I think, been quite frank with the House and generous in the information he has tried to give, and on a number of occasions he has tried to the best of his ability to indicate what he expects to see in the regulations. I think all members of the House appreciate the courtesy this hon. Minister has always shown in that matter. When he brings in legislation where regulations are going to be an important factor, he tries to indicate as far as he can, his thinking about the regulations, and that is always very helpful to members in assessing the bill.

Therefore, when I ask some further questions about what he has in mind with respect to the regulations, I am certainly not implying that we have not appreciated the information he has given us up to now. One thing, however, that has occurred to me in relation to his new formula on subsidization, relates to the borderline cases and the anomalies that can arise there.

As I recall the hon. Minister's thinking last year, he had it in mind that there would be a fairly elaborate sliding scale of subsidization—a subsidy that would be in inverse proportion to the amount of taxable income up to a certain limit. I assume that has been scrapped because it has been found to be difficult from the administrative point of view. I do not know this—it is just an assumption I am making. It seems to me that in principle it had a lot of merit in it. On the other hand, one has to balance the merit in principle against feasibility in practice, and I have no doubt that what the hon. Minister now proposes is a lot simpler to administer.

It does, however, bring forth in a very acute form, this problem of anomalies at the borderline, because unless there is going to be some sort of notch clause, or notch clauses in his regulations, anomalous situations could arise. Take the case, say, of a family of three or more. It is entitled to a subsidization of \$90 per year if it has some taxable income, but no more taxable income than \$1,300 a year.

So the situation could arise where a family whose taxable income was precisely \$1,300, would get \$90 a year, but a family whose taxable income was \$1,325 would get nothing. The second family would, therefore, be \$65 worse off than the other even though its income was higher.

Now, I raise the point only to ask the hon. Minister if he has in mind any way of dealing with it. If he has not, would he

take it under advisement before the regulations are issued?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I appreciate this problem, sir, and I can assure hon. members that we have thought about it every possible way we can. We recognize that there is this sudden cut off. We determined, of course, that there had to be a cut off and we determined on this figure. We realized that no matter where we cut off we would be up against the same "grey" area where the person just over the border seems to be quite severely penalized. I have not got an answer to the problem yet, but we are continuing to look at it.

I would say very frankly that I would appreciate any suggestions, apart from the failure to observe our cut off mark.

The hon. member spoke about the elaborate sliding scale, and I grant you that I thought it was more fair, and it did not make this sudden cut off so obvious.

Mr. Bryden: No, the cut off was small.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: That is right; it was only a matter of \$10, when you got up close to the border line. However, it was administratively difficult. My people pointed out to me that it would increase the administration a great deal, and since our concern was to keep administrative costs to the bare minimum, we felt that this was one place to save considerable administrative costs.

I repeat, we have not found a method of dealing with this and we will continue to look into it.

With respect to the proposals of the hon. member for Riverdale, it would seem to me that discussing arbitration procedure suggests there will be two parties to a dispute, or disagreement, or difference of opinion.

Mr. Chairman, I pointed out yesterday that the medical profession, the body with whom we will be dealing, the body who will provide the services, have told me that the association has no power or authority to negotiate. So that there cannot be two parties, and if we were to get into arbitration it would be with individual doctors.

What we propose to do under this—and this so far is only in the proposal stage, but it is about the only method left open to us—is that we will look at any proposed changes. This clause is actually to give us the power and authority to deal with internal changes in the fee structure that come about from time to time. As long as this does no harm to the whole fee structure, then we

can make internal arrangements and deal with them.

Our thinking at the present time is that if there should arise the necessity to discuss fee schedules, then we will determine what we believe is just and equitable; we will discuss it with the representatives of the medical profession so that they will be advised of, and aware of, what we are thinking. Then we will have to do exactly as we did in the case of the 90 per cent—we are going to have to come to an arbitrary decision and tell the profession that this is it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I have two other points that perhaps the hon. Minister would comment on in dealing with the section related to the regulations. Is it his intention to include in the regulations to be published the actual schedule of fees and any changes which may take place in it from time to time?

It is my impression now that the schedule of fees of the Ontario medical association is, for practical purposes, known only to the doctors. Now that standard contracts are going to provide for payment of those fees related to that schedule, is it not a wise suggestion to put that schedule of fees into the regulations, and to provide by changes in the regulations for any changes that may take place from time to time in that schedule so that the people who are having the benefit of standard coverage could have a public place where they could refer to the schedule?

The other point which concerns me is whether, inadvertently, by making schedule A the actual contract part of the statute, we have burdened ourselves with a very cumbersome method of making any changes in the standard contract. If at any time, on the recommendation of the medical council, it is decided that the area of services to be covered should it be enlarged it may well be that the provisions relating to the regulations should contain specific power to pass regulations to enlarge the comprehensiveness of the contract with a protective provision, of course, to prevent the services from being restricted.

I would appreciate it if the hon. Minister would make any comment on those two remarks.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I had not thought of publishing the schedule of fees, and I do not know where we would stand in respect of this, but I certainly will take this under consideration and discuss it with my people.

As for the other proposal, I can see no harm to accepting it. Indeed, I am prepared to propose an amendment to this effect on the suggestion of the hon. member.

I cannot say anything more about the schedule. I do know that this schedule is available to any member of the public who wants to buy it. It costs \$2, but if it is published in the regulations it might be more readily available to them. I do not know, but we will think about this.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my support to what the hon. member for Riverdale has said. I think definitely, sir, that there should be a schedule of rates. Government money, taxpayer money, is being spent here, and doctors are no different from other people. As taxpayers we have a right to know what they are earning for certain tasks they perform. There is no doubt in the world that the vast majority of doctors are most conscientious and honest. On the other hand, there are always bad apples in a barrel.

I think that to put this above board, sir, so there is no suspicion of anyone, a schedule of fees definitely should be published so that the doctors know what they can charge, and we as taxpayers and patients know for what we are paying.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there is a schedule of fees, there is no question about that, but unfortunately it is a guide and the doctor can use it as a guide if he so chooses. I have never known any doctor loath to discuss the schedule of fees with a patient, but again many patients are not too anxious to discuss fees. When you are sick and you go to see the doctor, you do not go worrying about money, you go to get better, we hope. However, as I have promised, I will give very definite consideration to this proposal. Frankly, I had not thought about it being in the regulations.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister know offhand what the charge for a house call is under the schedule of fees today?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I do not. I have not made a house call for a long time and I really do not know. I believe it is six dollars, but I do not know.

Mr. Whicher: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am aware of cases where it has been as high as \$17 just lately.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well now, that depends how far the call was from the doctor's office.

Mr. Whicher: It was one and a half blocks.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, of course, I know nothing about it.

Mr. Whicher: I know the hon. Minister does not, but that is what happened.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sopha): Normally less than a plumber, however.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: My TV repair man charges fifty cents more than I do.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, following on this, the hon. Minister, I believe, has said that the cost to the province would be \$58.9 million. I find it difficult to know how the hon. Minister arrives at that figure if he has not had some kind of suggested schedule. I do not want to go through those questions again, but I have asked this question before and I wondered if I can get an answer to some of my questions.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: At the moment we are getting that information for the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I would move an amendment that subsection (k) of section 28 be amended by inserting "extensions or" before the word limitations so that the clause will now read:

—prescribing extensions or limitations on benefits under the standard contract.

Clerk of the House: The amendment is by inserting the words "extensions or" before "limitations."

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman; I am sorry, that should be "extensions of or limitations on."

Clerk of the House: So the section will read "prescribing extensions of or limitations on benefits under the standard contract."

Mr. Chairman: Does the member withdraw his amendment?

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I would withdraw to allow the hon. Minister's amendment to take its place provided it be re-introduced.

Mr. Chairman, I have just one comment—the point is not the extension of the benefits

in relation to payments only, but it is the extension of the services to be provided and whatever the appropriate wording to cover that would be most—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is actually a benefit. If we add services to the contract we are extending benefits.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment please say "aye."

Mr. Chairman: Those opposed say "nay."
The amendment is carried.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, to return to this matter of the Ontario medical association schedule of fees, I think that the hon. Minister confused the issue somewhat when he said the OMA schedule of fees is merely a guide. That is absolutely correct, it is merely a guide for the individual doctor. They cannot make it compulsory upon him. In fact, I think that if they tried they might be in trouble with the combines people in Ottawa. So a doctor could charge twice as much or half as much as the schedule of fees, if he wished.

That is true with regard to the doctor, but it is not true with regard to our legislation. This schedule of fees now becomes the basis upon which public funds are paid out, and from that point of view it is no guide, it is law—90 per cent of that schedule must be paid out. Therefore, I think it is imperative, since it now becomes part of the public law of the province that it be public. The average citizen has the greatest difficulty getting a look at the schedule of fees. I have seen it but only after considerable difficulty. I do not say that previously anyone had any right to look at it; up until now it has been for the information and benefit of the medical profession, but henceforth, it is a matter of public interest.

I think the schedule of fees under which payments are going to be made under this Act should be published in the regulations and confirmed by the regulations.

I may say also that this relates to the amendment that the hon. member for Riverdale proposed and then withdrew. Maybe I will say something about that later. Perhaps, just for this moment, we can stay with the specific point of the publication of the schedule of fees.

Mr. Trotter: Well, Mr. Chairman, the only way we are going to have any control over the doctors is to keep the public happy. In other words, if the doctors start to boost the

OMA fees as high as they like, there would obviously be a great outcry from the public. Surely the public should have a right to know what the schedule of the OMA fees is. It should be in the regulations.

We in this party support the hon. member for Woodbine in what he has said. Surely if you are spending public money, not only the government, but the public in general have a right to know what the fee schedule is. Also, they will know from time to time if the fee schedule is being raised and how much, and of course, it will again be for public opinion to decide if the doctors are charging too much.

When we were discussing it yesterday I was one of those in favour of saying let us trust the doctors, they will not go too far in their charges. In other words, we do not want to move in and have price control on what a doctor charges for fees.

One thing that will act indirectly in a so-called free enterprise market, if you wish to call it that, is that public opinion will judge what the doctors are doing, and the only way the public are going to judge is if they have knowledge of what the fee schedule is. Surely it is not asking too much of the hon. Minister if he would promise here and now that the fee schedule will appear in the regulations.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I cannot promise this to the House. I have undertaken to you, sir, that I will give this very careful consideration, and if it is possible and it comes within my right to do so I will act. I can assure the House that I have taken very seriously the things they have said about this and will be governed by the sentiment of this House.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister whether, with his staff here now, he is prepared to answer some of those questions? Shall I quote them again?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would the hon. leader of the Opposition pose his questions? My staff did not hear them, and I did not get them all down.

Mr. Thompson: Certainly. My questions are:

Am I correct that the government's estimated cost was \$58.9 million over the first year? Can the hon. Minister tell us whether he has an estimate on what his administrative costs will be? Can the hon. Minister estimate how much will be expended in wages? How much will be spent to ad-

vertise the enrolment plan? How much will be received in subscriptions from the three groups which will be participating in the plan, those three groups being the fully-subsidized, the partially subsidized and the non-subsidized? How many subscribers are you considering in this \$58.9 million? What is the breakdown in that estimate of single persons and married couples?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. leader of the Opposition wants these answers right now, we can get them for him. I can tell him that the administrative cost is estimated to be five per cent.

Mr. Thompson: Five per cent? Thank you.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Now, how this is broken down still further they will have to find for me. If you will give me a list of these questions, I will get the answers for you.

Mr. Thompson: Fine.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, to draw the session back just for a moment further to the question of the fee schedule, and respecting the hon. Minister's reply to our request that it be included as part of the regulations, some of us understand the medical services insurance division is preparing a handbook for distribution to the various doctors who join the plan, and the interested parties throughout the province, which handbook will include a printing of the OMA fee schedule. If it is, therefore, to be part of the branch policy to disseminate that information in public terms, should it not also logically then be appended to this Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, there is no intention of publishing the fee schedule to send out to the people or the doctors.

First of all, the doctors have it. This book—the last one I saw is something like 100 pages—would be a very costly undertaking. In fact, it would pay me better to buy the books from the OMA and distribute them. No, there is no intention of publishing the fee schedule, or us reprinting the fee schedule and sending it to every person in the province.

Mr. S. Lewis: Not to the doctors?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, the doctors do not need to have it sent to them, they have it

now. Every doctor has a copy of the fee schedule. It is automatically sent to him.

Mr. MacDonald: Following this, if I might, Mr. Chairman, while we are on it, is not the medical services insurance branch developing a manual for their own internal use, which is going to include the fee schedule, with regard to claims procedure?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, if you are doing that—admittedly this may be just for your own internal use—I think the hon. member for Scarborough West is just pointing out that if you are including it there for your own internal use, it should be part of the bill, so that everybody knows what it is. This is the basis upon which public moneys are going to be spent.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I am not arguing this with the hon. members at all. I have undertaken to you, sir, to give very careful consideration to this. I have listened carefully and, I think, sympathetically, to all that has been said. I think there is a great deal of validity to what has been said, and I have undertaken to give most careful consideration to this.

Mr. Sopha: May I ask the hon. Minister if I understand correctly, that a building has been obtained for the administration of this Act?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: And where is that building?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: At 135 St. Clair avenue west, the corner of St. Clair and Avenue road.

Mr. Sopha: May I inquire who it was purchased from?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, he would have to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). I had nothing to do with the real estate dealings.

Mr. Thompson: He did answer who it was purchased from. I think there was a question about—

Mr. Sopha: I am particularly interested to find out who it was purchased from.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I really do not know, because I have nothing to do with the purchasing of the real estate. That is done by The Department of Public Works, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: Well, if my wife buys a car, I am interested in where she buys it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, but this is entirely different. The Department of Public Works is involved in all property transactions for the government, sir, and when they hand me the keys, that is the first I have to do with the building. I have nothing to do with it prior to that, except to see it, and to pass judgment that it would suit our uses.

Mr. Sopha: This is the strangest sort of secrecy that I ever heard of. Does the hon. Minister mean to say that before he gets the building he isn't even interested in it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I recall this was asked as a question before the orders of the day some weeks ago, and I think the record is in *Hansard* now.

Mr. Sopha: It was not asked before the orders of the day. We are particularly interested to find out who the owner was.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): There is no secret about who owned the building. It was the McNamara Gunnar Corporation, or—

Mr. Sopha: All right. Then may we hear who is on the board of directors of the McNamara Gunnar Corporation?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not have that information.

Mr. Sopha: Could we have that information?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It is available by a search. I will take it under advice.

Mr. Sopha: Could we ascertain how much was paid for this building?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: This has already been answered.

Mr. Sopha: Could we find out how much was paid by the McNamara Gunnar Corporation for the building?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, I think this is a little remote.

Mr. Sopha: It is not remote at all.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: It has nothing to do with the bill here whatever.

Mr. Sopha: The administrative costs come within this Act and it is not remote at all.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Not the cost of the building to the vendor.

Mr. Sopha: Oh yes. I would like to know—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I have already pointed out in answer to a question when the hon. member for Sudbury was not in his seat, that the cost of this building has nothing whatsoever to do with the administrative costs of this programme at all. The building was purchased, as in the case of all public buildings, by The Department of Public Works, for the use of The Department of Health. It is paid for out of The Department of Public Works budget.

I do not concern myself with how this is acquired or anything else. I have no authority over that building until the key is handed to my department, and I have no costs involved in it whatsoever coming out of the medical services insurance division budget.

Mr. Sopha: Well, all this sounds like a very excessive answer to a very simple question. My point is that I am rather surprised that before the hon. Minister gets a building he does not even go and have a look at his real estate.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did.

Mr. Sopha: He was telling us a while ago that he did not move in with the OHSC because there was not enough floor space.

Now in this day of high taxes I say we are entitled to know how much the Gunnar Corporation paid for that building when it got it, and how much it sold it to you for. I suggest that is a minimum of information we should have. And we should also know who is on the board of directors of the Gunnar Corporation, because you are going to find a very interesting name when you look at the board. I would also like to know whether that interesting name had any connection.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, I know that I am not on the board.

Mr. Sopha: Well, nobody said you were on the board.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the Opposition asked some questions. How did we arrive at the \$59 million, the \$58.9 million?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: We estimate, and I repeat, these are estimates; in respect of the welfare recipients, we know that number was 275,000 persons: Estimated to cost \$40

per capita — \$5.5 million. Non-income tax group estimated at 756,000 at \$40 per capita, \$30.2 million. Partially assisted, 1,044,900 persons, estimated at \$40 per capita, \$23.3 million net, a total of \$59 million.

It is estimated that \$5.5 million will be received from the federal government under the Canada assistance plan. It is estimated that the administrative costs will be five per cent. We have no breakdown of the salaries, the advertising costs. And what was the other thing you asked?

Mr. Thompson: I have several other questions, but I appreciate what you have answered for me.

I notice you mention under welfare recipients \$40, may I question that? You said welfare recipients \$40, but surely you are going to get, under The Canada Assistance Act, half of that paid?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, the \$40 was the net by which we arrived at our projected cost. We estimated that the per capita claims cost — pure claims cost, would be \$40 annually.

We will reclaim from Ottawa under The Canada Assistance Act when it is passed, 50 per cent of what the province expends for medical care on those eligible under that Act. We estimate that will be \$5.5 million. They will give us \$20 per capita back, in other words, and that of course will come off your total.

Mr. Thompson: On the premium that the individual who is non-subsidized pays, will the hon. Minister be indirectly subsidizing this cost, does he think? I am thinking of the two other areas of indigents, half premiums to be paid by subscriber, and individuals who are non-subsidized, I assume that all that would be paid by the subscriber. I do not know if I make myself clear.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not quite clear on that. We will be subsidizing all of those that I have mentioned.

Mr. Thompson: I have tabled the other questions previously and I look forward to answers.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I have been up and down so many times to get at this I feel like the hon. member for Woodbine's Mexican jumping bean.

However, Mr. Chairman, I want to raise a number of questions with the hon. Minister that I think appropriately come under this

section. If you will let me return to this question of the OMA schedule of fees I am not concerned with the question of it being published—the hon. Minister has indicated he will give serious consideration to this. But I do want to raise it once again in the context of any future changes, and whether or not they are negotiable, whether or not changes remain the unilateral right of the OMA.

Let me say in this connection, Mr. Chairman, that I fully appreciate the difficulties that the hon. Minister of Health and the government have had in trying to—if I may use the word—"negotiate" this whole issue during the last five or six months. The hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts), and various government spokesmen have had many meetings, indeed the president of the OMA has been credited with attending at least a dozen meetings.

I was once credited in the press with saying that the government had presented their proposed amendment to the OMA. I wrote a letter to the paper, correcting this, but they did not even deign to publish my letter. Yet, I have never said that the government presented the amendment.

I know that the government was dealing with a body that had been excessively secretive—arguing that it had the exclusive right to deal with a matter that they think is their right. I think the government is coming to recognize, and the public recognizes, it is something beyond their exclusive right. I think the hon. Minister has been negotiating at arm's length.

One of the hon. Minister's problems is magnificently illustrated by this problem he faces now on any future changes in the OMA schedule of fees. I have reason to believe that the government said to the OMA that at the end of the two-year period, the schedule of fees would have to be negotiated. The counter-statement of their position by the OMA is that they have no power to negotiate the fees, they presumably can come up with a schedule of fees, but then they pass it on as a suggestion, and in effect the government is placed in the position where they have to negotiate with each doctor.

Now, I suggest to the hon. Minister that if the OMA is going to persist in this particular position, it may be necessary for the government statutorily to give the OMA the power to negotiate. The hon. Minister has given the OMA or its related body, the college of physicians and surgeons, certain powers in terms of the regulating and the

disciplining of the medical profession. Indeed, at the national level, the doctors' organizations are now considering whether or not they should negotiate. They have set up a committee to look into the question of whether they should not negotiate, and whether they should accept arbitration procedures in the event of not being able to reach a satisfactory and amicable solution in the negotiations.

I think this is the situation that the government finds itself faced with at the moment, and I sympathize with them completely. It is an intolerable situation. I do not think that the OMA can, with justice, say they have no power to deal with this.

In fact, they draw up the schedule of fees. In fact, it becomes a guide that most doctors accept. In fact, it is going to become the basis upon which the government is going to pay out public money.

Therefore, I think this needs to become institutionalized, if I may use that term. Because, I suggest to the hon. Minister, if he does not do this then he has only one alternative—the one that he, by implication, conceded he might have to resort to two years from now.

If the OMA say they will not negotiate with you; that they have no power; that they reserve the right to a unilateral decision when raising fees, then the hon. Minister is in a relatively powerless position. The only thing he can do is to go back to his bill and alter the 90 per cent payment figure. If the OMA schedule of fees goes up so much, you can reduce your payment to 75 or 80 per cent, so that in effect you keep payments at a level you think is fair. I would suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, this is a very untidy way of going about it.

Now, it may well be that up until now doctors have operated on the basis that this was their exclusive right. But, now that we are moving into the field of public provision for medical insurance I think the doctors have got to cut out this procedure and must be willing to sit down and negotiate a schedule of fees.

Now, sir, a good deal of the money has got to come out of the Treasury, and whether they like it or not they are going to be put into the position of everybody else who has to negotiate to a degree for the income that they will be receiving and will have to live on from this point forward.

However, I leave that because I am painfully aware that the hon. Minister has got a problem on his hands. But I have suggested one or two alternatives on how he

should cope with it, and I suggest the tidier alternative would be that he seek some sort of acceptance from the OMA for negotiation. I suggest that he should not be too timid in seeking this, because within the framework of their own organization they have acknowledged that they must do this. They have set up committees nationally to consider whether or not they should negotiate. Indeed, I wonder if the hon. Minister should not go one step further and in effect say to them now, rather than facing them with an arbitrary decision two years from now, that we want to negotiate and we will set up the procedure for arbitration if you cannot come to an amicable solution, so that they would know precisely where they stand and we would know precisely where they stand, Mr. Chairman.

So much for that and unless the hon. Minister has any comment on it I will go on to my questions that I wanted to raise with him.

This section is dealing with the regulations and, as has been pointed out, there is a new addition to it, the one that deals with the prescribing of subscription rates. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of questions I would like to put to the hon. Minister in this connection because I personally am not clear in my own mind as to how he anticipates this will operate. For example, if a patient gets a bill from a doctor and that patient is not in a position to pay that bill, can he send the bill on to the medical services division, where it will be paid? Or must he, in effect, have paid the bill and got, in effect, a receipt for it, and send that on to the government agency to get repayment? What is the procedure here? Would the hon. Minister mind clarifying it for me?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: If the patient is covered and the doctor wants to bill the patient directly, he does so. When that bill comes to the division the patient will be paid at the prescribed level, 90 per cent of the fee schedule for that service, but we will not ask for a receipt. We do not care what the patient does with the money when he gets it.

It was suggested to me, not by organized medicine, but by a few individuals, that we should not reimburse any patient until we get their receipts. That is not what we are in business for. We are in business to pay the patients' claims, and what the patient does with the money, if the doctor does not want to bill the plan directly but bill the patient, is not our concern.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, let me get this clear then. The doctor gives the patient a bill. The patient is not in the position to write a cheque or make a cash payment; he just has not got the money. He passes it on to the medical insurance division, which sends back 90 per cent. You are in effect saying that if he wants to go out and spend that money on beer, or a holiday in Florida, this is his own business. And if the doctor does not then get the money presumably this is going to be your procedure for putting pressure on the medical profession.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member would not think that of me, would he?

Mr. MacDonald: Of course I would not think that of the hon. Minister, but events may be pushing him in this direction. He may be the unwilling victim of events. It may be he will teach the doctors that the way to get their money, and to get it quickly and not have it dissipated on Florida visits or on beer, is to bill the government directly rather than giving the bill to the patient for when he gets the money it may just stick to his fingers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member said it.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, I said it.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The hon. member said it, I did not.

Mr. MacDonald: And the hon. Minister smiled in asquiescence.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I laughed out loud.

Mr. MacDonald: Very good. I think I have the answer to that.

Now, secondly, Mr. Chairman, I was curious about one point which I recognized as comparable to the procedure which exists in connection with hospital insurance. I happened to receive a letter from a lawyer in Hamilton who points to what he feels—and I think he has a point—is an injustice, namely, for mothers who support a single child on a single income—this may be women who are separated, who are divorced, maybe widows, they are trying to sustain themselves on this single income. The procedure, as I understand it, is that they are going to have to pay a family premium, though they are not really a family in the sense of father and mother and children, and the contention is that they should be treated as an individual.

Has the hon. Minister given any consideration to this, and what is his reaction?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I take it there would be the mother and one child? No, frankly I have not, other than in a general consideration, given consideration to details of this kind, but it would seem to me the logical way to deal with this would be to look upon this as a couple rather than a family unit. This might well be the kind of case that would be decided by the council.

There is one thing certain in my own thinking. I would want it administered in such a way that the least possible hardship was worked on the mother, and as I say, my first reaction would be that two single premiums would be better than charging a family unit.

Mr. MacDonald: I think the hon. Minister has gone a step in the direction that I feel is justifiable. I believe I am correct, in that under the hospital services commission, at the moment, a single person under these circumstances with a child is treated as a family.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I think that is right.

Mr. MacDonald: So maybe it should be reviewed in the context of both the prospective health plan and in the hospital services.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: There are two governments involved in that programme at the present time.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes.

A third question—and I hope that I might be able to explore with the hon. Minister something that I raised earlier in this debate. Has the hon. Minister in the last three or four days—he said he had not done it before—given any thought to the premium proposals that I made in my initial statement in this debate? If we are going to get subsidy of 50 per cent based on a \$34 national average, that would result in a \$110 million subsidy, from Ottawa. If the total cost is going to be \$40 per capita for the population of Ontario, in the range of \$260 or \$270 million, this leaves us \$150 million to be raised in the province of Ontario.

Now the hon. Minister has already indicated he is willing to spend under this bill approximately \$70 million for the subsidized and the partially subsidized groups. This leaves only \$80 million to be raised. And that extra \$80 million can be raised on premiums, which, if the hon. Minister has looked into, will find are valid, of \$20 for a single person, \$40 for a couple and \$50 for a family. In other words, we could give coverage to the whole

of the people of the province of Ontario for that amount.

Now, has the hon. Minister looked into it? Does he confirm that these are accurate assessments? And if so, why is he not willing to move quickly in giving that level of premiums for everybody in the province?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, at the time the hon. member brought this up I undertook to look into it and consider it. I have not done so yet and I am quite sure the hon. member will recognize why. I have been well tied down to this House.

I must point out that the postulated \$110 million from the federal government is not available to us yet, and in the whole context as we consider that programme and what the provincial attitude shall be toward it, I can assure the hon. member that this will be very carefully considered.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, you will recall that the first item on the consideration of this section is an amendment which I introduced and then withdrew when the hon. Minister introduced his amendment. I would like to ask that the amendment be now considered which I placed before.

Mr. Chairman: It has been moved by Mr. Renwick that subsection 3 of section 17 of Bill No. 6 be amended with regard to the new clause (1a) by inserting after the words "procedure for" in the first line, the words "including arbitration procedures"; 2. by adding thereto the words "and thereafter."

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, are you calling the amendment now?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I wanted to go back to an earlier matter. Since I asked that question earlier courteously, I do not see why there should be any attempt to deny to me information that the people are entitled to have. Two people have sent me notes referring to page 163 of *Hansard*, where the question was asked by the hon. leader of the Opposition, "How much was paid for that building in the previous sale?" The answer was given that the information was not available. I cannot comprehend that, because surely in purchasing real estate—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have to ask that you rule this out of order. It has nothing to do with my department whatsoever.

Mr. Sopha: What is the hon. Minister trying to hide?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am trying to hide nothing. I do not know anything about it. This is a matter for The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Sopha: I am trying to find out how the McNamaras got the contract of sale.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I repeat, sir, that this is a matter coming within the purview of The Department of Public Works. I have no responsibility for it at all. I have no knowledge of it. I have only the knowledge that I read on page 163 of *Hansard* where the question was asked already by the hon. leader of the Opposition. But I am quite certain that the hon. Minister of Public Works is capable and willing to answer the question of the hon. member if asked at the proper time and in the proper context.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order: About two days ago the hon. member for Sudbury rose, polished his halo and said that we were doing violence to the bill by bringing in matters that had no relevance to the bill. I suggest that he is doing precisely that now. He is engaged in a little bit of nit-picking.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I think this is very fundamental. One of the reasons why we did not have a close organization with the Ontario hospital services commission—the hon. Minister talked about the fact that under administration we would be able to cut out duplication, we would be able to have the wide experience of these people and so on—was the fact of floors.

Why should not the hon. member for Sudbury ask about the building in view of the fact we had duplication of administration on the excuse of one and a half floors?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: It is out of order.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, if somebody would just tell me how much profit the McNamaras made, the same people that tendered a \$100-a-plate dinner to the hon. Prime Minister of this province. Talk about Mr. Pearson being entertained by the Rockefellers. Here people sell a building to the government and they tendered a \$100-a-plate dinner to the leader of the province.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the member to ask his question at the proper time and then put it on the order paper.

Mr. Bryden: I was wishing to speak to the amendment, Mr. Chairman, now on the floor, the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Riverdale.

I think that a lot of the discussion we had in the interval during which the amendment was withdrawn indicates the need for this type of provision. The amendment, as I recall it, suggests at least the beginnings of a negotiation and arbitration procedure in the determination, not of the fees that individual doctors will charge, but of the basis on which payments will be made to the medical profession under this Act, and, I hope, under more comprehensive legislation that some day might follow.

I think it should be noted, Mr. Chairman, that what we are proposing here really is something that I think would be beneficial to the medical profession. It is not a proposal that would be restrictive on the profession. As the matter stands now, essentially the government arbitrarily determines what the basis of payment will be.

Now I am not saying that they do that in practice; they do not have discussions and so on with the medical association. As far as the law is concerned, however, they can arbitrarily determine the basis on which they will make payments. The statute says that for two years it will be on the basis of the OMA schedule existing at the time the section comes into force. Thereafter, as far as I can see, nothing governs it and, therefore, it would follow that the government simply determines itself what the schedule will be under its power to make regulations.

We are suggesting that there should be a recognized procedure whereby the government will talk to the doctors about the schedule of fees to be used as a basis for payment under the Act, and that if there is a dispute there should be some sort of machinery agreeable to both parties whereby the matter can be arbitrated. Then we would hope in those situations that both parties would accept the arbitration without further ado. I think it is necessary to work towards that type of procedure. Otherwise, we can anticipate trouble in the future.

I am not saying we will run into the kind of trouble that has occurred in Belgium, because I think Belgium is different from Canada; its problems are of an entirely different nature. On the other hand, there is a problem in Belgium, and the problem is over the negotiation of the payments that doctors are going to get. That is what it turns on. I think we should be preparing ourselves for this.

I believe that our amendment does not really go far enough, but it was the best we could do in dealing with the sections as they are now before us. I would like to see it clearly laid down in the Act, that we start off with the present OMA schedule. We then have a procedure whereby from time to time, as necessary, it can be changed by agreement, and where there is no agreement, there will be arbitration.

I do not think it is relevant for the hon. Minister to say that the OMA cannot negotiate for individual doctors. I am not suggesting that it can, but what it can do is speak for doctors as a group as to what they think is a desirable schedule of fees. They are doing it right now. They issue a schedule of fees as a recommended schedule. They are doing that as a group right now.

This schedule of fees is now acquiring a new significance because it becomes a basis under which payments are made out of public funds. The future determination of that schedule takes on a public significance that it did not previously have, and therefore, I think better guidelines should be laid down in the Act than are now laid down as to what we do a year from now, two years from now, five years from now and so on in relation to the very important schedule of fees which becomes really the basis of payment of public funds.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I have listened to these arguments carefully, and again I repeat that there could be, and would be, validity in the argument if there were two parties to negotiate. As I see it, there can be no negotiation unless there are at least two parties, and there are not two parties at the present time. I stated that we discussed this, and frankly I was going along merrily believing that the executive of the Ontario medical association did have the power to negotiate for the profession. When I was a practising physician and a member of the association I believed that the executive spoke for me, and when I participated in an election it was with this in mind, that these were the men whom I would choose to speak on my behalf. However, in the late days of our discussions, they told me that they did not have this power.

I am led to hope, as the hon. member for York South pointed out, the parent organization—and the OMA is a division of the parent organization, the Canadian medical association—has already established a committee to look into this whole matter of negotiating. I would, therefore, ask that hon. members indulge us for a time and let this go because

it covers the first two years of operation, in the hope that there will be satisfactory negotiation proceedings set up, a body empowered by the Ontario medical association to speak for them.

Of course, they are drawing up a fee schedule now which is acceptable to the group. This is a tariff arrived at by a committee which goes into the matter very extensively indeed. I think now it is a continuing committee dealing with this matter throughout the whole period between changes in schedule—this is the latest information I have about it. This is then put on the floor of the council which represents the whole profession and every member of council and every member of the association has a right and an opportunity to speak about it.

But I cannot possibly, on behalf of government, meet this huge body of people, and until they have an established group which is empowered to speak for the profession as a whole I think it would be most unwise to write into legislation that we are going to undertake this. I have stated already, sir, that we may very well have to do two years hence exactly as we did in this instance—discuss with the elected representatives of the profession, keep them aware of what we are proposing. Then if they still cannot negotiate, the government will be placed in the position of having to take an arbitrary decision and make it known to the profession.

I do not see how this proposed amendment would add anything to our Act at the present time. Probably next year, probably the year after, before we are ready to consider any changes in fee schedule, there will be the proper machinery that will allow an amendment such as is proposed by the hon. member for Riverdale to actually work.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the amendment of the member for Riverdale, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the amendment, please rise.

All those opposed to the amendment will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 24 and the "nays" 55.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost and section 17 approved.

Section 17 agreed to.

On section 18:

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, on section 18, we have a few remarks to make. The government in its amendment has suggested four items which admittedly are an improvement, but they do not go nearly far enough. There is one improvement particularly though. I am glad the government has seen fit to take the advice we gave them last year of removing the limitation for psychotherapy.

Time and time again we have tried to emphasize the importance of treating mental health on the same basis as we treat physical illness. I think in this province we spend about one-sixth the amount per patient on those who are mentally ill as on those who are physically ill.

We are well aware on this side of the House that by removing the limitations on psychotherapy the medical insurance scheme might be open to some abuse. I think if this is watched carefully that it will be a real advance forward. Insofar as that part is concerned, we heartily support this change.

The removal of the limitations on annual health examinations and well-baby care is a good thing, because one of the most important things in keeping down medical costs is finding an illness before it starts, or just at that point where it is about to begin. So many of these societies, like the cancer society, encourage people to have annual checkups so there is some opportunity for the doctor to find out if there is any illness. Well, one of the best ways to find it out is by having annual health examinations. So at least we can say the government has gone this far.

But if we look at such reports as the Hall commission report we learn of the importance of giving proper dental care. Well, the government has come into this House and it has said that in certain respects if there is surgical dental work being done it will be covered under this scheme. But again, prevention is so important, and what should be included under the schedule, which is part of this Act, is the dental care of children under the age of 18 years. As a party, we would like to see this done. We realize that a proper scheme would cover everybody who is going to need dental care, but under the present circumstances of the number of dentists who are available, and bearing in mind any medical health scheme will have to be phased over a period of time, we are saying that for a start, let us give the protection to those who are under 18.

What is even more important, Mr. Chairman, is that the government seems to be ignoring the heavy burden, particularly on older people, of the heavy costs of drugs. Admittedly, drugs are expensive and it would be an added expense to the scheme, but even as a beginning those people who are receiving old age assistance should receive drugs. The people who are getting on in years—those who are suffering from arthritis and similar ills—suffer from an extremely high cost of drugs. I know, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Health knows, and I am sure you know, Mr. Chairman, that there are many elderly people today who are trying to live under a very heavy burden of excessive drug costs. Therefore, I submit that this amendment the government has brought in, should have included drug costs for those who are receiving old age assistance.

Again I emphasize that this should be but a beginning.

Under what is covered in schedule A, we as always, see the overweening influence of the Ontario medical association. I do not know why they keep ignoring chiropractic services. We know for a fact that the workmen's compensation board have used the services of chiropractors. Some may want them; some may not, but the Ontario hospital association is always talking about freedom of choice. Surely, if a prospective patient thinks that he would get better services from a chiropractor he should have the right to go to the chiropractor and should be covered under schedule A.

We know that in this province—and again, it is obvious from the acceptance of chiropractic by the workmen's compensation board, we know that the science of chiropractic has reached a sufficiently high standard that they should be accepted. I say to the hon. Minister that the only reason why the chiropractors are kept out of this scheme is simply because of the blind prejudice of the Ontario medical association. It is a disservice to the people of the province of Ontario that they have not been included in here.

Under schedule A, there is item 4 which we on this side of the House say should be removed, and that section 4 under the "Exclusions" of schedule A reads this way:

4. Services with respect to conditions that, in the opinion of a physician, are not detrimental to the health of a covered person including services for cosmetic purposes only.

Now just briefly look at this matter of what they call "cosmetic purposes." The govern-

ment has had the good sense to say that psychotherapy should be covered. Well, cosmetic purposes could easily come under the matter of treatment of psychotherapy. We know that because—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I thought that we had established this principle two days ago, that where an amendment was not proposed in this bill, the section that was already law was not subject to debate. If we propose to amend it, then a new bill should be brought in by the proposer of the amendment suggesting that an amendment be made.

I would further point out that this section, before it became law last year, was very thoroughly debated, and as I recall, it was amended on the suggestion of the hon. member who is now speaking.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, the schedule is being amended, and all we are suggesting is that it should be amended further.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Not all of it.

Mr. Trotter: They have amended parts of it and they have gone on in section 18. They have removed three of the limitations, and under the "Exceptions" they made one more change having to do with dental surgery. Surely we can talk of what more should be done.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I submit that parts of the Act for which amendment has not been proposed in this bill, should not be subject to debate, and I think this principle was established two days ago.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, if you so rule in that respect, you are certainly limiting the extent of what can be said under this schedule. Surely when an Act like Bill No. 136 has been completely ripped apart, we are dealing, under this Bill No. 6, with amendments to 136. But the truth of it is that it has been ripped apart to such a vast extent that this schedule A should certainly be discussed.

Mr. Chairman: I have made my ruling.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I point to the fact that two previous Chairmen had different rulings to yours? If I may suggest with deep respect to you, I had brought up an amendment at the very start where I had included groups, and the Chairman at that time said it was quite all right, to have this included under "Persons Covered," I

could include groups. There have been two other similar amendments which the Chairman said would be ruled out even though the hon. Minister of Health brought up his point and was overruled.

Mr. Chairman: As I recall, the Chairman expressed doubt in making his ruling.

Mr. Thompson: You are making it like a steeplechase; one does not know what kind of a hurdle one has to face.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I shall attempt to live within the four corners of your ruling. First, I may say that we in the New Democratic Party welcome the first part of this section 18 which strikes out the limitations with regard to annual health examinations, well-baby care and psychotherapy. We can only say with a sigh of relief, that on this occasion the fullness of time was only about eight months. We argued this last spring and got nowhere; we were steam-rollered down. Now it is accepted. We are grateful for these small mercies, and we trust that the people of the province of Ontario will benefit from them.

Let me move on now to the next amendment that you have made, and the substitution thereof, where you say that:

The benefits provided by this standard medical services insurance contract to a covered person shall, subject to the limitations prescribed by the regulations, include payment for the surgical procedures that are specified in the regulations that are performed in hospital by a dental surgeon.

The amendment raises the question of payments to a dental surgeon. In other words, you are broadening those to whom payments can be made. Previously it was only going to be for physicians.

Now, first let me say with regard to dental or oral surgeons, I am puzzled as to why the hon. Minister imposes the restriction that this must be for surgery within a hospital. The reason why I raise this point, Mr. Chairman, is that there are many dental surgeons today—oral surgeons—who have equipped their offices at considerable expense, and they have everything that is required in that office to perform surgery. Therefore, why is the restriction going to be made that the payment can be extended to them only if it is done in the hospital?

It seems to me that the net effect of this is that you are going to deprive yourself of an opportunity of using these expensive facilities that have been put in the oral surgeon's

office, and secondly, you are going to impose an added burden on the use of hospital beds, because the only way that they can get payment now is to go into a hospital and the oral surgeon should follow them into the hospital and perform the operation there.

It seems to me that this is a mechanical kind of decision that is going to defeat your purpose of making the services of dental surgeons or oral surgeons available and compensable under the Act.

That is point 1.

Secondly, in opening this section the hon. Minister has not seen fit to extend coverage to one or two other groups, and yet he is going to make payment to doctors who may be performing these same functions as these one or two other groups. I am referring, for example, to optometrists and to chiropractors.

In the instance of optometrists, this service for eye refraction is handled by an ophthalmologist—if I have that word correct, I always have some difficulty with it. If you have an eye doctor handling it, he gets compensation. But if it is an optometrist who is handling it, he is not going to get compensation.

In other words, the government is not denying, is not saying they will not make payment for this. What the government is saying is we will make payment only if it is handled by an eye doctor, not if it is handled by an optometrist. Well, I am sorry. If it goes to an eye doctor, the payment is made.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No.

Mr. MacDonald: It is not made? Not for a refraction?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, I stand corrected in that particular instance. But, it seems to me that you are choosing between one particular member of the health team and not another.

Let me try to make my point in connection with the chiropractor. The medical association is taking its traditional antagonistic attitude towards chiropractors, despite the fact that government agencies like the workmen's compensation board have now accepted payment for chiropractic services. I draw this to the attention of the hon. Minister; it has reached the point where many insurance companies have extended their coverage for chiropractic services, along with medical

services, and they have found that it costs them nothing more.

In other words, the hon. Minister cannot come back with the argument that this is going to mean higher payments and, therefore, increased premiums. The simple fact of the matter is that experience is proving that when a person has gone to a medical doctor and he finds that he cannot get satisfaction instead of going to the second or third call he will go to a chiropractor because he thinks he can get, and sometimes he has got, satisfaction. Or alternatively, instead of going to a doctor, he will go to a chiropractor; because he believes that the chiropractor can give him the particular service he is seeking. In other words, this whole voluntary approach, or choice of who you want on the health team to look after you, is being denied by the government after it has enunciated this as one of its principles.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest that this particular point was substantiated by other developments in the last year. When the chiropractors came in to visit the hon. Minister of Health, they had been told a year ago that this government was waiting until the LaCroix commission in Quebec had made its findings.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, this is completely wrong. The chiropractors were told that we were waiting—they had asked for a bill—to see the LaCroix report. The LaCroix report has not been very helpful in any way to us. Now we are setting up our own committee to study the whole matter.

Mr. MacDonald: I just want to draw this to the attention of the hon. Minister. He says the LaCroix report has not been helpful. All I can say is that I understood spokesmen for the chiropractic association to say they were told this—maybe not by the hon. Minister—maybe by somebody else in the government.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In respect of the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not disputing his word, that they were waiting until the LaCroix commission came down. But the hon. Minister now says that the LaCroix commission has not been very helpful. The interesting thing is this: The Hall commission report investigated the job that the LaCroix commission was doing in Quebec and had such confidence in it that in its report it states that it will in effect accept the LaCroix report as an appendix to the Hall commission report.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I did not read it in the Hall report.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it is there; and I suggest to the hon. Minister that it is in it. And what does the LaCroix commission say? Briefly it is this: "The chiropractic vertebral manipulation is a valuable method of treatment and should be available to the people of Quebec." There, in essence, is the LaCroix commission report.

The Hall commission report, by prior statement, has in effect accepted that. This government now, instead of accepting the LaCroix report and the Hall commission's acceptance of it, so to speak, has established its own committee on the healing arts, which is going to postpone action on this for another year, or two or three. I do not think that this is a defensible proposition. What, in effect, this government is doing, is stepping in and agreeing to pay one member of the health team through this plan from public funds, and not paying another member of the health team—and they are using the committee on healing arts as an excuse, as a reason, for further delay, as they try to achieve some sort of a combination with the Ontario medical association in its traditional opposition.

I do not think this is defensible. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I would like to move that section 18 of Bill No. 6 be amended as to the paragraph to be inserted in schedule (a) of The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, by striking out all the words in that paragraph after the word "payment" in the third line, and substituting so that the paragraph which is at the bottom of page six of the bill will read as follows:

The benefits provided by the standard medical services insurance contract to a covered person shall subject to the limitations prescribed by the regulations include payment for the services of oral surgeons—which the hon. Minister himself has in his bill:

—optometrists and chiropractors.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): What is that going to cost?

Mr. MacDonald: I have indicated that in many instances it will cost nothing more. It will be an alternative form of service.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, the reason the oral surgeons were brought into this is because there is a certain range of surgical services performed both by plastic surgeons and by oral surgeons. This is of

particular importance in respect of our only dental college in the province, here in Toronto; and it was a very grave fear of the faculty that its teaching will be very greatly reduced if this were left entirely to surgeons alone.

After a great deal of discussion and conversation with the two colleges—the Royal college of dental surgeons and the Ontario college of physicians and surgeons—it was agreed that this limited list of procedures, usually referred to as maxillo-facial surgery, should be approved for payment either to a plastic surgeon, medically trained, or a dental surgeon. This was agreement reached between those parties and ourselves.

In respect of the other disciplines, and this is simply repeating what I said last year, this was a physicians' services programme. It was chosen this way because, next to hospital care, physicians' services take the biggest slice of the health-care dollar; therefore we thought that, by providing insurance in this area, we were performing the greatest service we possibly could. There has been—and none of the disciplines referred to are in any question or doubt about this—no discrimination. And I would like the hon. members of this House to recognize that the OMA was not consulted about this, and that we are not bowing to the OMA.

I occupy the chair of Minister of Health. I consider it my duty to see to it that whatever healing services come within the purview of my department are made available to the people insofar as it is possible. My great concern is to see that the best possible service is available to them, and that is where my concern begins and ends. I do not believe in chiropractic myself, but I frankly admit that a very great many people do believe in it and a very great many people use it. This is their right and I would be the first to defend that right against all comers. But at the present time—and I have stated this many times to the people concerned, the chiropractors, the optometrists, the podiatrists, the naturopaths and all of them—there is no discrimination against them as groups. All of them are practising under laws of this province and, as long as they do that, they are quite within their rights. They therefore have been given recognition by the state, by the province of Ontario, but at the present time we do not believe that we could include their services under the programme.

When we reach that place where a total health service is provided for the people, there is not any doubt in mind that they will be included. At the present time, we felt

that we had gone as far as we could afford to go.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, is it not true that if a man was going to a chiropractor, because of the fact that he is not covered under this scheme that is coming about, he has to go to a medical doctor? Is the hon. Minister suggesting that the doctor—that the fees would not be equal? Surely we have suggested here this afternoon that there would be a rates schedule, and surely the schedule would be the same for a chiropractor as it would for a doctor for the same service. As far as I am concerned, I simply cannot see why the cost of the overall scheme would be any greater by including chiropractors or optometrists.

Mr. MacDonald: The insurance companies have proven that it is not.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister can say that the reports of the insurance companies are contradictory, but on the other hand one of the best boards and commissions of this government, the workmen's compensation board, has accepted these people. If it accepts them, why cannot you do it?

What I fear, Mr. Chairman, is this: If you do not bring the optometrists and chiropractors into this scheme, you are going to legislate them out of business; and when the time comes in the distant future that the hon. Minister talks about where there will be an overall scheme—chiropractors and optometrists included—there will not be any chiropractors left for this reason.

Who among the citizens and taxpayers of Ontario is going to go to a chiropractor when he has to pay the money out of his own pocket, when in many instances he can get the same service from a medical doctor? Obviously he will go to the doctor, the medical doctor. And yet, Mr. Chairman, there are not enough of them in the province of Ontario to look after the legitimate demands of their profession. I simply cannot see why a chiropractor is not included: First, because there is no doubt in my mind that they do a great service; secondly, because of the fact, in my opinion, that they will be legislated completely out of business and thirdly, it simply will not cost any more by including them in this scheme. I say to my hon. friends among the Conservative backbenchers, there are many of you who believe what I have said here this afternoon. You are not going to cause a revolution by standing up and saying what you believe. You

have talked about these matters privately. Why not stand up and suggest to the hon. Minister this afternoon what you have said in the corridors of this Parliament building in the past?

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, when I was on my feet before I had a similar motion in regard to this. Naturally we support what the hon. member for York South has said. For some reason what I was saying was out of order in the same line, but I now find he is in order. I am glad that this matter has come before the House because, as I said earlier, the whole problem here is the vice-like grip that the OMA has tried to get on any health scheme. The treatment of chiropractic is the very, very same reason why we are faced with not only the chiropractic people being left out, but also the optometrists—those people in the field of optometry. So I would hope that this committee would support the amendment as given by the hon. member for York South.

If we are going to have any health services with a broad base we are going to need various healing arts as part of the scheme. No doubt as medicine and the other healing arts grow there are going to be various fields that should be added into such a scheme, and it is a pity that we as a Legislature deliberately serve the particular groups who in their own interests want to keep out other healing arts. So I would hope that it will be supported.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Chairman, I would not want anyone on the other side to get the impression that I would be so foolish as to deny the place of the optometrists and the chiropractors in our community. I have had personal experience with them as no doubt have many of the hon. members.

As much as I would like to support this motion that they be included now, I think we have to take into account what the hon. Minister has said, that in the consideration of the overall bill, the total bill, it has been found necessary to delay—which is practically what he has just said now—adding these other health services to the bill at this time.

I think the hon. Minister has given assurance now and he has given assurance before in and out of the House that these services would be included subsequently. Now as far as I am concerned, as one who supports and appreciates the importance of the optometric services, chiropractic and others, I think that at this time I am not prepared to

support the amendment. I am going to support the hon. Minister, and I say that after a lot of consideration because we have people in our areas, in our ridings—I know you have, as I have—who are keenly interested in this and have discussed the proposition with me on many occasions. Although I would be just as happy as many others to have this included at the present time I am not going to support the amendment, I am going to support the hon. Minister, and I have every confidence and faith that when he makes the statement that these services will be included, that will be good enough for me all in due course.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I was not going to get involved. But something occurred in the last minute. A member of the government said he would like to see this come about eventually, but he would support this bill now and these things would come after. I would like to tell you of an experience that our people have had in the county of Welland.

They have Welland county co-op who are doing an excellent job for the people—one of these non-profit organizations that service many people exceptionally well and they show a bit of a profit in their annual statement also. For the past two years they have included chiropractic treatment for their contributors, for the people who have paid into this plan, which is a good one—members of my family also belong. For just about two years now they have paid the bill for chiropractors. It is working out exceptionally well. No one is being hurt and I do not know why we have to wait for a year or maybe two to bring this to the public. This is the time for action. I do believe that we should get down to business and give people the service that they require. This is only an added service that certain people will need; they do not need medical men; they need adjustment. Chiropractors are the experts in that field.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, may I make just one further brief comment? I was a little intrigued by the logic of the hon. Minister when he said that he had listened to the plea of people in the dental surgeons schools in regard to what it would do to their teaching programme if these people were excluded. I suggest to him that precisely the same argument applies with equal validity, except the government is discriminating, with regard to the chiropractors.

One of the problems of chiropractors—I will say quite frankly and I have said it to

my friends in the profession up until now—is that we have got to be certain that their profession has adequate standards. The interesting thing is that in the province of Ontario they have achieved the standards they have, and I think they are as high as anywhere on the North American continent, without a single cent of public funds having gone into it.

Every other profession—dental, medical, all of the rest of them—have got millions of dollars of contributions in terms of their teaching, in order to establish adequate standards. The chiropractors have done it on their own.

So if the hon. Minister of Health is willing to bow to the pleas of the dental surgeons and the authorities in the teaching field that it is going to hurt their teaching if they are not included in this plan, I suggest the logic of that argument applies equally, in fact more strongly, in terms of discrimination against a chiropractic group which has established its present standards on their own efforts without any public funds. But now the government is going to continue to discriminate against them.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, I have just one more comment to make to the hon. Minister. What really is he afraid of? Is he afraid that these people have not had the proper training?

Mr. Bryden: He is afraid of the OMA.

Mr. Whicher: The optometrists, as I understand it, have about four years of training, chiropractors have about four years of training, and the hon. member for Woodbine, in my opinion, hit the nail on the head. We are all slightly afraid of the OMA, and the hon. Minister is the most frightened of any of us.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Whicher: What does the OMA think they are anyway, God Almighty? There are a lot of people in the province of Ontario who need chiropractic and optometry services.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The OMA has never dictated to me what services I shall put in, or what services I shall put out. They have never at any time said a word to me about chiropractic service, optometrical service or any other service except their own, and it has not been a plea that we cover only their services.

Mr. Whicher: Well, Mr. Chairman, I say this. I certainly accept what the hon. Minister has said, that they have never seen him about this. But he is certainly preaching from the same text that they have preached through the newspapers and television throughout the province of Ontario.

Maybe they have not gone into the closets or into his office and told him what they wanted, but nevertheless he is the strongest champion that anybody has in this whole province.

For example, if a person wants to go to an eye doctor in the city of Owen Sound today—supposing he needs glasses immediately—do you know how long it takes him to get an appointment? At least six months. And it is going to be longer than that under this health scheme that we have been promoting here the last few days. Optometrists are necessary in this province.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Whicher: Would the hon. Minister please sit down for a while? I am not going to sit down.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order it is specifically spelled out in the Act that examinations of the eyes by refraction is not a benefit, no matter who performs it. It does not matter whether it is the ophthalmologist or the optometrist, it is not a benefit under the Act. And it is rather strange to see that this is included in practically every state scheme. There came to my desk just today a report of the American Medicare. The cost of a routine examination for glasses is among medical bills the plan will not pay. Now, it is passing strange that every state that has gone into this has found the same difficulty.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, all I know is that in many of the health schemes throughout the province of Ontario today, and as far as the co-operatives are concerned, optometry services are covered, and as far as I am concerned they should be covered in this scheme.

May I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time there are nearly 600 optometrists in Ontario who, in my opinion, are perfectly competent to do just as good a job as any medical doctor, as far as looking after the needs of the people—and that goes doubly as far as chiropractors are concerned. The OMA—maybe the hon. Minister is not speaking for them, but he has certainly given a

perfect example of their story here this afternoon.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this, but it so happens that I have taken the opportunity on many occasions to get up and espouse the cause of the chiropractors, the optometrists, and so on—the paramedical groups. It seems to me that the point mentioned by the hon. member for York South is a very valid one, as well as the point mentioned by the hon. member for Bruce.

The hon. member for York South mentioned that the Hall commission report actually stated that, as far as they were concerned, the LaCroix commission report in Quebec was one on which they would base their entire case for the chiropractor. As it happens, the LaCroix commission report in Quebec has found that chiropractic indeed does have some scientific basis, that it is beneficial to a lot of people who suffer from back ailments, and ailments of a similar nature. The very fact that the Hall commission report did say that it would accept the findings of the LaCroix commission report indicates to me that in effect, the Hall commission report really knew, and understood, what the LaCroix commission report was going to bring in in regard to chiropractic.

What I am saying, in effect, is that the Hall commission report, as far as I am concerned, actually supported the profession of chiropractic; and to me the fact that the hon. Minister of Health will not recognize the chiropractic profession, the optometrists, and the other paramedical groups in this particular Act, Bill No. 6, is reason to assume that the medical resources which we now have will be strained to the breaking point. Because, as he pointed out, the fact that I can go to a medical doctor and have that service provided free of charge and covered under that plan, will put me in the position, all things being equal, that I will go to the medical doctor even though I know that perhaps a chiropractor would do me more good. I will go to the medical doctor because, having done that, I know that the service is paid for; whereas, if I go to the chiropractor, then the service is not paid for—I have to pay it out of my own pocket.

So I say to my hon. friend that I believe he should—as he often has said, under the name of common sense—include these medical groups in this particular bill.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, I draw your attention to the fact that

it is now six o'clock and, under the rules, we either recess or adjourn for the day.

Mr. Chairman: Well, there is still this amendment to get through.

Mr. Bryden: There will still be discussion of it, sir.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to put the amendment, anyway.

Mr. Bryden: No, no! There will be more discussion. I have some observations to make.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the committee of the whole House rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow in any event, between the hours of 5 p.m. and 6 p.m., we will consider items on the order paper under the heading: "other motions." We will continue tomorrow with the debate in committee on Bill No. 6; and thereafter, if we conclude that matter, we will proceed to the Throne debate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

1

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, February 17, 1966
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Tabling final report of special committee on redistribution, Mr. Robarts	623
Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, bill to amend, reported	626
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Young	631
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Young, agreed to	640
On notice of motion No. 6, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Welch, Mr. Bukator	640
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Bukator	650
Recess, 6 o'clock	650

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introductions of bills.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the final report of the special commission on redistribution of electoral districts in Ontario. Copies of this will be distributed to all the hon. members.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, may I ask my hon. friend is it now his intention to send this to a committee or deal with it on the floor of the House?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest we have a look at this report and let it be assessed and see what we might do with it. It will have to form the background for a bill—in other words this is nothing more than a report.

The committee is a committee appointed by resolution of this Legislature and therefore the committee reports to the entire Legislature and not to the government. It is a question whether the report itself should be referred to a committee of this House, whether it might be dealt with on the floor of the full House, or whether we might more properly introduce a bill embodying the recommendations contained in the report and then that bill could be dealt with in the normal fashion in which legislation is dealt with in this House.

But I would suggest that we allow the report to be distributed and examined and then decide what procedure we will follow after that.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I rise on a point of personal privilege. In the final edition of the *Toronto Telegram* of Wednesday, February 16, there

is a paragraph which says, and I quote: "Mr. Thompson claimed in the Legislature yesterday that \$300 million was leaving Canada."

I made no such statement and I will repeat for clarification what I did say. It was this, and I quote from my speech in the Legislature:

I wonder if the hon. Provincial Treasurer knows that U.S.-controlled companies are now raising large capital funds in Ontario. Let me explain. The voluntary guidelines put limits on the amounts U.S. companies can raise within the States for investment in foreign countries. As a result at least 20 large U.S. companies have set up new subsidiaries to raise money outside the U.S. in U.S. dollars for their operations in Europe.

I continued in my speech:

Total borrowings for the past five months come to at least \$300 million in U.S. dollars, much of it raised in Ontario.

I thought my remarks were clear and I trust that this clears up the confusion in all quarters, including any who are quoted as saying that I was "mixed up" or "confused" or "exaggerating."

I am satisfied that the information I gave is correct. Also, Mr. Speaker, there has been newspaper speculation as to who my advisors were in this matter. I say to the House that I have many advisers, not only on this subject but on all subjects which concern the Legislature. I sometimes take their advice and I sometimes reject it, but any statements I make are my own, after I have carefully weighed the advice I have been given.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), a copy of which has been submitted to him.

Has the Ontario hospital services commission established a listing of categories of personnel to guide nurses and the labour relations board in future applications by nurses for bargaining rights?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the commission has not established such a listing of personnel for the purpose mentioned and no request has been placed before us to do this.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may follow with a supplementary question of the hon. Minister.

Is he aware that the recommendation of Mr. Jacob Finkelman, QC, chairman of the Ontario labour relations board during the hearings at the Riverview hospital in Windsor, said that the lack of the definition of students for each category of personnel was one of the main difficulties in bargaining?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I was aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think that this comes within the purview of the responsibility of the hospital services commission at all.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), notice of which has been given. I trust that the hon. Minister will answer it while I am still here, because I see that my time here, according to this report, is short.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the announcement of the sale of cattle from the St. John's training school, could the hon. Minister inform this House if it is the intention of this institution to do away with the animal husbandry and agricultural operation? If so, have there been any studies made as to why this type of training is no longer beneficial in the rehabilitation of the trainees of St. John's?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in reply—and in answer to the hon. member's comment about answering these questions before he disappears from this House—if he continues to ask as many questions, the House will never dissolve and he will never disappear from it.

In reply to the hon. member's questions, Mr. Speaker, the farm at St. John's training school owned and operated by the brothers of the Christian schools has never been used as a form of training in the therapeutic rehabilitation sense. A greater percentage of the population of this school is under the age of 16 years and therefore the educational programme of these children has necessitated their full-time attendance in the school classroom.

The occasional boy over the age of 16 has been employed on the farm in the past, but there has been no regular course of study in animal husbandry at the school.

Before this school was constructed, the farm buildings comprised part of the property and the Christian brothers felt at that time that these buildings could be put to use in the raising of cattle, chickens and pigs which could be used by the school, as well as the community of brothers. This government's action assuming full operating costs of the private training schools encouraged the Christian brothers to make a study of the costs and value of operating this unit. They concluded that it was not a successful operation and should be terminated. There are very few children admitted to the school who are interested in this type of training and as previously mentioned, their academic educational programme should be continued.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld), a copy of the question has been submitted to him.

What are the department's plans in 1966 for a tourist reception centre at or near the exit to the Ambassador bridge in Windsor?

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, approval has been given to The Department of Public Works to purchase the necessary property and I am informed by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) that the plans for the structure which will go on it are virtually complete. As soon as this is done, tenders will be called.

I would also tell the hon. member that we have made arrangements for temporary facilities adjacent to the bridge entrance to be used until such time as the new building is completed.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question: I have a little difficulty in hearing him because of the paper noise in the background.

Does the hon. Minister intend to use the facilities of the Ambassador bridge for the setting up of a reception centre this coming year?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I am not as familiar with the area as the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, but my understanding is that the property being purchased is adjacent to the bridge, but not on the bridge property. The place where we propose to use temporary facilities is on the bridge property and has been made available to us by the bridge authorities, as I understand it.

Mr. Newman: The facilities will not be available this year, then, will they?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That I cannot answer except to say that we expect it will be completed before the end of this year.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health, notice of which has been given.

Could the hon. Minister inform this House what steps are being taken by his department regarding the use of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides, in view of the study made by the technical advisory unit, food and drug directorate?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, while there have been no cases of humans being poisoned from minute quantities of chlorinated hydrocarbon insecticides remaining on food, there is concern over their persistence, and over the evidence that low levels may accumulate in the fat of man and animals. The Department of Health and The Department of Agriculture have active programmes for the control of pesticides, in which they co-operate closely with the federal food and drug directorate and the federal Department of Agriculture. In addition, during the current session of the Legislature, I propose to put before the Legislature certain amendments to our pesticides control Act to further strengthen our control programme.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question? Is his department giving any consideration to the possibility of having insecticides sold in the same manner as poison, with the purchaser signing a poison register?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am not in a position, Mr. Speaker, to answer that question, but I will have the information for the hon. member.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Provincial Secretary (Mr. Yaremko).

Will the hon. Provincial Secretary please tell the House the birthrate for the province of Ontario for the years, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): The birthrate per thousand population for 1961, 25.3; 1962, 24.6; 1963, 24.1; 1964, 23.2; the rate for 1965 is not yet available.

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a statement in regard to certain allegations and remarks made by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr.

Sopha) in the House yesterday, regarding the purchase by my department of the building at 135 St. Clair avenue west from Gunnar Realty last December.

To clear the air and to give the House all the information which is available to my own department in regard to this transaction, I asked my Deputy Minister to prepare a memorandum which I shall now read:

With reference to the attached news article in the *Globe and Mail* of February 17, Mr. Elmer Sopha, MPP makes further inquiry as to the purchase by the province of the above building which was acquired for office space for The Department of Health.

As you will recall in a previous statement, a question was asked in the Legislature on this matter—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): But not answered.

Hon. Mr. Connell:

—one of the questions being: "How much did Gunnar-McNamara pay for the building before it was purchased by the province?"

The answer to this portion of the question was that information was not available, because the province had no part in the original purchase from the firm that originally erected the building. The original negotiations for the lease of this property were made between the Ontario hospital association (the Blue Cross) and Jayton Investments Limited, who established the yearly rental of \$37,500, mentioned below. This company erected the building under a contract with Angus Robertson Limited and later sold the building to Gunnar Realty Limited. It was on the amount of this sale that the department had no information, because it was made before the province started negotiations for the purchase.

I personally checked the amount of the contract price of the Angus Robertson Company and was given confidential information to satisfy myself that the asking price as made by Gunnar Realty was reasonable.

A study by the property office showed that the cost per square foot of office space was in keeping with current figures of \$20 per square foot on the 144,243 gross square feet of the building, or \$2,888,860.

The property office checked the equipment placed in the building by Gunnar Realty after their purchase and determined

that the built-in equipment which we were buying with the building had cost at least \$500,000. On this basis the asking price appeared quite in order.

In purchasing the building, the department was bound by all the conditions, outstanding leases, etc., that went with the property, among these were the following:

1. The \$2 million mortgage held by Manufacturers Life.

2. Leases with the following tenants: Canadian-Imperial Bank of Commerce, General Steelwares, Domtar Chemicals Limited, Prest-o-lite Limited, James Gordon Sweatn, Package Industrials Limited, totalling \$128,913.46 per year.

There were other commitments. For example, with the Associated Broadcasting Corporation Limited, to pipe music regularly into the various offices; elevators maintenance contracts with the Otis Elevator Company; water treatment contract with Culligan Limited and air conditioning contract with Trane Service Agency, Toronto.

There were certain rooms in the building equipped for the specific use of Gunnar-McNamara and their tenants, which are being adapted for office space by our department.

Mention has been made of the fact that the province does not yet own the land on which this building sits, although we are negotiating with the owners, the Ontario hospital association. The commitments which we purchased from Gunnar-McNamara include a long-term lease, 20 years basic, with the right of extension to a total of 54 years, at a yearly rental of \$37,500 for the first period, subject to negotiation at the end of the 20-year period. We propose to wipe out this arrangement in time and also to discharge the mortgage and obtain clear title to the land and the building.

As you will recall, we were asked to acquire accommodation for The Department of Health in November of 1965 for 600 employees and if possible have this accommodation available by December 15, 1965. It was impossible to erect a new building in that short period of time. Our property office searched for an existing building that could be rapidly converted for office space. I have no hesitation in stating that the purchase of this building was both economical and timely. I firmly believe the province received excellent value for the investment and the required office space has been placed at the dis-

posal of The Department of Health within the time limit requested.

That is signed by my Deputy Minister.

Earlier in his report it mentioned that the value was estimated at about \$20 per square foot at that time. I checked with a number of architects today and they have estimated that a similar type of building today would cost at least \$22 a foot, and possibly \$24 per square foot.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): But how old is the building? By how much have building costs gone up?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: Third order, committee of the whole House; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

THE MEDICAL SERVICES INSURANCE ACT, 1965

House in committee on Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

On section 18:

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): I have a question I should like to put to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) on this section.

He suggested yesterday that there were contradictory reports from insurance companies relating to whether or not costs were actually increased in such plans when chiropractic and optometric services were included. I wonder if the hon. Minister could indicate to the House which companies, and on what basis he conveyed that information to the Opposition?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I cannot answer that question. I only know that from the great number of reports I have, that these matters are all in controversy.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, can the hon. Minister of Health not name a single instance where this is indicated? I say to the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that we cannot have it both ways in this House.

If, in fact, the Ontario medical association, with its view of ill-concealed disdain for the paramedical professions, if in fact that view has not determined the hon. Minister of Health, then there must be some other view. What, in effect, he is saying is that the economists, actuaries and professional reports indicate that the cost of the plan would be

increased. But in truth, Mr. Chairman, all we are really being given is another example of autocracy by experts. Nothing is, in fact, spelled out; surely no one can contend that you have the right to come to the House and say the expert opinion posits this fact, and then give us no corroborating evidence at all.

There were many hon. members in this House, including the member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) yesterday, who obviously had a very close relationship with chiropractic services, who knew some facts about the costs of those services. We quoted the LaCroix commission. We quoted the Hall commission to the hon. Minister and the Minister has given us no responsible reply. Mr. Chairman, I think he should. I think he should give us some documented evidence for discarding the paramedical professions from the plan at this point, since our contention is that for the same services, there would be no increase in cost.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The best corroborative evidence one can give of this is that where these services are included, in the great majority of instances they are included in what is known as major medical services or extended benefits. I think this is proof of the fact that they do cost more than the basic physicians' services.

I would like to emphasize again, sir, that the Ontario medical association and the medical profession have nothing to do with saying what benefits would be provided within the terms of this contract.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I, too, would express my concern over the chiropractors and optometrists being discriminated against in this bill.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order to take issue with that. There is no discrimination. I have stated this unequivocally before the House; there is no discrimination.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, many of our citizens have been using the services of these two fine professions in the province. A couple of weeks ago I was into a doctor's office which was filled. When I got in to see the doctor, I asked him how long he had been practising here. He said 42 years. He also said he was doing more work then than when he first started to practise. He was over 70 years of age. If he should stop work, what would happen to the people on account of the shortage of doctors?

This raises a great concern where you are

going to be funnelling those who use the services of the chiropractors and the optometrists right into the medical doctors' hands. This is going to increase the work of our doctors.

This is of great concern to many of our citizens, Mr. Minister, and we hope you will take another look at this.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I really must protest at the categorical assertion of the hon. Minister that there is no discrimination in the bill as it now exists against these paramedical groups referred to in the amendment.

He comes before us time after time saying that certain unnamed experts have divined heaven and have discovered certain immutable laws that we mere legislators must accept without question, without even asking for the qualifications of the experts concerned. But when he further makes a dogmatic statement that a bill under which accounts for certain people will be paid, but not for other people, is not discriminatory, I suggest that he has himself confused with God to the point where it is ridiculous. How can he make such a statement? It is plain on the face of it that if people can get a certain type of service in one place without paying for it and they have to pay at another place, they are likely to choose the place where they do not pay. If legislation provides that an account will be paid in some cases and not in others, then it discriminates in favour of those cases where no payment is required, or where payment is made out of the public Treasury.

I frankly admit to no expertise of any kind in this field. I am in no position to pass judgment on the qualifications of chiropractors, optometrists or oral surgeons. My opinion on that would not matter. The point is, however, that they are licensed to practise in certain fields and under certain conditions in this province, and licensed medical practitioners often perform the same sort of work that these people do in some fields. There is not complete duplication. But insofar as the licensed medical practitioners work in the fields of these other people, the bill is obviously discriminatory in their favour and against the other people.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that we, in our public statutes, should not in effect be passing judgment on the relative merits of these particular groups working in the health field unless we have a lot more evidence to convince us that we can legitimately pass judgment on their relative merits. I can remember a great many years ago when the

question of chiropractors was a lively issue with regard to workmen's compensation. I was, at that time, in a province which made many pioneering changes in workmen's compensation and this was one of the fields in which we were interested.

I would go to the medical bureaucrats in The Department of Health and say: "Is there a sound scientific basis for determining that the chiropractors do not provide a quality of service which would justify their inclusion under The Workmen's Compensation Act?" The type of answer I always got was to the effect: "We will not say anything. We will not express any opinion at all except do not cover them."

Of course, we know that the medical profession never mixes in politics, but it takes over departments of health across the country. It does not use these old-fashioned, crude pressure-group techniques of going to the government with a printed brief and reading it while Cabinet Ministers doze. Then Mr. Chairman, the Prime Minister makes a few well-chosen comments. No, it does not bother with that sort of crude amateurism; it just moves into the administrative area in which it is interested and takes it over. So the hon. Minister does not have to go to the OMA to find out what the OMA wants. Why, he is surrounded by it. The whole atmosphere is permeated by the thinking of the OMA, and the other groups in the health field get mighty short shrift. They are always being pushed down—denigrated by the medical group. It is all done very subtly. It is hard to smoke it out, but I can certainly say from my experience in the field of public administration that you can never get them to say that chiropractic services are not scientifically performed; they are of no benefit to people. I do not know whether they are or are not, but you can never get any statement. You get just a constant pressure that you should not do certain things.

I will say that in Saskatchewan we went ahead and did it. We did not really know whether we were doing the right thing or not; we could not get any expert advice, but we went ahead and covered them under The Workmen's Compensation Act and I think now chiropractic services qualify under all or most workmen's compensation Acts in the country.

It is not my impression on the basis of any information I have had that this has had a deleterious effect at all. In fact, I think the effect has been beneficial. I do not think that there is any workmen's compensation board that would now suggest that it should cease to cover chiropractic services under certain

conditions. Of course, there are also conditions attached to all the services they perform, and that is reasonable enough.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that his legislation is, on the face of it, discriminatory among certain groups without any valid reason being given for the discrimination and that therefore he should remove the discrimination. As to the matter of cost, this is difficult to determine but if some people in your medical welfare group—the people who are, shall we say, compulsorily covered so that if they want to get free services they will get it—let them make a choice the same as any other citizen. When a person pays his \$150 or whatever it is that is required, let him also make a choice. If he finds that the chiropractor is not giving him service such as he wants, he will probably seek other professional advice.

Personally, I have never consulted a chiropractor in my life. I do not see that they provide any services that would be beneficial to me at all, but that is a different matter. I know lots of people who think they have been greatly benefited by chiropractors. Frankly I think that this whole area of how the human mechanism operates still has enough uncertainty in it that nobody can say dogmatically just who might be able to provide the best service for any particular condition.

I think in fairness to the professional groups concerned and in fairness to the public who often want to use their services, that this amendment should be carried. The scheme should be adjusted to provide payments for their services on the same basis or at least subject to the same type of conditions as are applicable to services of licensed medical practitioners.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, the case for the chiropractor and optometrist has been extremely well put here this afternoon and on other evenings. However, I would like to bring up the case of dental attention and primarily to the individual up to and including the 18-year-old. But before I do so, I would like to place on the record the stand that has been taken on a comprehensive medical care plan by the council in the city of Windsor. Back in 1964 the Windsor city council approved a resolution that called for a complete comprehensive plan. Then once the Hall commission report came down, the city council enlarged on their plan and included in their resolution—and I will read just the one paragraph: "Dental and optical services for children up to 18 years of age shall be included."

Now as dental services cost approximately 10 per cent of the whole health care of the individual, it would only seem proper that in this bill would be included some provision for dental services and especially for the dental services of those who are on some type of pension—the children of the person who is receiving some type of governmental assistance or aid.

Too often that youngster can only be treated for extractions. No attention is paid to the fixing of the teeth. He will apply to a dentist and the dentist naturally, in his good graces, will take care of the teeth in the proper fashion, but I do not think it is fair to be asking for the dentist to be subsidizing the community after that fashion.

In the city of Windsor we have a Civitan service club, whose prime service is providing dental treatment to underprivileged children. Now, I made a plea over four years now for some type of grant for this service club and my pleas have always fallen on deaf ears, both with the hon. Minister of Health and The Department of Public Welfare. Now I think that assistance should be given to the children under 18 years of age, so that both the health and public welfare ministries now can say that these individuals are covered.

The youngsters that do receive this assistance, as far as dental work is concerned in my own community, come from the very underprivileged group, and if there is anyone in the community that we should be attempting to upgrade, it should be those individuals. The lack of dental attention creates a serious emotional handicap in these youngsters and I think that by including dental assistance up to the age of 18, we would take a long step forward.

I would like to relate the case of a grown-up who required dental assistance. This fellow—in fact, I can mention his name, John Maj—was receiving some type of governmental assistance. I do not recall whether it was old age assistance or a disability pension—but during the Christmas mail run he was fortunate enough to obtain employment in the post office. After he had obtained employment and received his pay cheque, the department found out and immediately deducted a certain portion of his next assistance cheque.

He suffers from a heart condition, yet still took this employment so that he could have some type of dental work done.

Now, here is a man who was deprived of dental work simply because The Department of Public Welfare said that only extractions

were permissible. I think if dental assistance was available under this plan, that man would have never found himself in that position.

However, I would really like to put forward a case for individuals up to the age of 18, because in my own profession seeing the youngsters in school, the ones that you generally see that need all the dental attention are those who come from the underprivileged, the lowest financial strata of society.

I certainly think that in our 20th century we should attempt to do something, and I would strongly recommend to the hon. Minister of Health that he include dental services, especially to those up to the age of 18.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the hon. Minister is going to speak to the many representations made on this side of the House; I hope he will. But, I wonder if he would in the course of his remarks address himself specifically to the point I made with regard to his own amendment, namely, restricting payment to dental surgeons when operating within a hospital.

I raise the question as to why you deliberately exclude using all the facilities which many dental surgeons have in their own office now, when the net result of it will mean you will be overburdening our hospital situation which is a problem in itself.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, Mr. Chairman, in discussing this with the dental surgeons and with the physicians, we concluded that this was not to be so, that most of these procedures have to be done in hospital anyway.

I think the day is passing—and I must say I cannot speak from very wide experience on this matter—but I think the day is passing where surgery is being done in the dentist's chair, in his office. That day has gone and I think it is a very good thing for the people it has gone because this was one of the most hazardous undertakings I think that was ever embarked upon.

To answer the other representations that have been made, Mr. Chairman, I can only say again, as I have said many times, that this bill is to insure physicians' services. The hon. members from both Opposition parties have talked a great deal about the federal proposal. Now, the federal proposal, let me remind you, is specifically stated to cover physicians' services. I am not, again, detracting from the value of all of these services. I might suggest to you that because physicians'

services will now be insured, people will have perhaps a little more left over for themselves to pay for those other services pending the time when they shall come under a health insurance programme.

I would suggest in all kindness to my hon. friends from the Socialist benches that they should not suggest to the chiropractors that doctors can give their services because the chiropractors will be the first to deny this.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, there is quite a lot of overlapping.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is their right. As far as optometric services are concerned, it is specifically spelled out in the bill that optometric services will not be paid for no matter who gives them. They are not a benefit under this programme, whether given by an ophthalmologist, an optometrist or anybody else. I repeat, sir, that this is a physicians' services bill and as for the fact that the others have been left out—the pharmacists can complain, psychiatrists can complain, masseurs, and a whole host of other paramedical personnel can complain just as validly as can the ones that have been mentioned here today.

I think this is proof positive that there has been no discrimination in leaving them out. This is a physicians' services bill and, I would repeat, in keeping with the proposals laid down by the federal government.

Mr. Chairman: All in favour of the amendment, say "aye."

All opposed, say "nay."

In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All in favour of the amendment, please stand.

All opposed, please stand.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 30, the "nays" 56.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the amendment lost.

Section 18 agreed to.

Section 19 agreed to.

On section 20:

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister is going to have to be about as agile as a one-armed paperhanger in trying to get all the different phases of this legislation into force at the proper times and get it all meshed together. And still he has the standard, rather inflexible

commencement type of clause, namely, that the whole Act comes into force by proclamation of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor. I think it was the same coming into force section in the Act passed by us last year.

First of all, I wonder if I may ask him if last year's Act, which we have been in the process of amending, has in fact been proclaimed in force? How long has it been in force?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Two sections have been proclaimed.

Mr. Bryden: Do you have authority under a commencement clause of this kind to declare individual sections in force? Is there some provision of The Interpretation Act which enables you to proclaim individual sections in force?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, I am advised there is. It would be our intention now to put the whole Act together and proclaim it as one piece, with the exception of the two sections already proclaimed.

Mr. Bryden: What are the two sections that are now proclaimed?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Section 2, subsection 1, and 27.

Mr. Bryden: What is that again? It is very hard to hear in here at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Section 2, subsection 1, and section 27.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, yes. In other words, that is the basis on which the administrative machinery has been set up that the hon. Minister hopes will be coming into operation shortly.

Well now, how does the hon. Minister plan to handle the question of certain groups starting to get benefits under the Act at an earlier date than others? As I understand it, for what we might, as a shorthand term call, the medical welfare group, benefits will start being paid in their case on March 1. Is that right?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: April 1.

Mr. Bryden: April 1. In all other cases it will not be until July 1?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Those in receipt of social assistance are now under partial cover-

age. The present agreement will be terminated as of March 31, therefore they have to be taken over. And the division will take them over.

It is anticipated, according to the Minister of National Health and Welfare that the legislation pertaining to the Canada assistance programme will be in effect by then so that the federal government will be ready with its part of the programme.

Since that has been announced, we felt we should be ready to fit into that part of the programme when it came into effect.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I still want to discuss this matter. I understand the explanations of the hon. Minister but the fact still remains that this means a big increase in the income of the medical profession from this class of people, or these classes of people, that come under various types of assistance legislation as of April 1 when nobody else is getting any benefit until July 1.

It seems to me that the whole thing should become operative on July 1. I do not see why the medical profession should get this bonus for the three-month period before they are providing services to other people under the Act. I would suggest to the hon. Minister, at least as far as the payment of benefits is concerned, that it all come into force at the same time.

If it were a matter that the people in these various groups covered by assistance legislation would suffer, this would be a different matter, but I do not see that they will suffer to any considerable extent at all. All that will happen will be that the doctors will benefit greatly, and I think they are doing very well under the Act as it is. I see no reason why we should give this extra bonus for them which will be quite substantial for an additional three-month period.

Let them get the extra payments in respect to medical welfare, which I suppose will be roughly triple the payments they are getting now, but at the same time as they are providing services to other people covered by the Act.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he proclaim the Act, the whole thing, in force at the same time, and make it operative with regard to its benefit provisions all at the same time.

Section 20 agreed to.

Section 21 agreed to.

Bill No. 6 reported.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and the bill be reported with certain amendments, and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed: Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report a bill with certain amendments and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, in rising to continue this debate, I would first of all ask the serious consideration of this House to an urgent problem which is facing some of the employees of this province at the present time.

Yesterday we had the introduction of a bill concerning the rights of our citizens. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) introduced it. It is a bill that prohibits discrimination in certain categories and he said this: "There are still, as hon. members are aware, a great many capable older workers with many years of useful employment ahead of them."

I am quite aware that this bill sets an upper limit of age 65. Some would quarrel with that upper limit because we feel that the pension situation in this country is not yet adequate to meet that upper limit.

There are a good many people in this building who are facing a layoff tomorrow; they have received a letter which says:

A shortage of work has resulted in a surplus of staff in the tradesmen and labour groups. Our records indicate that you attained the retirement age of 65 years on February 17, 1964.

—this is the specific letter to which I refer:

It is contrary to the policy of this department under these circumstances to retain employees who are beyond the age of retirement. You will therefore be released from employment on February 18, 1966, at 5 p.m.

Should you obtain other employment in the meantime, one day's notice to the department will be required in order to prepare your final pay cheque.

Yours truly.

This has gone out to a large number of men who are over 65 and in the employ of the province. They are very concerned about this because some of them—I think all those concerned here are casual staff—have been in the employ of the province for a great many years. They have looked forward to reaching the age at which they could collect the old age pension. As the House is aware, the pensionable age is now dropping by one year each year; in a few years the age will be down to 65.

But these people who today are facing separation of employment have been counting on achieving the pensionable age when the old age pension would carry them over. One 67-year-old man is facing unemployment and his big problem is that at 67, who will hire him? Others who are over the 65 age limit have the same problem.

The hon. Minister said in his statement yesterday:

We have all had personal experience of older workers whose lives have been blighted by difficulties in finding employment. These difficulties have often been based entirely on age. We can ill afford to lose the skills and capabilities of our senior workers. In terms of dollars and cents and considering the valuable contribution that older employees can make, it is wise to protect the employment opportunities of these older individuals who are capable and efficient workers.

He also said:

We now have enough reliable information and studies from a wide range of agencies to indicate clearly that many of the myths held about the capabilities of older workers are not only untrue, but can have a deleterious effect upon our developing and productive economy.

Mr. Speaker, in one of these cases the worker would be eligible in one year—he is 67 now—for the old age pension. Others will be eligible in two years and, at most, with the pensionable age dropping, these workers who are now facing the layoff would be eligible for the old age pension in 2½ years' time.

So the treatment seems a little harsh at this point, because these men have been making their plans with the old age pension in view. I quite understand that they chose to be casual labourers in the employ of the prov-

ince, but they chose that because of the scandalously low wages being paid.

I have before me the wage schedule that went into effect in November, 1963. A maintenance painter and decorator started at \$4,200 and went up to \$4,400.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What does the hon. Minister of Labour think of those rates for skilled labour?

Mr. Young: One of the men concerned—a painter—gave me the figures for last year in actual earnings. One of the reasons why these men did not come on permanent staff—if they indeed had the opportunity—was that they received trades' pay as casual labourers. Of course, they were subject to periodic layoffs and that sort of thing, but this one man in particular received last year \$5,310.18 in income. It is not a high income but it is about \$1,000 more than he would have received if he had been on the permanent staff.

Another man received an income of \$4,500 because of sickness during the year, but the problem is, Mr. Speaker, that these men with just another year or two could bridge that gap between present employment and the pension. It may well be that they should have provided private pensions for themselves but men on this kind of income would not have very much to spare to provide these pensions. So just as a matter of human dignity and decency and common sense, it seems to me that this House, at least this government, ought to seriously consider extension of employment of these particular individuals.

There is no question that there is work to be done. Maintenance work must be kept up in this building and in adjacent buildings, and while it may be that there may be a week or two layoff once in a while, I think these men are quite willing to face that, provided they can look forward to secure employment until such time as they are eligible for the pension.

I simply say in passing, Mr. Speaker, that this is a generation of men who have built up the great productive capacity of this nation. Their work was interrupted by depression and various events which made it impossible for them to build up much equity, yet these men have made it possible for the great outpouring of goods and services in Canada and Ontario. To shut them off at this point from sharing in that output in a realistic way is just a bit on the cruel and heartless side.

What I am asking for, Mr. Speaker, is not charity. It is just plain, simple justice and I hope that before tomorrow at 5 o'clock, the Cabinet or whoever is responsible in this field, will see fit that this matter be reviewed and that these men be continued in employment as long as they are productive. We are not asking more than that—as long as they are able to do a full day's work for a full day's pay, until such time as they reach the age when the pension will be paid automatically to them.

We bring that to the attention of the hon. Minister and of the Cabinet and we hope they will act, thinking in serious terms about the needs of these men.

Mr. Bryden: Why should they be thrown off, anyway, when they are capable of working?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe): What is the hon. member mumbling about?

Mr. Bryden: It is a serious matter. I would have thought the hon. member would be concerned about it.

Mr. Letherby: But I cannot hear the hon. member when he is mumbling.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member should go and see the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) and tell him to be a man.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I now turn to a matter which has been of increasing concern to the hon. members of this House and to the people, in the northern half particularly, of this continent.

All of us have seen increasing pollution in our lakes and rivers over the past years. The Ontario water resources commission has been taking certain steps in this province to carry out remedial measures. Our municipalities have been examined. They have been issued reports. They have been asked to initiate certain sewage works. Our industries have been looked at and have been asked from time to time to look after the effluent which they are pouring into the rivers of this province. The same thing has been happening across the border in the United States. The situation has become so serious in part of our international waterway and water system that the international joint commission has been asked to look into the situation regarding pollution in our lakes and rivers.

I have before me an interim report of the international joint commission of the United

States and Canada on the pollution of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and the international section of the St. Lawrence river.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this report was tabled because the commission felt an emergency situation ought to be faced up to at this time. The preamble to the report explains what happened. On October 7, 1964, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of the government of Canada and the Secretary of State for the government of the United States requested the international joint commission to investigate and report upon the extent, causes, location and effect of pollution in the waters, limited here to Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and the international section of the St. Lawrence river, and to recommend the most practicable remedial measures which might be considered necessary. Their terms of reference include these:

The commission is requested to inquire into and report to the two governments upon the following questions:

Are the waters of Lake Erie, Lake Ontario and the international section of the St. Lawrence river being polluted on either side of the boundary to an extent which is causing, or likely to cause, injury to health and property on either side of the boundary?

If the foregoing question is answered in the affirmative to what extent, by what causes and in what localities is such pollution taking place and if the commission should find that pollution of the character just referred to is taking place, what remedial measures would, in its judgment, be most practicable from the economic, sanitary and other points of view, and what would be the probable cost thereof?

Mr. Speaker, this report was tabled because of the emergent situation. The report says this:

Because of the magnitude and complexity of the problems involved, it will, inevitably, be some time before these investigations can be completed. However, the information so far achieved, although far from complete, reveals that the situation, particularly in Lake Erie, is serious and is deteriorating. For this reason, the commission has concluded that the facts should be brought immediately to the attention of the two governments.

And what is the situation? The situation that concerns them is the excessive enrichment of these waters by nutrients. This phenomenon, technically known as eutrication, causes the

prolific and rapid growth of aquatic vegetation such as algae. In others words, the growth of algae is primary. These algae not only seriously interfere with essential uses of the waters, but their decay progressively exhausts the dissolved oxygen at the lower depths of the lake. It has been established that the high proportion of the nutrients discharged into the lakes is contained in the effluents from municipal and industrial facilities.

The report points out that while there is yet no definite proof that the cessation of such nutrients going into the lake will cure the situation now existing in a hurry, they do find that it is necessary, in order to prevent further deterioration, to cut off the source of the pollutants as soon as humanly possible.

Recent data, the report says, "indicate an accelerated rate of deterioration in Lake Erie, and there is an indication of a similar process, though less advanced, taking place in Lake Ontario."

They give an example of the growth of algae. Adjacent to Cleveland, the growth increased from 200 to 400 cells per millilitre between the years 1920 and 1930 to 1,500 to 2,300 in 1962—seven times during that period. About 350 miles of the shoreline of Lake Erie and 300 miles of the shoreline of Lake Ontario in the United States are suitable habitats for the nuisance-forming algae called cladophora. Prolific growths of this algae were reported in these areas in 1965. In September of 1964, some 800 square miles of algae blooms were noted on the surface of Lake Erie. In July of 1965, the blooms were found in the southeast section of Lake Ontario, and some 43 miles of shoreline between Toronto and Presqu'ile Point were affected by the accumulation in 1964. As I said in 1965, they are now moving into Lake Ontario.

Of course, the algae growth curtails commercial fishing, and recreational activities. It imparts obnoxious odours. It impairs filtering operations of industrial water treatment plants and it lowers waterfront property values. And, of course, it interferes greatly with certain industrial processes and thus becomes a very serious situation.

The second thing, in addition to the algae accumulation, is the matter of oxygen content in the lakes. Records show that in 1929, and I quote again: "Lake Erie possessed a high degree of oxygen saturation, even to the lowest depths. In the bottom layer of the central basin of Lake Erie this was true."

This is the part which is now coming under review. Surveys in 1959 and 1960 of the bottom zones of Lake Erie, where pronounced thermal stratification exists, indicated that an area of 1,600 square miles of the central basin exhibited low oxygen concentration. And in 1965, a total of 2,600 square miles, or 25 per cent of the entire area, had an oxygen level of less than two parts per million in the bottom layer. Because of the water stratification, the water does not sink and the oxygen is not renewed; that is, the top water does not sink down and the oxygen is not renewed at the lower level. This lack of oxygen means a change in the whole fish life. The oxygen deficiency is due to the decay of algae, which drops to the bottom. The micro-organisms there eat the algae, and in that process they clean out the oxygen from the water.

But once that process of disintegration takes place, the phosphates which drop with the algae stay there and are, once more, available for the new cycle; so the lake becomes almost permanently polluted.

The bottom fauna of the lake is now changing drastically. It used to be that important fish food organisms such as mayflies and caddis flies used to be there in great quantities. These have virtually disappeared from the deeper water off Bass Islands. They have been replaced by slugworms and bloodworms, which are inferior fish food, tolerant of a low oxygen content and indicative of polluted conditions. This means that the fish life in Lake Erie has changed tremendously. Whitefish, ciscoe, the walleye and the blue pike have all but disappeared.

I have a report here of a speech by the Hon. Stewart L. Uddall, Secretary of the Interior of the United States before the united automobile workers' conference in Detroit last November. He says this:

One dramatic illustration of the price of pollution bears repeating. It appears as part of a Cleveland article and contrasts the blue pike catch in Lake Erie in 1956 and 1963. The figures are so startling that my first reaction was it must be a misprint, for blue pike production in 1956 was nearly 7,000,000 lb worth \$1,316,000. But by 1963 it was down to 200 lb. worth \$120. That a body of water the size of Lake Erie could become so polluted in that short time is a threat which cannot be ignored and except for the size of the water body involved the same situation exists all across our land. Whether it be detergent foam bouncing along on the surface of playfully bubbling brooks or the great cloud mass of algae

which is sucking the life-giving oxygen out of the water of our greatest lakes, the overriding problem is one of pollution, the time to deal with it is running out. I have called water conservation the scandal of our time. It is without a doubt our most abused resource.

Stewart L. Uddali, Secretary of the Interior of the United States.

Now this situation is being presented to us so dramatically that we cannot afford to ignore it. As I have pointed out a great problem exists as the algae drops to the bottom of the lake and makes a permanent change or what the experts think may well be. They are not willing to say it is absolutely permanent, but they say it may well be a change for years to come.

And so unless some remedial measures are brought forward quickly, more than we have now been undertaking, Lake Erie may become, as one of the hon. members has said, another Dead Sea.

The report does say some encouraging things about Ontario. It points out that as far as Lake Erie is concerned, the United States is the big offender. In New York State about 53 per cent of municipal wastes from a population of 10 million receives secondary treatment, 41 per cent primary treatment and 6 per cent no treatment at all.

In contrast to that, the Canadian portion of Lake Erie in the province of Ontario, 1.2 million people concerned, 79 per cent of municipal wastes in a population of 1.2 million, receives secondary treatment, 12 per cent primary treatment and 9 per cent no treatment. That means about 21 per cent of the wastes going into Lake Erie from our side is still receiving very inadequate treatment, Mr. Speaker.

As far as Lake Ontario is concerned, about 82 per cent of the wastes receives secondary treatment, 17 per cent primary treatment and one per cent no treatment. That is the Ontario side of Lake Ontario. But the problem here is that the bulk of those wastes come out of the sewers of the Metropolitan Toronto area and while in ordinary times that effluent does receive secondary treatment, because of our separation of sanitary and storm sewer systems in the city of Toronto, when storms occur the valves have to be opened and all the effluent rushes out into the lake without treatment. And so this is a challenge—while the figures say this, the facts are that it is not quite as good as the figures seem to say, particularly during a wet season.

Now as far as industry is concerned, the commission is informed of 271 sources of in-

dustrial waste in the United States portion of Lake Erie. The states concerned have classified 63 of these as having inadequate waste treatment facilities. The adequacy of 26 has not been determined.

The problem is that many of these industries that are causing the trouble are very large industries, pouring very large amounts of waste into the system.

Similarly in Ontario, 18 of the 29 sources of industrial waste into Lake Erie are reported to have adequate treatment and the balance have inadequate treatment facilities. So that we are doing fairly well, except for the fact that many of the industries that do not have adequate treatment facilities are very large ones, pouring large amounts of waste.

At a conference a week ago, dealing with this very subject, we were told that the city of Detroit and its area pours 400 barrels of oil a day into the waters of the lake, and similar pollution is being poured in great quantities from that side. But this does not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side can be too proud of what has happened. Many of our large sources of industrial pollution are farther up the lakes from the part which this survey covers and many of the municipalities on the other lakes are also offenders.

So it seems that we have a challenge to speed up the process which we have now undertaken. Dr. Vance tells us this in a speech he made before the same conference in Detroit: that the major challenge in pollution and control today is in the field of industrial waste. There are approximately 1,400 industries throughout Ontario which are under inspection by the OWRC. The most prominent problem is associated with the substantial volumes and complex types of waste waters.

There are pulp and paper mills in Ontario, for example, with industrial waste flows up to 40 million gallons per day. Other similar industries produce extremely strong chemical wastes whose population equivalent in terms of domestic sewage are many times larger than the municipality in which they operate. And so he urges speed in cleaning up this situation.

I know that there are many of our industries concerned with this matter and spending money in trying to clean up the pollution that they are pouring into our rivers and lakes. But, Mr. Speaker, that process evidently, by this report, is not taking place rapidly enough. Because of the emergent situation the international joint commission

has issued this interim report to bring the matter to our attention. And they make certain recommendations, and I will read them to the House:

(a) Sufficient purification of all municipal and industrial wastes before discharge into these waters and their tributaries to achieve the maximum possible removal of phosphates. (b) Prohibition of the construction of combined sanitary and storm sewers, initiation of a programme of separating existing combined sewers in communities discharging waste into these waters and their tributaries.

This has special reference to the city of Toronto where perhaps the province itself ought to be looking toward aiding in this process of speeding up the separation of storm and sanitary sewers.

(c) An effective system of regular sampling of effluents discharged into these waters and their tributaries in accordance with a programme approved by the commission.

Mr. Speaker, I lay this report before this House today and urge upon the House that action be taken as soon as humanly possible to implement its recommendations, and to clean up the kind of situation that is all too prevalent, right across this province, in many of our municipalities and in many of our industries.

The United States we hope will take the same prompt action and already we believe that a move is going forward by which the President and his government will make federal funds available in order to assist this process and do it more rapidly than otherwise might happen. So I hope this province will move this year and move fast to clean up the situation before Lake Erie becomes another Dead Sea and that Lake Ontario may well follow in its footsteps before too many years have passed.

An hon. member: In its wake.

Mr. Young: In its wake, yes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to lay before this House one of the great problems we face in regard to our highways and the death toll on those highways.

The *Weekend Magazine* of November 28, 1965, said this:

Only heart disease and cancer kill more people than traffic accidents. If you are between the ages of 5 and 29 you have more chance of dying on the roads than in any other single way.

Well, some of us are not between those ages but our chances of dying on the highways are still very high.

During 1964, the last year for which figures are available, we had 111,232 accidents in Ontario involving motor vehicles. In these accidents 1,424 people were killed and 54,560 were injured. Property damage amounted to \$55,452,730. What evaluations were put on the killed and injured in the way of lost time, lost production, disruption of homes and just plain agony and grief, we have no way of knowing. What we do know is that much of this injury and loss in life and property is avoidable and completely unnecessary if we are willing to tackle the carnage and destruction more realistically.

When we examine causes of this increasing toll on our highways two factors stand out above all others—the driver and the motor vehicle. Human carelessness must top the list of contributing causes. During 1964 statistics show that of the 189,096 drivers involved, 1,400 were suffering extreme fatigue or physical defects and 15,233 were classified either as “ability impaired” or “had been drinking.” The rest were apparently normal. The human factor loomed large in the total number of accidents. Carelessness, temporary inattention, misjudgment, speeding, all these took their toll. Better driving certainly is one answer to the situation and, while human perfection in any endeavour is hardly to be expected, much can be done to improve the skill and the attitude of the person behind the wheel.

A start should be made with the young driver to make sure that his skill with the motor car and his attitude towards its use make him as safe a driver as is possible. As I mentioned in this House last year I believe that driving instruction should be part of the educational system whether we incorporate it into the present course or offer it as a required subject after regular hours or on weekends. For a long time we have taken for granted that the young driver is an unsafe driver but evidence is now accumulating that young people who have had proper driving instruction are in fact safer drivers than their elders. So far we have been leaving young people to accumulate driving skills where they may—often from parents who themselves are not as efficient as they ought to be. The result has been the high accident rate in the younger category. This must be faced and corrected in a civilization where driving skill is not only a universal necessity but too often a matter of sheer survival.

Road design, of course, and traffic manage-

ment are important in cutting down the accident toll on our streets and highways. These matters are getting more and more attention, and rightly so. I do not propose to deal with them today except to stress their importance.

What I do want to point out is that government—and that includes the government of Ontario—is callously and incredibly shelving responsibility for the structural safety of one of the most lethal weapons in our civilization—the motor car.

President Lyndon B. Johnson, long an advocate of safer cars, made it clear in his State of the Union message last month that he intended to deal realistically with the problem of the mounting road carnage. Let us hope he means business when it comes to car design as well as the other aspects of the problem. For right here we come to one of the problems we face as Canadians: Most of the cars sold here are designed across the border. Perhaps present integration of the industry will help. Only time will tell.

But the fact is that we have known for many years how to build safer cars. There is no mystery about it. There is an increasing body of literature on the subject. Tests have been conducted by various universities and other bodies to establish what does in fact constitute a safe vehicle. Their findings are there for anyone to read—and for any automobile manufacturer to profit by. Ralph Nader, in his book, "Unsafe at any Speed," points out, and I quote:

Dashboards and instrument panels with projecting knobs and flanges can kill a person striking them at five miles an hour. 1965 model dashboards were the most dangerous ever devised.

Pre-1966 safety glass breaks at 13 miles an hour, breakage point of 1966 glass is 24 miles an hour. Pedestrians are usually killed by being speared by hood ornaments, sharp fenders and grill projections, hooded headlights.

Dashboards with padding added to the upper lip are actually more dangerous than most old unpadded types because the padding is supported by heavy reinforced channel iron.

"Deep dish" steering wheels kill and injure almost as frequently as the old style.

Mr. Nader points out that all the law—American law, that is—requires is that automobiles carry such basic equipment as brakes, windshield wipers, directional signals and the like. Canadian law requires no more.

Ontario regulations under The Highway Traffic Act require two lights in the front and one red light on the back, two sets of brakes, emergency brake and regular brake, safety glass—although it does not actually specify what safety glass is—windshield wipers and a rear-view mirror.

The United States public health services accident prevention bureau estimates that 43 per cent of the people who die in automobile accidents die under survivable conditions.

Dr. Campbell in the CBC TV show, "This Hour Has Seven Days" recently pointed out the great hazards in the automobile when he said this:

The design of the car at the present time results in injuries because the heads of the occupants are not protected. The driver's head strikes the steering wheel or the corner post and the right-front seat passenger routinely strikes the corner post of the instrument panel. And as it has been said, the main problem in this whole thing is the prevention of head injury. Head injury accounts for something like 70 per cent of all the fatal traffic deaths.

1964 Ontario Department of Transport statistics show that 559 of the 1,424 killed in Ontario, died of fractured skulls and that 537 people had serious injuries to the skull.

The United States public health and national safety council says that one half of all injury and death-producing accidents occur within the front quadrant of the automobiles, and that one half of all accidents occur at speeds below 40 miles an hour. These two factors account for one quarter of the deaths.

National safety council figures would indicate that close to 200 Ontario lives per year could be saved if people wore seat belts; and another 200 by proper construction of the car interiors. This, of course, is in addition to thousands who would be saved from injuries of various degrees of severity.

The general services administration of the United States government has published a proposed list of safety specifications which should be demanded on all cars bought by the government. These have been watered down because of opposition from the industry although I noticed in today's paper that they are once again coming to the fore, and pressure is being put on the government to include them in the specifications next year.

The GSA says that a safe motor car should have the following features: padded dash and visors; recessed instruments and controls

on instrument panel; impact-absorbing steering wheel and steering column; safety door latches and hinges; anchorage for seat belt assemblies; dual brake systems; standard gear quadrant; safety glass; glare-reduction surfaces on instrument panel and windshield wipers; safe tires and safety rims; exhaust emission control system to limit the amount of air-polluting elements emitted from the tailpipe; windshield wipers and washers; standard bumper height; four-way flasher that will flash all signal lights together to warn of a hazard; backup lights; outside rear-view mirror.

In addition to these features, of course, the design of the car itself needs alteration. The Italian Pinin Farina Sigma safety car prototype which has been put together and which will be on display in New York at the auto show in April, has these features: Fully rounded-off corners and edges; doors that slide and cannot fly open in a crash; anti-roll bars built into the roof; the passenger compartment very rigid and strong with the surrounding structure so tapered in firmness at either end that initial collision momentum will be absorbed in the buckling of ends before the compartment is reached; in head-on crashes the engine is forced under a strong central area and a steering wheel arrangement prevents it being pushed back upon the driver.

Now this car has been put together but as yet has no engine and has not been tested so we do not know just what the results of such a car might be in the prevention of accidents. But this is the kind of thinking that is going on in Europe in this respect. And I might also add that no American car now made contains any of these features.

The House will recall that in 1964, Metro Coroner Shulman recommended that all cars should be built with: 1. Roofs that must be noncollapsible with rollover bars. 2. Reinforced doors with beams to protect against impact. 3. Trunk wall should be able to withstand the impact of objects flying forward after sudden stops. In other words, the cardboard between the trunk and the back seat should no longer take the impact, it should be stronger than that. 4. Collapsible steering wheel. 5. Interiors should be padded with energy absorbent materials. 6. Shoulder harnesses and neck protectors should be in every car. 7. Cars should have two independent braking systems; the emergency brake should be a true emergency and not just a parking brake. 8. Obstructions to vision should be removed. 9. Front end surface

should be rounded. Inside knobs should be recessed. Spikes and spears should be outlawed. 10. Door latches should be strengthened so that they do not fly open on impact.

Getting a safer car built is not an easy task. There is too much public apathy in spite of the tragic toll on the highways. Accidents occur here and there. Few people see each one. Relatively few are affected by each. If we had the year's traffic toll concentrated in one spot at one time there would be such a hue and cry that even our governments would hear it—and heed. But such concentration is impossible and the indifference continues.

Governments seem to be evading the issue—jurisdictions are not clearly defined and above all there is the powerful pressure of the motor car industry to keep costs down and profits up. To that end the flashy gadget, the minimum material content and the consumer eye-appeal becomes far more important than safety features designed to prevent death and injury to those using the machines.

I have here part of the testimony before one of the American committees that I would like to put before the House. In 1965 Senator Abraham Ribicoff's subcommittee on executive reorganization, opened hearings in Washington on the vehicle safety issue. Each of the four domestic manufacturers of motor cars was invited to testify. James Roche, the president of the General Motors Company, was there and Frederick Donner.

After devoting a quarter of his testimony to cataloguing past advances—this is the president—he went on to discuss the company's proving grounds, the rigorous company testing, the need for better vehicle maintenance by car owners and the support General Motors gives to education in this field. He pointed the finger to the driver and to the need for education there.

Then another testimony by Harry Barr, GM's engineering vice-president. He said that Dr. Donald Hueike's investigation of 114 fatal accidents financed by a grant of \$15,000 from the United States public health service, not financed by the companies, had given General Motors more useful information on second-collision passenger impacts—that is the impact inside the car—in General Motors' cars than the company had accumulated in the preceding 10 years.

Senator Robert F. Kennedy pressed to find out whether General Motors had similar investigative arrangements elsewhere in the country. Barr said: "We have not found another dedicated doctor who is doing this type of work." Kennedy asked whether he

had tried to find people in other areas, and after much evasiveness, Barr simply stated, "No, I have not."

Kennedy was visibly nettled. Kennedy: "What was the profit of General Motors last year?" Roche: "I don't think that has anything to do—". Kennedy: "I think I am entitled to know that figure. You spent a million and a quarter dollars, as I understand, in this aspect of safety. I would like to know what the profit is." Donner: "The one aspect we are talking about is safety." Kennedy: "What was the profit of General Motors last year?" Roche: "\$1,700,000,000." Kennedy: "What?" Donner: "About a billion and a half, I think." Kennedy: "You made \$1.7 billion last year?" Donner: "That's correct." Kennedy: "And you spent \$1 million on this?" Donner: "In this particular facet we are talking about." Kennedy: "If you just gave one per cent of your profits that would be \$17 million." And so the investigation went on.

Car manufacturers have talked of safety and have been concerned with safety research—but within the general structural concept of the present cars. They have not been willing to face up to the problem of new structural design.

The attitude of the industry is perhaps well summed up in the words of General Motors vice-president, Wm. Mitchell, when he said before the Ribicoff hearing:

The motor car must be exciting and create a desire and not become mere transportation or we will have just the utility and people will spend their money on other things.

Such an attitude indicates little interest in safety beyond the minimum demands of the market, Mr. Speaker.

A significant fact that Nader mentions is that according to Ford's Gene Bordinat a new rear end on a car model costs between \$25 million and \$50 million. Twenty-five million dollars is more than the combined research and development expenditures of the industry on collision safety in the past 15 years.

It is significant that we do demand safety standards that are meaningful in rail, marine and air transport. TCA spent millions of dollars trying to find out what happened when the jet liner crashed north of Montreal some years ago. Similar investigations are carried on after every major air crash. Yet we kill thousands of times as many people in car accidents as we do in the air and yet we have not begun to look into the fundamental problems of car safety.

Mr. Speaker, one of the vexing problems in car safety is that of tire standards. Various attempts have been made from time to time to set tire standards, particularly in the United States, but so far without too much success.

In 1959 the *Wall Street Journal* published a front-page story which outlined the tire industry's attempts to get the motor companies to buy large tires to prevent overloading which resulted in shorter tire life and in blowouts long before the tread wore down. This precipitated public discussion in which the industry maintained that tire problems were mainly in the realm of improper use, maintenance and replacement. In other words, tire safety was the motorist's not the industry's responsibility.

At about this time, State Senator Edward Speno, then chairman of the New York legislative committee on automobile safety, began to receive letters complaining of new tires on new cars which blew out after a few hundred or a few thousand miles. Speno investigated and became convinced that the motorist had no way of telling what he was buying when it came to tires. No genuine standards existed.

Senator Gaylord A. Nelson in an article entitled "Death on Wheels" in *The Progressive* of September 1965, said this:

The problem is far worse than I had ever imagined. It seems clear that the concern for public interest in automobile and tire design and manufacture is almost completely obliterated by the competitive pressures in these industries. Quality labels on tires, such as Deluxe, Premium and First Line, have no meaning whatever and there is no way to tell one tire grade from another. Size labels on tires were never meant to indicate the precise size. The notion that these labels were meant to indicate the exact size is "merely a recent misunderstanding on the part of the public." It is perfectly possible for a 750 by 14 tire to be larger than 800 by 14. The ply or ply rating labels on tires have no understandable meaning any more. Tires supplied by the auto industry with its new cars are not designed to carry the full load for which these automobiles are designed.

General Motors conceded that the design guide in selecting tires was three passengers, but said that its sedans could carry six passengers plus 200 pounds of luggage provided the tires were specially inflated at 28 pounds in the front and 30 pounds in the rear.

Ford conceded it has been customary to make tire selection on the basis of a three-passenger load.

Mr. Speaker, it being five of the clock, I move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member nearly finished? If so, we could let him finish.

Mr. Young: I have quite a considerable amount more.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): May we then turn to page 6 of the order paper under "Other Motions"? It is motion No. 6.

NOTICE OF MOTION NO. 6

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 6 by Mr. Paterson:

RESOLUTION: That, in the opinion of this House, this government should make available long-term, guaranteed loans at reasonable interest rates for the development of legitimate attractions and accommodations in the tourist industry.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by Mr. Ben, that this resolution No. 6 stand in my name to be approved.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Paterson moves motion No. 6 standing in his name.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, the reason that I have reintroduced this resolution in a slightly altered form this year is that, during my experience in the tourist business many motel and hotel operators, in particular, have come to me to say that they have been unable to borrow first-mortgage and second-mortgage money to update their premises; and that those who can are forced to pay interest rates as high as 20 per cent.

A second reason is the economic council's report on the tourist industry, in chapter 19 of which it details financing in this industry. I think it underlines the basic fact that these resorts and attractions do require more finances. In fact, I could turn to one point here in the economic report:

True, Ontario needs more resorts of international stature and these resorts can be earners of foreign exchange. Government assistance to such, moreover, is a way of bonusing export sales without violating any international agreements.

I think these two reasons underline this resolution.

In section 3 of The Department of Tourism and Information Act, it states:

The objects of this department are to develop the tourist industry in Ontario by encouraging and promoting improvements in the standards of accommodation, facilities and services offered to tourists—and to undertake to publicize such—

and so forth.

So it is very basic to our industry that sufficient financing is available to encourage this development.

I have not dwelt at this point too much on other attractions such as ski resorts, historic sites and so forth and I will not pass too much comment on these but these are all embodied in my thinking in this resolution. I need only to mention the McCrea house at Guelph or the Sir John A. Macdonald home here in Toronto that could all fit into this picture should sufficient money be made available to legitimate operators to acquire these properties and set up a programme of continued operation.

For these reasons I would hope that most hon. members in this House can support this bill, certainly in principle if not in fact.

Probably most of us read the article in last December's *Independent Businessman* entitled "Canada's Third Largest Industry Withers without Working Capital." It points out: "many resorts are marginal in profit"; that "many are deteriorating and many have failed."

Last year in the debates on the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information, I dwelt on this problem at great length and drew into the debate the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) and also the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) had a few comments.

As a result of our inquiries the hon. Minister indicated that from the Ontario development association only one loan had been approved for the tourist service industries. I hope that this number is greatly enhanced in his report this year.

To me there are two ways of providing, or making available, these long-term guaranteed loans at reasonable interest rates. Either the government can set up a formula, such as the farm improvement loan, specifically for the tourist industry, made up of the resorts, the motels, the hotels and other attractions, and have these loans made through the chartered banks. I would favour this.

The second method would be through the Ontario development agency to loan these moneys directly.

But hinging on both, and underlying all this, is the involvement of the Ontario development agency and The Department of Tourism and Information. Some small efforts have been made in this regard by sending people out to go over the books of these particular resorts of the tourist industry, to help train them more fully, to continue to check on their operations and to see that they are headed in the right direction. I think all of us realize that financing is not the only problem facing these operators. They have other problems, and it is up to this Ontario government, the Ontario development agency and this department to give this assistance.

I might make mention of our provinces to the east where this is done. In Nova Scotia, to encourage such expansion, the province of Nova Scotia offers a counselling service to prospective owners of motels, and loans are available under The Industrial Loan Act, administered by The Nova Scotia Department of Trade and Industry. These loans, granted to provide or increase accommodations where the need is apparent and to enable substantial improvements in existing facilities, bear an interest rate of 6.5 per cent per annum.

In the planning programme, the Nova Scotia food services council and several government departments co-operate in this field and conduct training courses for personnel involved in serving the travelling public. To me, it is all embodied, if and when a loan is made, that these services should be provided for the protection of this loan and for the development of our industry.

In Prince Edward Island, loans are made available and the province is almost adequately serviced at this present time.

In Newfoundland, the tourist development loan board will loan up to 50 per cent of the cost of constructing new units, for motels and hotels, even including swimming pools.

So the precedent certainly has been set in other jurisdictions in our country and the precedent has been set in the farm-loan type of plan. I can see no reason why some such similar financial institution and operation cannot be set up in our province to offer assistance to this industry.

We often get complaints about the high rates charged at our hotels and motels. It is certainly no wonder. If these people are involved in second mortgages, paying up to

20 per cent interest on their debts, they have to charge. The whole problem is that of the loan sharks that take advantage of these people. They are the blood suckers of our society, bleeding our tourist operators to death.

Last year I documented several cases of financial troubles in the estimates of The Department of Tourism and Information. Since then, many more have come to my attention from all parts of the province. No doubt many of the hon. members assembled here have had similar complaints. A few months ago the federal government saw fit to designate areas in our province where tourist facilities will qualify for accelerated depreciation allowances. Let us give these areas and all areas of Ontario another boost, by making available long-term, low-interest guaranteed loans.

Since I spoke on this last year, I have had correspondence with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and his officials. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent letter to me on April 21, many of the problems relating to this industry were documented in regard to financing and other problems that beset this industry. I do not wish to take up the time of this House in reading this report, and I do not feel that I can read this report in part without destroying the whole context of the matter. I would compliment the hon. Minister and his officials in this regard, and trust that the facilities of the Ontario development association will be broadened and that these facilities will be made better known to our tourist operators, and help them in their multiple problems.

But I do request this House to support my resolution, that this government should make available these long-term guaranteed loans, at reasonable interest rates, and help develop the tourist industry which is so essential to our provincial economy.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution of the hon. member for Essex South, I do so with, I think, a very real and very sound knowledge of a good deal of the tourist business in the northwestern part of the province of Ontario.

I can agree with the previous speaker when he says that during the past few years tourism generally has grown tremendously. We all realize that. It has grown in so many ways, in so many spheres. I am sure all the hon. members of this House are thoroughly aware of the trailer aspect of the tourist business, for instance, and I am sure that

as we travel the highways all across the province, we see the vast number of trailers using the roads and the vast number of boat trailers as well.

These people who are occupying these trailers and using these boats in the waters of the province, must have accommodation. They need suitable accommodation. Unfortunately, many of the people in the tourist business in the province are, owing to the rapid increase in the industry, more or less entrepreneurs. They went into the business on a shoestring, so to speak. The result of it is that they have been forced to pour most of their earnings back into the business each season. The result of that, of course, is that they have had to eke out an existence as far as they personally are concerned. They have also been almost impelled to supply more and better accommodation to tourists from the United States and from other countries and from other places in Canada. The result of that has put them in a position where they have had to borrow money, as has been said, at fantastic rates of interest. And in many cases, under fantastic conditions of repayment.

It is known that many of the people in the northwestern part of the country at the present time are in a position where they have to refinance each year in order to carry out their financial obligations and to carry on their business. This seems to be a very sad state of affairs when one considers that the statistics have a very sound basis of fact inasmuch as they are contained in this Ontario tourist industry booklet—a very good book too, I think, which was published by the Ontario economic council tourist industry committee. Other departments contributed to the book: The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Economics and Development.

I think it is generally agreed, Mr. Speaker, that the tourist industry in Ontario is now recognized as one of the high-income developing businesses in the province. It is growing bigger and it should grow bigger, because our province has everything to offer this business, to increase its scope and its service to the people with whom it will be dealing, not only in the summer months but the winter months as well.

Skiing we know—and I am sure that my friend, the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) will agree with me when I say that in our part of northwestern Ontario, skiing has developed enormously in the past few years.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Does he ski?

Mr. Freeman: Occasionally, I believe.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): He slips occasionally, anyway.

Mr. Freeman: But I am sure he is very interested in skiing as a sport and as a revenue-producing industry.

I am sure that the skiing in our part of the country, as elsewhere in the province, is growing year by year; it has been developed into a big business now and those people who have money to spend demand proper accommodation in which to live while they are out of their own country or their own area, and I would hope that many more of them come to that very fine ski area which we have in northwestern Ontario. It has been said by very expert skiers and people who have travelled throughout the world, that our part of northwestern Ontario is the best ski area between the Laurentians and the Rockies. Now to have this in the province of Ontario I think is an asset that we must all nurture, and if it requires financial nurturing I think we should give very serious consideration to this matter.

If you start a business and you find that your business is growing by leaps and bounds, but you are held in check simply because you do not have sufficient money with which to buy stock to service the people who come to you for service then I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is a form of business strangulation. It is not only a form of business strangulation but it must be a frightful form of business frustration to the operator.

Where a business offers so much—and where a tourist business, skiing and tourist resorts, boating, fishing and various other sports, add so materially to the financial position of our province—I believe that it is the duty of this Legislature, nothing less than the duty of this Legislature, to give very sound and very serious consideration to the problem of setting up some system of finance. A system that will make it possible for these people, who are perhaps operating in a small way within the confines of the province at the present time, to extend their business interests to offer better service, to offer better food supplies, better menus and all that goes with all this sort of thing.

I believe that the government of this province is doing a fairly creditable job with regard to promotion in the area of tourism.

But when you look at the figures which are contained in this book which is produced—as I pointed out—by the Ontario economic council tourist industry committee and at the additions which were offered by The Department

of Economics and Development—I am sure they had quite a real hand in this—the figures are very disappointing when you compare Ontario's financial contribution to the tourist industry, to that of some of the other and smaller provinces.

Some of the provinces have much less to offer the visitor from other countries and the visitor from other parts of Canada, than we have here in Ontario.

So I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that the words of the previous speaker, my own words, and I would hope the words of any speakers who are to follow us on this matter, will fall on fertile ground and that the thoughts will not be shrugged off, that the matter will receive the attention of the Cabinet and of the hon. Ministers of the departments involved presently, and other departments who should be involved such as Lands and Forests—very definitely involved in this matter, very certainly involved.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that some real deep-down thinking be done on this matter—not ten years from now or 20 years from now, but this year, 1966, so that we can this year and next year and in the years to follow bring an even greater number of people from foreign countries and visitors from other provinces of Canada to visit Ontario and I would hope leave with us some of their dollars to add to our gross provincial product.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will agree with me that the contribution of the tourist industry in the past several years has added enormously to the gross provincial product and I would hope that he would use his influence together with the other hon. Ministers in this government to see that something of a sound constructive nature was done. Thank you.

Mr. R. Welch (Lincoln): Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to participate in this particular debate, coming from that part of the province which is so rich in the historical treasures about which we hear so much from time to time, and to recognize along with the other speakers, the hon. member for Essex South and the hon. member for Fort William in a very real way, the importance of this particular industry.

We are all well aware of this, I am sure, because of the copies of the report which have been made available to us, to which reference has already been made during the discussion on this particular resolution. As you know, the Ontario economic council several years ago did appoint this tourist in-

dustry committee to study and to present its findings with respect to this industry, which according to them is providing some 10 per cent of the gross provincial product and which is a very real and important factor insofar as the returns on investment are concerned.

I would like to say at the outset that I doubt very much that there would be any basic disagreement between any of us in this House with respect to any policy or any sets of policies or any programmes which would encourage this industry to grow even further. I would hope that any discussion I contribute to this debate this afternoon would be seen in the light of this—that we must all work together to develop this particular industry.

The purpose of the committee as we were told, this particular tourist industry committee which was established by the council, was to assess all aspects of tourism in the province and to formulate certain recommendations concerning at least these two things.

First, there was the relative effectiveness of current government assistance and participation in the tourist industry. This was a very major part of the study.

And then too the report was to contain an evaluation of the strength and the weaknesses within the industry itself. In December of last year we were all sent copies of the particular report, which received a great deal of publicity.

The underlying themes to the report—and I think we should keep this in mind as we discuss the resolution before us, Mr. Speaker—the underlying themes to the report are that more money must be spent, but it is a matter of priority as to the areas which demand the money first. The report is very definite in its emphasis on the need for money to be spent on research into what tourists want, how these wants can be met, and then the money which has to be spent on the whole subject of promotion to get people to actively involve themselves not only in the industry itself but as customers, so to speak, of the industry.

The matter which the hon. member for Essex South has introduced as the subject-matter of the resolution is dealt with in the report itself. He has already made some reference to this by quoting sections from pages 49 and 50 of the report which has to do with the whole question of financing the industry.

As an introduction to this particular section it is interesting to read that during the public hearings of the tourist industry committee many references were made to the problem

of credit availability for the tourist operators of Ontario, and during those hearings apparently much was said about the lack of funds which were available to finance new tourist facilities.

Then the report goes on to point out—and I think this is something very significant and something that I would like to adopt as the theme of the few remarks which I have—that simply having a desire to get into or expand a particular line of business is really not a total justification for securing such financial aid.

There must be a proven market with demonstrated potential of profit and acknowledged managerial know-how, and given such there are already some avenues of access to aid, Mr. Speaker.

In the course of chapter 19 of this report there is a summary of the type of government assistance which is now available, subject of course to the conditions which are laid down by the particular pieces of legislation which authorize government either at the federal or the provincial level to involve itself in this type of financial programme.

I think this particular report is of interest naturally to me and it will be of interest to my hon. colleague from the riding of Niagara Falls (Mr. Bukator) because there is much said in this report about the development and the potential of that particular area. But as one looks at the highlights of this report—and I go back to it because I think anything we say must be seen in the light of this—the highlights of this council's report may be summarized along these lines:

That Ontario needs to adopt the hard-sell tactics of private enterprise, says the report, to sell tourism; it also goes on to point out that the tourist promotion budget of \$1 million a year is not an adequate sum of money. Once again returning to the question of promoting those particular facilities and those particular assets which we now have, the report goes on to highlight the fact that apparently we in Ontario are very timid about advertising the attractions which we have, and if we were to promote this in a more active way it certainly should bring very real results.

It also goes on to point out very significantly, and this goes to underline what the hon. member for Fort William and the hon. member for Essex South have impressed already on this House in their very able presentations, that for each dollar which is invested by government in tourist promotion, a minimum of \$20 in tax revenue

is being generated, and I think this is a pretty good return in the concept of economics.

Tourists are not staying, says the report, long enough, and travel agents are enticing our people elsewhere, namely, abroad. Then they talk about more imaginative promotion being needed for our two show windows, Niagara Falls and Upper Canada Village. I will leave the promotion with respect to Niagara Falls in the very capable hands of my hon. colleague who represents that riding.

The recreational potentials of inland waters, river and canal systems have hardly been tapped, and I might say by way of digression, coming from the city of St. Catharines, the county seat of the county of Lincoln, we of course have the Welland canal.

This attraction is an amazing engineering feat, yet up until a year or two ago it was difficult for tourists from many parts of the country to even find some suitable place at which to watch the locking system of the canal.

The St. Lawrence seaway authority along with the city of St. Catharines have become quite active through road signs, promotional material and directional maps to indicate the location of some of these locks and have constructed a landing place where people may stand and watch ships being locked through lock No. 3 of the Welland canal.

It would seem to me that if this canal were in other parts of North America, particularly those south of our national border, there would be great schemes to make sure that thousands of people were paraded up and down the canal in buses or miniature railroads to see this great and wonderful feat. Notwithstanding comments made recently that it is becoming outdated, I can assure this House that even as natives of this area we never cease to be amazed at the attraction which it holds, and also at the wonderful lessons in geography for our young people as the ships from all parts of the world use this particular waterway.

Here is an excellent example, one of thousands, Mr. Speaker, which can be the subject matter of more active promotional displays and all the other programmes which are associated with publicity in this line.

Travel, said the report, should be encouraged on out-of-way roads where the tourists can see the sights—and also leave with them as they are visiting in this area some of their currency.

The report summary goes on to highlight many other matters, and I am sure we would be all agreed this is a very important part of the economy but should be an even more important part of the economy of this province, contributing so significantly now to our gross provincial product.

Having said all these particular matters the next thing is to ask what has the government been doing about it already. I say in fairness—and I am sure the hon. member for Essex South indicated this in his remarks, as did the hon. member for Fort William—that we have been somewhat active in this particular field now.

The Department of Tourism and Information has its development branch and it is my understanding that one of the main functions to be performed by this branch is the whole question of research. I think we have to understand what the interests of our visitors might be. What are the sort of things in which they would be interested in seeing? What about our own people? Are we developing the right type of facilities? Because we have in the motion itself reference to legitimate attractions, and I think it is very necessary.

Regardless of who loans the money there is a great responsibility on the lender, whether he be lending himself or simply guaranteeing loans, and particularly if it is government, because we are loaning or guaranteeing the credit of the people of the province, that we be satisfied that we are investing our money and that we are involving ourselves in the credit for very responsible and also very worthwhile projects.

I think that the development branch of The Department of Tourism and Information, and in particular the research facilities of that department, are being geared for this type of work in co-operation with The Department of Economics and Development. I think in fairness to The Department of Economics and Development we should also point out—because some reference was made by my hon. friend from Essex South of the need for some counselling services—that this has in fact engaged the members of the Ontario development agency for the last two years in a very concentrated way.

There have been these on-the-spot consultations where the Ontario development agency—as we know, an agency formed in late 1962—has had this as one of its very major programmes. For the past two years it is my understanding that it has been increasing its activities in the field of tourism, particularly with respect to these consultative services.

No doubt this was what was meant by my hon. friend from Essex South when he made reference to the summary in the form of a letter from the hon. Minister of this department. The agency has co-operated, Mr. Speaker, with the regional development associations which are outgrowths of the work of The Department of Economics and Development, and The Department of Tourism and Information, the boards of trade and chambers of commerce and other interested groups, and the tourist groups themselves—and we must not overlook the importance of working with these associations.

The Ontario development association has formed consulting teams and has sent them to many areas and has invited tourist and resort operators to discuss their problems with them, and I understand that during the last year such consultations have been held in places like Niagara Falls and Barrie and Cornwall. There is quite a list, Elliot Lake, Fort William and Port Arthur, Trenton and Stratford and Guelph, and many other places which are here, and in some places like North Bay, and Kirkland Lake and Timmins, and Sault Ste. Marie, I notice they have had two such consultations with the people in this very important industry.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to these on-the-spot consultations, many tourist operators, I am told, have visited the offices of the Ontario development agency here in Toronto, and as a result, the Ontario development agency consultants have had an opportunity not only of reviewing financial statements, but also the actual operations of a large number of tourist operators in Ontario.

Being interested in this particular resolution and the financial aspects of it, or the credit aspects of it, it was interesting to read—not only making reference to the report of the Ontario tourist industry, to which I have already referred—that the growth of this industry has been very significant and it has been this rapid growth itself which has developed many of the problems.

Among those, I am told, and I am sure we understand these, we have the whole problem of under-capitalization and low earnings. Such matters as weather and the length of the tourist season, perhaps, have influenced the fact that for a very short period there has to be a great return, although as the hon. member for Fort William said, we are moving into the situation where attractions and facilities have to be provided for this type of thing all year round.

In addition to these particular matters to which reference has already been made—that

is, the research facilities and the development branch of tourism and information and the consultations and the advice of the Ontario development agency—I am sure that we look forward, as reference has already been made in the Speech from the Throne, to the establishment of the Ontario development corporation. We are not yet able to discuss the particulars of this, because the legislation is not before the House, but I would hope that this would be in some corporate way, simply an extension of the work which the Ontario development agency has already carried on and that it would be a very real and helpful factor to those who participate in this particular industry.

I think it also should be pointed out that as we attempt to give credit—I was going to say to give credit where credit is due, but that is the whole point of the resolution; I meant to say to summarize the type of help which is already available—the industrial development bank is very much involved in this and I am now making reference to chapter 19 of the report of the Ontario economic council.

The second area of conventional financing available to the industry has been in The Federal Small Business Loans Act and there is some reference in this report to the amount of financial assistance which has been forthcoming from that source. There has been the Ontario development agency and of course, the whole question of private finance.

Unfortunately, and one would have to agree, Mr. Speaker, unfortunately there is in many cases a type of private financing which has resulted in some very substantial interest rates having to be paid by people who have not been able to find money through the regular lending institutions.

The Department of Tourism and Information has been attempting to help our tourist operators in bookkeeping systems, workshops for hotel-motel operators. One has just been finished in Ottawa and one planned for North Bay on March 11 and 12.

All this really points to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we are agreed on the importance of the industry, not only from the standpoint of our motel and hotel operators and facilities for people who are going into various parts of our province, but also satisfying ourselves that we are developing properly on the basis of good research and study with respect to market and numbers of people available and the interest of those people once they are in our industry. References have already been made in this debate, and in debates up to now on the Speech from the Throne, about the increasing number of hours

that will be available to our people through shorter work weeks and working conditions which will enable people to travel more in our province, to know more about our province and to appreciate more of the history of our province, and that we shall see an even greater development and an even greater growth in tourism in the years to come.

The government should be ahead of the situation, so to speak, in these research programmes and in these studies and in these advisory capacities, to make sure that if, in fact, it is the decision of government to become involved in some credit arrangement ways, that we are satisfied that the credit of the province is being pledged with respect to operations which are sound insofar as business principles are concerned.

In summary, I think it is sufficient to say this, Mr. Speaker, that if the tourist industry—in the opinion of some who have studied this and who are far more knowledgeable than I—is to attract a larger measure of support from the financial community, it must improve its performance. This is, of course, a generalization which is dangerous, because there are a good many in this business who are doing extremely well here.

First and foremost, the skills of many tourist operators must be raised to a more satisfactory level, approaching that of the best operators in the industry. Reference has already been made to the efforts of government to stimulate and to assist in this regard. For if one reads the estimates of the departments of economics and tourism as they were introduced by the Ministers last year, and studies some of the reports that have already been published, maybe the first priority is not so much with respect to financial assistance, as it is with the need for managerial skill, and the impression insofar as the people are concerned who wish to inaugurate activity in—or rather the need that people must have with respect to sound business training and to understand that this is a very important business—that there are many aspects of it which must be studied carefully, with respect to all sorts of conditions under which these people must operate.

I would hope that if we develop this in this orderly way, in keeping with the tone and the theme of the report which has been placed before us by an objective group such as the Ontario economic council, there will be great benefit to the economy of this province of opportunity.

Mr. E. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that I am not going

to have too much trouble talking about. I am acquainted with the tourist industry. I guess I have been for some 50 years.

I recall the first investment that the province of Ontario made to the Niagara parks board, back in about 1895, when the province lent that board \$525,000 to purchase 157 acres of land, which was made up of the land from the Clifton hill to the Horseshoe Falls, beyond the Horseshoe Falls to the Dufferin Islands and just a little bit up the river nearing Chippawa. That land was purchased at that time for \$525,000 which the government lent them, and they found that they did not have sufficient money; they came back to this aggressive government and they borrowed another \$75,000.

They were thinking into the future. They were looking to better conditions for the travelling public, because at that time the tourists, who came in by train and by wagon and by horses, were being taken by these establishments along the escarpment. When the tourists got to the Falls in those days, they found pickpockets, and they found people there who would not let them get to see the Falls because they claimed they owned the land. So when the parks commission took over, then and there they established a wonderful policy for the people of the province. They and, yes, the people of the world, have enjoyed that wonderful area for these many years.

This commission with that small amount of money, found themselves in a position where they could establish and operate concessions along the way, which paid them well, and do even to this day. As a matter of fact, I get up in this House annually to tell you of the net profit that they make. They sometimes show a better net profit than the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) himself. \$700,000 is no problem for the parks commission to show on their books as a profit for one year's operation.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): It keeps the government going.

Mr. Bukator: They are an efficient body who do an exceptionally good job, Mr. Speaker. Now the only reason I have said that is that some of the hon. Ministers visited that area, considering the possibility of purchasing another 133 acres of land from just within a stone's throw of the Horseshoe Falls, to the village of Chippawa. There was a time that particular area was a golf course; it belonged to the late Sir Harry Oakes. Some of the hon. members and some of the hon. Ministers who are here now were there look-

ing these lands over. They were approached by the parks commission. The parks integration board, I believe, was there about a year ago—maybe two years ago, time passes very quickly—but they were there at my request, I might say. They honoured me with that visit; they looked these lands over like a group of experts who knew the value of property by just one look. I have been in the real estate business in that area for some ten years and I think I know the value of property too, and I would say this, that if property like that could be purchased—this 133 acres, right on the escarpment, overlooking the Horseshoe Falls—could be purchased by private enterprise for \$1 million—

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): The hon. member would have to look pretty hard from there to see the Falls.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. gentleman lives in Dunnville and he sees the Falls quite well when he comes down. It would not be too difficult for them to walk that half mile or drive a half mile, but the Niagara river is just above that property. I live on it and I can see the spray from the Falls and I can see the lights at night. I enjoy that and I am a mile beyond the property I am talking about. But this bunch of pros, the Cabinet Ministers who belong to a board, come into that area and look the situation over and say it is too much money. It is a good thing their predecessors did not look at things that way, because we would not have the park that we have today.

So I suggest that they take another look, because the son of the late Sir Harry Oakes still has this property for them and is willing to sacrifice it, in my opinion—as one who is in the real estate business in that area—is willing to let the government have it for just \$1 million.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): I will sell my house for less than that.

Mr. Bukator: Well, I am talking about acres of land that the hon. member's children—if he has any, or maybe he does not—and his children's children can enjoy; 133 acres.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. member for Woodbine needs a hole in the head more than Harry Oakes' son needs a million, I can assure you. I am talking about the future of this great province of ours. I am talking about the park system that we should enjoy.

I am talking about what this province has done recently by spending \$5.5 million in Montreal for an exhibition, for the Centennial. I think that is good. I saw in the papers yesterday that it is not \$5.5 million, it is now \$7.5 million. And what is it going to cost to put the exhibition in? What is it going to cost to maintain that during the exhibition?

That is a hidden cost and no doubt we will never know. But I venture to say at this time—and prove me wrong if you will—\$10 million will not cover the cost of our contribution to that exhibition in Montreal. And here we have a recommendation from this particular council—and the hon. member for Lincoln has brought it to our attention—they tell us that there has to be more done in that area; otherwise private enterprise will have to get in there and will benefit by what nature provided.

And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the right people should begin to produce a Canadian-made souvenir that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development I believe, has been promoting. You can walk into the city of Niagara Falls, Mr. Speaker, or any other tourist area and pick up a souvenir, if you will. We did last summer, when we were up on the Hudson Bay and I found a beaded belt, a lovely belt that I took home to my daughter. After I purchased it one of the men on that particular tour said to me, "Did you see where that was made?" and I said it must have been made by the Indians. It was a souvenir made in Japan.

I have had people come into my office, talking about purchasing property in that great riding, that great county of Welland. The hon. member is not here, I had to say it for him. The souvenirs that one picks up on the stands of those stores, including the parks commission stores, are going to be either from Germany or from Japan or from some foreign country. They tell me that the souvenir of the mountie—who is typically Canadian and is doing such a great job representing something Canadian—is made in Japan, and because it happens to be made there, the makers even put slanted eyes on them. A great Canadian product.

I suggest it is about time that this government made some investment in private enterprise and in people with imagination who have the ability to develop more souvenirs such as those mentioned in this report.

I have been talking pretty fast. If I had slowed down I could have adjourned this debate at six. When I get excited about a

subject, I just go on and on. However, when I get to the Skylon that will take a good half hour.

An hon. member: We are enjoying it.

Mr. Bukator: I am glad that the hon. member is. Maybe I should read a little out of that report because I think it is quite good.

An hon. member: That is why we printed it.

Mr. Bukator: That is why the government printed it. As a matter of fact, it was only a day or so ago that I had one, I sent for it and the department was good enough to send me this one. I knew I was going to speak tonight.

An hon. member: Where was it printed?

Mr. Bukator: It says "Top Show Window" and I suppose it was printed some place in the province: "The Niagara parks system is a key foundation stone to the province's tourist industry."

An hon. member: Would the hon. member repeat that?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, it is worth repeating. "The Niagara parks system is a key foundation stone to the province's tourist industry."

Do I have to read beyond that? Eleven million people, according to the government's statistics, not mine, come into that area to see that mighty Niagara. It used to be a lot mightier before Hydro took the water off; at night it looked like a canyon.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Eleven million people come in to see the Falls and they spend possibly a day looking over these beautiful parks from lake to lake that the parks commission developed, and here I would like to boast a little bit.

I sat on the commission for six years, and among the areas that were developed in my time were the golf course, and the little park at Chippawa, and this is all good. I tried to persuade the former Prime Minister of this province to purchase another 3,300 feet at the Fort Erie end but because his time was limited in this House and the new hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) is not looking at parks for the time being anyway, this will have to lie there until some private enterprise picks it up and no doubt makes a lot of money out of it.

That is another area, just across from Buffalo—3,300 feet of lakeshore property that can be bought for less than \$200,000. This is where the government should contribute and help organizations of their own that are doing a good job and making a fair amount of money.

I would suggest this to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the hon. Prime Minister or some of his hon. colleagues would get together with them and say, "Purchase it," they could buy it anyway, because in 1934 when a certain party took over in the province here, they developed those parks and spent many millions of dollars. When I was appointed to the commission back in 1950 or 1951 they were in debt some \$5 million or \$6 million. In 1956 I was through on the parks commission and they had repaid their debt of well over \$5 million, paid it off in full. Since that time they have found that the water rights that they were getting as a commission had to go into the parks integration board. They are taking some \$600,000 a year, putting it into the parks integration board's fund at that time. Now I guess it goes into the consolidated revenue fund, because the park has more money than they know what to do with.

I would think that this government should assist them in view of what this particular council said. I also think that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development should take a good look at the possibility of commercializing this one establishment and one only. If it is true that 11 million people come into Niagara Falls—and who am I to doubt the statistics, the facts that are presented to us by the government and the parks commission?—and if it is true that the Skylon is being built to the tune of \$11 million by private enterprise, and if it is true that they have an exhibit area, an exhibition area where 11 million people can come in and look for nothing—no admission charged to go to the exhibition area—and if it is true that this government is spending \$7.5 million, \$10 million in Montreal in my opinion, would it not be good business for this government to spend some money to rent a space in that area so that when 11 million people have looked at the Falls, have gone into that exhibition area, where there is no charge, they can be directed throughout this province to see more of the province through the government's exhibitions?

Where are they going to get these concessions and what are they going to do with them? I would like to ask, what does this government do with that excellent exhibition

in Toronto, the Canadian national exhibition? When it gets through with that particular display is it dismantled—does it go on the junk heap? I imagine it does. Some of it you could keep to another year.

Some of us would like to see a nice picture of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development and, yes, the hon. Prime Minister himself in this lovely exhibition ground, with ceilings as high as this House has.

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): That would be the day!

An hon. member: You do not want to scare the people.

Mr. Bukator: I say to you gentlemen—and I think I am entitled to, at least if nothing else, it is still a free country—that if the hon. Prime Minister and his Cabinet Ministers cannot see the good business of putting an exhibition in that area to let this 10 or 11 million people see it for nothing, to show them the rest of the province, you are playing nothing short of politics. You are doing it because there is a Liberal member in that riding. No common sense or business would deprive you of doing it.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I went into the hon. member's riding and opened it.

An hon. member: A good Liberal member.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Now then, in view of what the hon. Prime Minister has said—he said "I went into your riding and opened it," and he did—I might say that under those circumstances with a little bit of backfiring, I might say politically, he handled himself exceptionally well under the circumstances.

I have said it before, and I say it to him again: "We are still proud of you. You are not a bad sort of politician." But I am going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. Prime Minister, he is a lousy businessman if he does not see the good of putting that exhibition in there.

An hon. member: Now you are talking; now you are getting to it.

Mr. Bukator: And I might repeat, he is a lousy businessman if he does not see the good of putting an exhibition in an area where 11 million people will see it—at no charge.

I was told that you might want three or four minutes before six and I would like to adjourn this debate because there is lots more to be said by myself and others.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There would be a charge to the government, though.

Mr. Bukator: You would have to pay the rental, yes, naturally. But I would think that in view of what you are spending in Montreal because of the Centennial—and I think this is good business—I would think that this particular area warrants consideration, if nothing else.

An hon. member: We will ask you about that later in the Budget debate.

Mr. Bukator: I doubt it very much. I do not think that I speak from both sides of my mouth like some people do.

An hon. member: I meant the hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, I might say I have enjoyed this portion of the debate because I think on this particular subject I know what I am talking about.

Mr. Bukator moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at 8 o'clock we will resume the Throne debate.

It being 6 o'clock p.m. the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 17, 1966

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Young, Mr. W. B. Lewis, Mr. Sargent, Mr. Grossman	653
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	683
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	683

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The first order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the Speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, just prior to adjournment I was discussing the problem of tires and tire safety and had quoted Senator Gaylord Nelson, in his article "Death on Wheels," when he pointed out certain deficiencies in tire standards and had said that the industry makes its tire selections on the basis of a three-passenger load.

Two years before this, in September, 1963, Senator Speno's committee had visited Akron, Ohio, the home of four of the five big tire companies. They attended a dinner given in their honour by these companies. Speno made a hard-hitting speech in the matter of tire safety and he wound up by proposing minimum safety performance standards for the new automobile tires. He urged co-operation in achieving this end on the part of this industry, but he made it clear that if the industry would not co-operate, then the New York Legislature would do its job by introducing legislation to force the issue.

The 1964 report of the committee, which is written in a rather interesting fashion and is entitled "Safe Tires Save Lives," says this:

There was absolute quiet in the large room until the speech had been concluded and the listeners had recovered. One working newspaperman who had covered the tire companies for many years had been invited. He spilled both his coffee and his after-dinner liqueur over the man seated to his left.

The report further states that:

Some top executives and chief engineers were questioned about the lack of such standards and the possibility of establishing them. They expressed interest in what they

admitted was a novel proposal for a highly competitive industry in which the only co-operation among companies had been agreement on loads and on sizes so that tires could fit the rims of any American passenger car.

Minimum safety performance standards? We have never faced up to it, one industry executive said.

But the tire industry finally did decide to co-operate with Speno in order to have some say in the drafting of the legislation. The bill was introduced. Ralph Nader, in the current *Consumers' Report*, describes what happened then. He says this:

Late in 1963, however, the automobile industry told the tire companies crisply that there was to be total opposition to any tire legislation. There followed what veteran observers in Albany called some of the most intensive and improper lobbying ever seen on those legislative battlegrounds. The Senate passed the bill, but the lobbying paid off in the assembly where the bill was never brought to a floor vote.

Senator Speno told me a week ago that they were still struggling to get it to the floor of the assembly.

Senator Gaylord Nelson took up the battle in Washington, where it is now being pushed with real enthusiasm on the part of some of the people there. He recently introduced a bill to establish an actual system of tire grading and labelling and to ban unsafe tires. The bill is still stalled in the machinery there, as it is in New York.

Public concern, however, is rising and complaints are pouring into his office from motorists, automobile clubs and tire dealers across the country.

One California tire dealer wired:

YOU ARE RIGHT. MANY MOTORISTS ARE RIDING ON A TIME BOMB.

Complaints of a similar nature were poured into the offices of the federal trade commission which finally decided to hold hearings in January, 1965. Nader recounts the results:

These hearings visibly shocked some of the FTC commissioners. Chairman Paul

Rand Dixon told the Senate commerce committee, which began hearings in May: Our hearing contains substantial testimony as to the inadequacy of these rubber manufacturers association standards. The specific safety problems relate principally to the matter of tire size and the so-called practice of overloading, which are inter-related. Overload is the situation which exists when the curb weight of the vehicle plus the designed load capacity in terms of passengers and luggage exceeds the load-carrying capacity of the tires with which the vehicle is equipped. One tire manufacturer stated that over the years vehicle manufacturers in an attempt to cut costs have cut down the amount of the tire they are designing into their vehicles and that some vehicles are overloaded when they are empty. Repeatedly the problem of overload was placed back to the automobile manufacturers.

Mr. Speaker, Dixon later told the Senate commerce committee that:

The replacement tire market provided a great deal of consumer confusion and deception. We believe confusion and deception are inherent in the existing situation, where tires may be designated as to quality—that is premium, first line, second line, and so on—regardless of the tires' inherent quality of safety, where the price of the tire has no discernible relation to its quality or safety, and where many of the descriptive terms employed, such as "ply rating," "100 level," and other grade designations, have no real meaning or definitive value in the absence of uniform standards.

But in spite of these revelations, legislation has been blocked and little has been accomplished. The industry points to the need for the consumer to be able to choose the kind of tire he wants as if he is in any position, without any standards, to do this. The power of the opposition to tire standards is outlined by Nader in this way:

The industry knows that the political success of any administration more and more is being measured by its success in promoting economic growth. Automobile production utilizes 21 per cent of all steel, 49 per cent of all lead, 61 per cent of all rubber, 32 per cent of all zinc, 13 per cent of all aluminum, and 58 per cent of all upholstery leather sold in this country [USA]. One business in every six is classified as automotive. One worker out of every seven is employed

directly or indirectly in producing, supplying, servicing, financing or transporting automobiles. Automobile spokesmen never fail to cite these figures whenever they want something from government or want to block government action. As a privileged institution the automobile industry has made an impressive record in Washington. Hearings reveal abuses but legislation almost never follows.

In Canada we have not even begun to solve this problem or even to move toward safe tire standards. There seems no good reason why this government should not introduce legislation designed to provide safe tire standards. I call this to the attention of the government and hope some action will take place. It is long overdue and desperately needed to supply protection for Ontario citizens.

Not long ago the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Davison) experienced a tire blowout with a car that had not yet gone 3,000 miles.

The industry, according to the findings of the United States committee, sets its higher standard at the level of a car carrying three occupants. Fortunately, the majority of cars carry one or two persons most of the time, but danger comes when the family loads up the car for a holiday trip and drives at higher speeds on what should be a carefree vacation.

They do not raise the pressure of the tires, as the industry says they should do at times like this. They do not know about it, or forget.

The tires which come with the car evidently are not designed for this kind of use except under these circumstances. Since standards are absent there is no way in which the driver with confidence can replace those tires with something better. Ontario people should not be forced to ride on time bombs. The remedy lies within the power of this Legislature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the Legislature a week ago, and I guess it is just a week ago tonight, it was my privilege a week ago Wednesday to attend a hearing of the New York legislative committee on motor vehicle and traffic safety and to meet informally with the committee members and their staff before the formal hearing.

For some time I have been interested in this committee and what it has been doing in the field of automobile safety, and when the invitation came for me to see at close quarters what they were doing, I gladly accepted

it, and I might say the experience was an extremely rewarding one.

The New York committee, first authorized in its present form, was set up in 1959. It has issued several reports—and I have some of them here—on various aspects of the motor car problem and has played an important role in progressive legislation in this field. In the foreword to one of their reports called "Death or Life," Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller says this:

Under Senator Speno's leadership, the committee has played a major role in giving New York state national leadership in traffic safety work over the past four years. Senator Speno's committee has worked closely with my administration in pioneering traffic safety legislation. The committee's seat belt legislation and negotiations with Detroit through which auto manufacturers have agreed to supply the safety device nationally are of unparalleled importance, because seat belts reduce fatalities and serious injuries among users by at least 35 per cent.

Another example of New York leadership is the statute regarding driving while impaired by alcoholic beverages.

Signed by Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York.

In 1965 the state Legislature appropriated a sum of money for a feasibility study of a programme to design, fabricate in prototype quantities, develop and test a prototype car embodying all feasible safety devices and features and practical for a limited mass production. The first stage of that feasibility study has now been completed. I have the report here of the Fairchild-Hiller Republic Aviation Division in Farmingdale, Long Island, and I have made a copy of this available to the Minister for his information and perusal.

At Wednesday's meeting in Albany this study was discussed in some detail and its results assessed. At the meeting were representatives of the states of Iowa and Illinois as well as Howard Graffey, the Conservative member of Parliament from Brome-Missiquoi—and I might say that the Conservative Party is now engaged in a real drive in Ottawa to bring the government into knowledge and into activity in this field. They are being thoroughly backed by the national leader, John Diefenbaker, and I would hope that pressure will find its way through to the hon. members of this Legislature who may belong to the same party.

Now the feasibility study—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Do they belong to the same party?

Mr. Young: Well, at least it is under the same banner and the same name, but they are in Opposition in one House and government in the other, so we shall see what happens.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): I wonder if the hon. member would permit a question.

Mr. Young: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Edwards: I wonder if the hon. member has read the report of the committee that was set up in this Legislature to review the same things that he is talking about. I might inform the hon. member that 90 per cent of the recommendations have been put into the laws since.

Mr. Young: I am very happy to know this, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware that a committee of this Legislature has ever been set up to study the possibility of safe cars and to build the prototype of a safe car, but if the hon. member knows of information which I do not possess, I would be very glad to hear from him at some future date about it.

An hon. member: Now!

Mr. Young: Perhaps, or at some future time.

In any case, I might say that the feasibility study started first inside the car. They did not think as much of the car itself as the possibility of saving life inside and outside the car in accidents involving it.

They begin with the premise that the injury-producing mechanism in automobile crashes is the relative acceleration of the occupant as related to the auto passenger compartment and its fixtures. In an impact crash the unrestrained occupant becomes a missile, free to accelerate in an infinite number of directions.

The second premise is that the conventional seat structure protects the occupant from below and behind except for the head and neck. They want to take a look at how the head and neck can be protected and also how they can provide protection in front.

They also work from the premise that the specific injury produced may be modified by many factors. The most severe damage is produced by accelerating into rigid small area surfaces which concentrate impact pressure. Examples would include knobs, hard metal edges, gearshift levers, rear-view mirrors,

steering wheel hubs and so on. Rigid flat areas may not penetrate or fracture locally but they do a great deal of injury to limbs and ribs and other parts of the body. Ejection at any speed increases injury or death potential approximately four to one. Anybody thrown out of a vehicle is in four times as much danger as the person who remains inside.

Now what does this study find? It finds that it is feasible to design and build prototype safety cars which would greatly reduce injuries and fatalities and which would also be practical to use, comfortable to ride in, attractive in appearance, and at least as economical in daily operating costs as today's conventional automobile.

For a designed crash impact speed of 50 miles an hour, it is considered possible to reduce occupant injuries and fatalities by more than 50 per cent as compared to today's conventional automobile. This designed speed would reach between 70 per cent and 80 per cent of injury-producing accidents.

It is estimated that the car can roll over at 70 miles an hour without loss of life inside providing the seat belts are fastened and providing, of course, it does not hit a rock or a tree or something of that nature to cause an extra crash.

The estimated improvement is based on theoretical design possibilities in preventing injuries when a crash occurs. Further gains in design to prevent accidents from occurring, to reduce injuries to pedestrians, and to prevent non-operating accidents are to be studied.

Initial design concept stresses improvements available from aero-space engineering design. We have done tremendous things in the whole concept of aero-space design and this knowledge is now being used in respect of cars.

A total of 134 design features are under study. The car is about the size of the three low-priced popular American cars. Later phases of the study will show how graded levels of safety can allow car users or government agencies to balance safety against production costs, and those studies are going forward and will be complete in 1966.

I want to list some crashworthy features that are built into this car concept:

Front collapse structure controls crash deceleration to reduce impact felt at the seats. In other words, the front of the car is built so that the crash impact is gradually

absorbed before it reaches the seat area of the car.

The swinging gate front bumper turns to equalize impact on the other car. The bumper will bend back and, like a ploughshare, deflect the impact of the crash.

Engine mountings and inclined firewall cause the engine to be deflected downward in the crash, protecting the front seats; so the engine goes under the car instead of through into the front seat.

Combined door pillars, roll bars and bulkheads provide a strong passenger-surrounding structure. Deep side frame is externally cushioned for controlled deceleration in a side crash. Door posts are shaped to restrict climbing of front bumper of opposing vehicle in a side crash. The roll bar frames are curved to avoid destructive jolt forces during rollover. Front bumper face is vertical to avoid overriding another car. Controlled collapse column steering wheel has broad, cushioned upper face.

This is somewhat different to the one the industry is now offering. It has a very large centre, well cushioned, and the steering wheel itself will give about one foot—instead of the eight inches that is proposed in the 1967 cars.

Contour seats provide lateral support in side crash. Seat belts are attached to strong seats and they do not clutter the floor. They expect to have them attached to the ceiling by a magnetic device and fastened down over the body. When they are unfastened they back up to the magnetic top and will stay there and not clutter up the seats.

A foot-thick, energy-absorbing cushion in the door; they are thick and with absorbent structure. Space ahead of driver and front seat passenger allows a two-foot-thick crash cushion. Near-flat, resilient windshield cushions occupants and struck pedestrians equally—a protection for both.

Cushioned basinet, with covering net, fastens firmly to rear or front contour seats and a harness is provided for children. Gasoline filler pipe is located within the frame protection to prevent crash fire. Near-flat windshield glass reduces distortion and provides 95 per cent wiper coverage.

A mirror pylon on the roof provides panoramic rear vision, and high forward vision mirror looks above the cars ahead over the crest of a hill. This pylon will snap off in case of a roll-over.

Large-face instruments placed far forward reduce eye focusing and driving problems, particularly with bifocal glasses. The speed-

ometer indicates stopping distance in dry or wet weather. An anti-lock brake system prevents uncontrolled skidding.

Non-operating safety features: door padding shaped to prevent injury in door closing; and the trunk lid opens from either side so that the person does not have to stand behind the car to open it. He opens it from either side.

I have graphic illustrations of this car here, if any of the hon. members are interested in seeing the various features of this car—or anybody who wants to have a look at them. They are available and they will be here over the next period of time for you to see.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that this House would seriously look at what is happening in New York state in respect to car safety. And I would hope that we would seriously examine the report which is now available from the committee. I have an extra report or so available, if anybody wants to look it over. I would refer this particularly to government hon. members who might be interested in really making this thing a matter of government policy and building it into, perhaps, a non-partisan crusade in this Legislature.

If, as experts confidently think, we can save, through improved car design, 50 per cent of the people now being killed or maimed on our roads, then it behooves this House to move as quickly as possible to achieve this desired result.

A prototype car can be built within eight months and the testing would follow. The New York committee plans to build ten cars for testing purposes. Right now, they are going through the painful process of raising about \$4 million in order to complete this project. The initial appropriation was only for the feasibility study.

Word from Albany indicates that the Legislature there is now at the point where they are ready to make a good-sized state appropriation and they are hoping for federal funds and other help for this.

The committee has indicated they would welcome Ontario's participation insofar as Ontario wants to participate, and as the next stage of the work is important, I would hope that we would look at this seriously. On February 8, I asked the hon. Minister of Transport the question:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister. Has he considered the possibility of co-operating with the state of New York in their project of developing a safer car?"

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, no consideration has been given to such action. The project mentioned by the member is being financed by a legislative appropriation by the state of New York.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, could I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister? Would the hon. Minister welcome overtures from the state of New York in regard to such co-operation? Or even seek such?

Hon. Mr. Haskett: This is rather hypothetical. I would hardly know how to answer it. I would say that The Department of Transport has had a continuing concern with the many aspects of highway safety as regards also vehicle design and maintenance. If as a result of this project some useful findings should come out of it, I can assure the House that our department will give them very careful and detailed consideration.

Now the New York committee, as I indicated, is very interested in having our co-operation and will be writing the hon. Minister in respect to this, I hope before too long, as soon as they clear away their own problems in connection with it.

I would hope that when this invitation comes the hon. Minister will give "careful and detailed consideration" to the communication and work out ways and means of initiating such participation.

There is no question that concern is growing among the legislators to the south of us about the mass slaughter on the highways. Popular pressure for a safer car is increasing. People are now finding out for the first time that it is not only possible to build a relatively safe car, but that such cars can also be beautiful, they can be powerful, and they can be in the low price field. The present estimate is that the prototype car outlined in the report can be built at about ten per cent higher in cost than the present cars of comparable size. They hope that price can come down with mass production. But this will leave it still a competitor in the big three range.

The old device of the car manufacturers, to point the finger at highway design and driver carelessness, is no longer working as it once did. The actual structure of the car itself is coming in for wide criticism. Politicians are beginning to sniff votes in the issue, as well as coming to the realization that if the industry is not going to do the job, then the public authority must do it. This attitude is

now being reflected by the increasing millions which the industry is pouring into advertising to tell the public just how concerned they are with safety.

There is no question in many minds that the startling facts brought out in the recent Albany hearings played a significant part in the announcement of the industry that a collapsible steering column is being introduced into the 1967 cars. The industry was there in full force, listening and sampling the air of determination which is growing among the elected representatives around the capital.

The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that governments do move in to set safe standards in house construction, in aircraft manufacture, in rail transportation. The time has come when governments also must insist upon building into motor transportation those features which will save life and limb, and curb the disastrous events which are making a shambles of our highways. One thing is certain, Mr. Speaker, as I have already said: If we could combine all the accidents which occurred on our highways last year into one time and one place, the death and suffering and property loss involved would galvanize us all into instant action to prevent this awesome disaster happening again in the future. But the accidents occur only one by one, separated in time and space. Only a few people are affected by each one and their voices are muted and small. Too often they do not realize that a safer car might have prevented the tragedy and they have been brainwashed into thinking that the fault lies, not with the car, but with the driver or with the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) for not building safer roads.

I hope, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Edwards: That is not possible. He is doing a good job.

Mr. Young: Sure, I agree he is doing a good job, but I am simply saying that industry too often points the finger at either the driver or the road and it should now be pointed directly at car construction as well.

Mr. Edwards: Then why make that point?

Mr. Young: And so I hope, Mr. Speaker, that on all sides of this House there will be a determination to move on this matter. Safer cars can save thousands of our people from death and suffering over the decade following their introduction. It is not good enough for the industry to give us windshield wipers one year, seat belts another, and now collapsible steering wheels.

Widespread research in many institutions,

and in a wide variety of jurisdictions, has established that it is possible and feasible to build a car which can cut drastically the human and property toll in accidents. The car ought to be built now and it should be tested and put into production at the earliest possible moment. And this House can, in a non-partisan spirit, contribute to that end.

We do not have to go through all the process of research. That has been done. There is no reason why Ontario should duplicate the work done by New York and California and other places. We are doing research on automobile corrosion, which can be shared with others as we share in their efforts to save life through car design. The recent agreement which internationalizes our motor industry may give us the vehicle through which we can find the areas and avenues of co-operation.

It also may provide us with an answer regarding costs. Since eventually Canadian cars, we are told, should drop in price to the level of American ones, if in fact the safety car proves to be slightly more expensive than present ones, then our prices just will not go down quite as far as they otherwise might have—and we still will get a safety car at a price lower than we are now paying for the conventional one.

Mr. Speaker, we must not fool ourselves into looking to the industry for this safety car. The industry has had the knowledge and the ability to build safe cars for a long, long time but they have not done it. This has something to do with yearly model changes, with freedom of design, fear of sales resistance after the buyer has been conditioned to look for the fancy chrome and the lethal gadgets.

A safe car does not necessarily mean an end to these things. It will certainly present a greater challenge to design engineers and colour experts. Further research would also unearth different methods of accomplishing the same safety aims. The important thing now is that we no longer allow ourselves to be lulled by the siren song that cars are becoming safer and safer and that, in the "fullness of time," the safe car will eventually roll off the lines in Detroit.

Just as seat belts and other safety features were forced by government action, so the pressure is now building up for a capsule inside the automobile, and for construction features designed for people, rather than for the profit of the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the New York committee will welcome our co-operation. The hon. Minister has before him the results of their study, and

the plan of what they hope to do when the financial means are available. He will also have an invitation to participate in the project.

I would suggest, therefore, that this House move toward that kind of co-operation. The international agreement makes our automobile industry one on both sides of the border. It also gives us a united governmental concern with the industry.

I would urge upon the hon. Minister and upon this House that an all-party committee of this House be appointed to meet at an early date with the New York committee to: (a) Examine in depth and detail their safety car programme to date; and (b) explore ways and means of co-operating with them in their further development of the safety car.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have taken so long in the presentation of this subject. But it is one of vital concern to this province and to those responsible for its government. We must not continue to kill and maim our citizens at the incredible rate we are now establishing. Improved highway design and driver education must be stepped up—yes, we agree with that. But car design must have our immediate attention and our wholehearted concern. This House must face its responsibility in this field and face it without delay.

Mr. W. B. Lewis (Humber): Mr. Speaker, once again I consider it a pleasure and a privilege to have your permission to participate in the debate emanating from the Speech from the Throne. I wish you every success in this session and many sessions to come.

Tonight I would like to speak to you about the progress that has been achieved, and predict the progress for the future of Metropolitan Toronto. When the year 2000 arrives, few will be around to say whether I was right or wrong in what I have to say about what Metro will be like 35 years from now. History is not only a record of events of the past, but it is also a basis from which to forecast the future. What has happened so far in the 20th century indicates that our generation has witnessed more mechanical, technological and scientific progress than any other generation since the beginning of time.

We saw the automobile invented to change the whole economic and social structure of the North American continent. In 1965, a record nine million motor vehicles were produced in the United States. This means about 800,000 to 900,000 were produced in Canada, and that 60,000 to 70,000 of these

were domiciled in Metropolitan Toronto. It is no wonder that our highways are plugged and our expressways are filled the day they are opened.

We saw the Wright brothers invent the airplane, McCurdy make the first flight in Canada, Bleriot fly the English channel, and now you can fly from New York to Los Angeles in the morning and return the same evening.

We saw Marconi discover the wireless, and the radio develop from a peanut tube contraption into a receiving set no bigger than a cigarette box which can receive communications from all over the world.

Television has been around for only about 15 years but now, in colour, you can see a baseball game in New York and, by a twist of the dial, see a football game in Los Angeles. The Telstar is in the stratosphere, with television programmes and commercial communications being bounced off it from New York to London and Paris, and vice versa.

We went through World War I, which was to be the war to end all wars, only to see it followed by World War II—to say nothing of Korea and now Vietnam.

In recent years we have seen the British Empire evaporate, and the British commonwealth of nations become a loosely knit organization—and a half dozen countries leave it as they gained their independence.

We saw the atom bomb invented, and now a half dozen countries know how to make the nuclear bomb; so that all that prevents a major war is that major nations realize that one hydrogen bomb can demolish a whole city in one blast.

A few months ago we thought it was a miracle when two astronauts spent eight days in the stratosphere and one of them had the temerity to get out of his capsule and go for a 20-minute walk. What was the miracle yesterday is commonplace today. A few weeks ago, two astronauts in Gemini VI travelled around the world 206 times in 14 days for a distance of over 5 million miles, and were pursued and met in space by Gemini VII and travelled around the world at 17,500 miles per hour—four times in tandem, one to ten feet apart—and landed within a few miles and a few minutes of their prearranged schedule.

In the light of these miracles, how can one say what will be the conditions under which we will be living in the year 2000? So far as our cities are concerned, it is not very long ago that there was a great exodus to

suburbia. Now the tide that went out is coming in, as the people want to be closer to the centre of things and avoid a couple of hours of driving every day, bumper-to-bumper. Our back-to-downtown movement is said to be a direct result of the new \$30 million city hall, which has re-established the city's core as a place where exciting things are happening.

Other soaring structures are being built: The 55-story Toronto-Dominion centre, the 35-story Simpson tower, 29-story Richmond-Adelaide centre, and the recently announced \$250 million Eaton project, which the mayor of Toronto says will be as good as Rockefeller centre—maybe better. The whole skyline of Metro Toronto is rapidly changing.

Only two cities in North America—New York and Los Angeles—are growing faster than Metropolitan Toronto, which increases its population by 65,000 people every year. The factories, the schools, the office buildings, the apartments and the homes needed to house and provide working space for all of these new Metro Torontonians rose to about \$700 million in building permits in 1965.

Not only are more apartments being built than ever before, they are being built faster than ever before—largely through the extensive use of climbing cranes which, with freedom to swing their buckets a full 360 degrees, are to be seen reaching out over every part of the horizon.

It is only a few years ago that the population of the North American continent was equally divided between those who lived in the country and those who lived in the city. Now 70 per cent of the population live in urban areas. This is giving rise to metropolitan cities of one kind or another—Toronto and Winnipeg in Canada, Miami-Dade county in the United States, Greater London in England, with its 8 millions of population, and Tokyo with 10 million in a much smaller area.

We used to think that metropolitan cities were something new. We now find urban developments that stretch out for hundreds of miles. The best example is Boston-New York-Philadelphia - Wilmington - Baltimore-Washington. In the past decade, pessimists predicted that the U.S. automobile explosion would eventually overtake the country's highways and bring traffic to a full stop. They did not allow for modern enterprise and ingenuity.

On the east coast, the continent's most congested traffic corridor, which I have just described, has a system of thruways upon which a motorist can whip along the 435

miles between Washington and Boston without ever encountering a stop light. You can travel from New York to Chicago, a stretch of 840 miles, through New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, where there is nothing to make a motorist stop except fatigue, an empty gas tank, a toll station, or a state trooper.

Here in Ontario we have a similar development running from Oshawa to Niagara Falls which certainly, before the year 2000, will constitute an urbanized corridor of about 160 miles, extending back from the lake for 15 or 20 miles—this will include about one-fifth of the population of the whole of Canada—of which Metropolitan Toronto will be the axis.

To solve some of the riddles which such a development will create, the provincial government is now giving consideration to the establishment of regional governments, each of which will involve many municipalities, in order that the common services which they require can be provided.

We now find that the financial resources of the whole of the Dominion of Canada are necessary to provide schools for the training which is essential for any young person who seeks employment in a society where you have to have a BA today to get a job as a stockkeeper in General Motors. Many of the skills which are being taught today will become obsolete tomorrow.

Machines will take more and more work from the hands of men. Cybernation—a new \$10 word—which means the marriage of automated machinery and electronic computers, is only in its infancy. And the day is not far off when computers will take over many of the thinking functions of professions and executives. If hon. members think this prospect is remote, they have only to witness the development in man's conquest of outer space to stimulate your thinking.

At the beginning of the century, when it took five and a half days to cross the Atlantic in a steamship, it was considered a remarkable speed. Now you can fly across the Atlantic in about six hours. And before very long you will find that, so far as the clock is concerned, you will be arriving at your destination before you have left your point of departure.

It was only a few years ago when one would have been accused of the wildest kind of imagination if he suggested that it was economical to pipe water from Lake Huron to the city of London and southwestern Ontario. Now this is in the process of being completed. And other pipelines, between

such places as Lake Ontario and Brampton, are being financed by the Ontario water resources commission, involving such sums as \$67 million. And we hear of projects to reverse the flow of rivers now flowing into the Arctic ocean, so that they will flow south into southern Canada and the United States as our previously considered unlimited supply of water is disappearing or being contaminated.

Perhaps the more pertinent observation as to what Toronto will be in the year 2000 is raised by a consideration of the recent Goldenberg report, which proposes that the Metropolitan Toronto area be shrunk from 13 municipalities to four cities. This would involve an increase in the size of the city of Toronto, and increase its population by about 25,000 and its assessment by about \$400 million.

The continuance of the dominance of the city of Toronto as a continuing municipality, enlarged in the manner indicated, is contrary to the conclusions which were arrived at by the Greater London commission in England, which concluded that that area involving about ten million people should be divided into 32 boroughs of relatively equal size—of 200,000 to 300,000 population—with no one municipality dominating the whole area.

We now have a barrage of different ideas as to how this metropolitan area should be reconstituted. Goldenberg's suggestion is four cities. The hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Robarts') is six boroughs. And the city of Toronto still desires to dominate the situation, insisting that there is no solution short of amalgamation.

The population of this area today is about two million. By the year 2000, it will be at least four million, and the borders of the urban area will have expanded north to Richmond Hill, east to Oshawa, and west to Oakville. Either an expanded metropolitan government, or some other form of regional government, will have to be established to provide the necessary services.

By the year 2000, our subway system will be extended to the Etobicoke river on the west, to the Rouge river on the east and to Richmond Hill on the north. Already the provincial government, together with the CNR and the CPR, have arrived at a system for commuter trains which will run from Dunbarton on the east to Burlington on the west and, when expanded, will extend in an arc from Oshawa, Uxbridge, Newmarket, Bolton, Georgetown, Guelph, Milton and Hamilton. This system will be computer-operated, running at speeds of up to 80

miles at convenient times. The provincial government is risking \$12 million on this venture, with an annual subsidy of up to \$2 million, because that is only about a third of the cost of building a single mile of elevated expressway.

Instead of the passenger buying a ticket or paying a fare, he will pull out a plastic ticket and shove it into a slot of a commuter computer which will electronically control a gate to the platform. If everything is in order, the ticket will pop back out and the gates will open. If, however, the ticket's magnetically inked code shows the ticket has expired, the computer will gobble up the ticket and the gate will not open.

Automobiles will not cease to be manufactured, and the expressways and parkways will have to be built to accommodate them. The logical development of our expressway system will include the Gardiner expressway, the Don Valley parkway, the extension of 400 south to the expressway, east of the Prince's Gates at the exhibition; and, despite all the opposition to the contrary, the cross-town highway to connect 400 with the Don Valley will have to be built.

It may well be that, instead of the Spadina expressway coming south to meet the St. George subway station at Bloor street, that will go directly south through Christie park, Trinity park, the old Cosgrave brewery, Stanley park, and south to the expressway; and, in its course, connect with the Bloor street subway and Queen street subway, running from Trinity park underground to Sherbourne street, but avoiding the downtown traffic on Queen street.

It is not a question of whether highways or subways should have priority; both are necessary and essential. And, despite all the arguments that people should be derricked out of their cars and put on the public transit system, people will only leave their cars at home when the transit system is more convenient and an economic way to travel, or when our highways become so clogged with traffic that public transit is faster than the automobile.

We used to hear imaginative suggestions for the building of highways under our streets, and using the streets for pedestrian traffic. Now we hear the opposite: That the streets shall be made available for the motor vehicle traffic, and that a series of pedestrian tunnels will be established in the downtown area, involving moving sidewalks and escalators, to join up the Simpson tower and the new Eaton complex, the city hall, the south side of Queen street, the Richmond-Adelaide

building, the Toronto-Dominion centre, the Royal York hotel, and the subway station at Front street—so that future generations of Torontonians may arrive downtown, shop, eat, be entertained, and leave for home again without once setting foot on a street.

In case the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) thinks that this concept is too imaginative, Montreal is already ahead of us, with two underground blocks involving the new CNR station, the Queen Elizabeth hotel, and Place Ville Marie, each lined with modern and up-to-date stores and restaurants, all of which are doing a thriving business.

Since 1953, when the metropolitan corporation was established, this city moved off a static plateau into a vibrant and explosive residential, commercial, and industrial metropolis. The memory of man is so short that we can scarcely remember what the city looked like before that important event took place. With an ability to build a \$100 million water plant, a \$100 million sewer system, a couple of hundred new schools, expressways and parkways and subways, aged persons' homes, and low rental apartments, we moved into a new era, the momentum of which still continues.

Today we stand on the threshold of developments beyond the expectation of our most imaginative citizens. Sufficient to say that if Rip Van Winkle lived in Toronto and went to sleep for the next 35 years he would never recognize the place when he woke up, any more than we who are here today can remember what it looked like 35 years ago. So there you have it—one man's guess as to what the future will bring forth.

But one thing is certain, and that is that the most imaginative of us all will have to dream in technicolor to foresee what will be around in the year 2000, and I would like to be here to see it. Thank you very much.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I know that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) would like me to, and I know that our hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) would extend to the visiting young Liberals from St. Paul a warm welcome to the House tonight.

Mr. Speaker, as custom requires, I deem it a pleasure to extend to you my best wishes, and I hope that you will continue to be as good an umpire as you were a hardball pitcher some years back; and to extend to your Deputy Speaker, the smiling Irishman from Eglinton (Mr. Reilly), our congratulations on his appointment; and to say to the House that in this back row I congratulate the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith)

and the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) who, as the hon. member from St. Thomas says, will continue to talk over your heads in much stronger fashion in days to come.

Mr. Speaker, about the recent happenings of the night before last, I would like to say that I have had many calls about it. The principle involved here is a very serious one to the people of Ontario progressively, because we find that the people we engage to serve us are becoming our masters. We are devolving into a form of police state, not realizing what is happening a little at a time, and are gradually being hoodwinked by the master PC government. They keep feeding this stuff to us in little pieces and, rather than make an issue of it, we accept it with a shrug; one of these days we are going to wake up and find we are past the point of no return.

A man phoned me tonight and said that in the past three years he had paid \$600 to the sheriff of York county in eviction fees and he is still in his house. I do not know the bill for eviction, but I imagine it would be around \$1,000. That is not important. But they had to hire 31 people to put a man out of his house. The fact is that when you look back—last Christmas we had spot checks. If these things had happened 20 years ago, we would have thrown them out of the country, but now we are going to have to carry cards, and we are getting a bit like Russia. The eviction programme is part of all this. It gives the law and the government such powers that police can invade your home, and break down your doors like in pre-war Germany. These are great pictures to appear from democratic Canada in the world press, from the city of Toronto.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there could have been a much nicer way for this to be handled. We seem to forget that the dignity of the individual is still important, whether he lives in Forest Hill or Cabbagetown; do not forget that.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak tonight about a miracle. Miracles do happen. They tell a story about a professional gypster who fell in a downtown store and sued the store for \$500,000 for damage to his back because he could not walk. After the trial the defence attorney went across to him, when he had been awarded \$250,000 damages, he said to him, "We know that you are a professional con man, we know that you have taken us in this case, but we are going to make it our life's work to see that you do not ever enjoy that money; it will keep you in a wheel-

chair." And the winner of the award said, "Well, now that we are being frank, I will tell you something. Tomorrow morning I am having a big Cadillac ambulance come to my home with a beautiful nurse; and they are going to take me to the airport and I am going to fly in a jet to Paris, France; and there, at Orly Field, I am going to have another big Cadillac ambulance meet me with a beautiful French nurse—"

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Is this a supposition?

Mr. Sargent: "—and I am going to have them take me to the shrine at Lourdes, and there you are going to see the damndest miracle ever."

Mr. Speaker, I am going to make that a motion to this House tonight; and if it ever comes to a vote there, too, you will see the damndest miracle ever.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, the Throne speech was a hard-to-stomach menu. There was the old garnish—half-baked approaches to revisions of The Municipal Act, and its failure to cut the education costs off real estate to give the homeowners some relief, the people on fixed incomes; the soup, with the watered-down Medicare plan; the vegetables, in the form of grants to municipalities for transportation subsidies as promised by the hon. Prime Minister, did not appear; the meat course was as tough as a pair of hobnailed boots—ignoring agriculture and providing nothing for the impoverished farmer; and no investigation of gasoline prices or action on lotteries.

Mr. Edwards: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Edwards: Who gave the first two per cent to the municipalities in this province? Was it not Mitchell F. Hepburn?

An hon. member: The druggists did that.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I do not remember that far back, Fred.

Mr. Edwards: The hon. member had better read it.

Mr. Sargent: In fact, Mr. Speaker, this whole presentation of the Throne speech was a \$2 billion tab presented mainly for the "haves" and against the "have nots." I wish

to show this House tonight, in spite of the lack of intelligence on my left here, if I can get through it, three glaring cases of discrimination. And whether I can get it across, whether you can hear it—it will be in *Hansard* anyway—time will show that the people of Ontario will get a chance to know what I am talking about.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, there is not an hon. member in this House who is not aware of all our talk about poverty on the farm; and this is my theme tonight—the lack of regard of this government for agriculture.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The hon. Minister is not in his place.

Mr. Sargent: My hon. colleague from Sudbury says the hon. Minister is not here, and these remarks are geared to the hon. Minister and the hon. Prime Minister.

An hon. member: Neither one of them is here.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: We have heard the story of the fact that the family farm is going to disappear within ten years; we have heard the story of the fact that there are many farmers making less than \$2,000 a year in this dynamic province; and, Mr. Speaker, we accept these as facts. There must be a reason for these if they are facts—and there is a reason. It is the growth of the octopus known as the packing houses—a great friend of this government, as we will show shortly. It is a matter of record that livestock production occurs on three-quarters of the farms of this province, and accounts for about half of their farm cash income. And farmers, therefore, sir, have a very great interest in a competitive processing industry. But is it competitive? Let me give a few actual happenings that are current.

Recently a farmer sold six steers for \$609. The same meat will cost the consumer \$1,614. Even if it were sold for stewing beef, this is the margin. In 1956 farmers received 25 cents for a pound of beef which cost the consumer 81.6 cents. In 1963, the farmer got only 18 cents a pound for beef which cost the consumer \$1.03.

Mr. Speaker, farmers everywhere—and there must be farmers in this House—blame monopoly control and the prices set by the packing houses as their greatest enemy.

An hon. member: What is the price of pork?

Another hon. member: Getting through, eh?

Mr. Sargent: One farmer told me, Mr. Speaker—and you will appreciate this—that it is a fair statement to make that the high standard of living that we enjoy in this country is because of the low standard of living on the farm. He further said the time would come—it is not too far away—when farmers of this province would work the land the way the communists do, working for someone else and maintaining low production.

A clipping I have here, dated January 17, is indicative of the magnitude of this problem.

An hon. member: What year?

Mr. Sargeant: This is headed "Canadian meat packers top \$1 billion in sales." It reports that the annual sales on the slaughtering of meat and packing in this country is \$1 billion, half of the budget of this province. It is the fourth largest manufacturing industry we have in Canada. To shorten this down, the fact evolves that the whole villain in this piece, insofar as the trouble with agriculture is concerned, is this octopus of the meat packing industry.

I intend to show, regardless of the lack of intelligence and courtesy down here—because this is important to agriculture—that this government has discriminated against the farmers of Ontario in favour of their friends in big business in the large packing houses.

These companies control, because of their size and their dominance in the field, the cost, the price, of livestock, beef, pork, mutton—meat in all its forms. They similarly control and set prices for this industry on all poultry, and control all the feeds and fertilizers. They control the canning industry. They control the cash crops. They control hides and leathers, and almost everything in the home today as we know it in Canada. They even have their own supermarket chains to finish off the deal.

Mr. Speaker, if you can have a group of supposedly intelligent men, knowing what is facing agriculture today, what they have to fight to stay in business, and hearing the bickering that is going on, I think it is an insult to the intelligence of the farmers of today.

Repeatedly, in excerpts from the restrictive trade practice commission report, we read "The control of prices must be maintained by the packing houses"—by one in particular. I quote a paragraph from a directive from

the head of the packing concern to his subordinates:

In the final analysis we all pretty well agree that the way to control these people is by doing an effective selling job. We realize it is not easy, nor will it be done overnight.

The last time—

and I am quoting:

—I was in Montreal, they were determined to establish where these people were selling their product, and to take such action they guaranteed they were not getting profitable prices.

Mr. Speaker, I could speak for hours on the inequities foisted on agriculture by this octopus, but I want to lay the reasons before you to show why agriculture is in trouble today, because they have been at the mercy of these packing houses all through the years—and it is getting progressively worse.

Is it any wonder, hon. members of this House, that in 1960 the need to fight this octopus brought about the organization known as FAME. Here we have a group of sincere, knowledgeable people, respected in their field, and worried; and they want to protect their homes and their farms. They conceived the concept that the livestock producer would have a purchasing power that was capable of taking such farm livestock as was offered on the market, or by private sale, to maintain prices at a stable and sufficient level and thereby raise their price level on such farm products.

They felt that a farmer-owned plant, or a system of plants processing such livestock and selling it direct to the consumer or large retailer, would provide such purchasing power as to keep their market constantly at a higher level. Its objective would be to keep up price levels rather than make profits for the association, to realize a long-cherished dream and goal to gain a fair and more stable share out of the consumer food dollar for the Canadian livestock producers.

This was their goal, the vision of the organizers of FAME. And, Mr. Speaker, some 13,000 farmers in Ontario, many of them from my area, put their money where their mouth was and raised \$2.5 million of their own money—not coming to the government for help—to prove something, to protect themselves, which the government would not do; and the government has not helped them one iota since they started. They were trying to protect their industry, to keep their heads above water.

At the same meeting in Stratford last week—

Mr. Edwards: You know, for years the two Opposition parties have been trying to make capital of this thing—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member cannot make a speech; he may ask the member a question.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. member is in a good farming area. I think he is concerned with the lack of help for his people and wants to get into the act some way, and I do not mind a bit.

Last week I spoke to more than 500 farmers at a meeting in Stratford. Was the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) there? No, he was not. Were any of his staff there? No, they were not.

And so, Mr. Speaker, these 500 farmers are in trouble. The facts came out at the meeting showed that in Ontario there are 60,000 livestock producers; and if you take the net worth of their farms and their plants as being \$40,000 each, at a conservative estimate, we have a gross worth of \$2.4 billion that they want to protect. The production of these 60,000 livestock producers is \$300 million a year—that is a lot of production—and of the 13,000 shareholders in FAME, their production is about \$65 million a year. So we are talking about no small group here.

From the very outset, FAME was doomed to have trouble and many headaches. Naturally the big packing houses were not going to accept this growth of opposition to them without hitting back, so their public relations firms jointly began spewing out the most defamatory remarks about this crazy idea to go into the packing house business; and almost everything was done to prohibit or stop the successful consummation of this concept.

Even at government level, Mr. Speaker, they had difficulty in getting a charter through the securities commission. I can just imagine the packing groups coming to this government and saying, "Now we have always been a great friend of this government; we must find some way to block this."

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I think this man had better—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

I would ask members to desist from interrupting the member speaking, no matter

how provocative his speech might be. The member has the floor, and he is entitled to keep the floor and not be interrupted by other members with interjections.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, if you think that this has been provocative, wait for a few moments.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that from the very outset of this whole programme, the Ontario federation of agriculture endorsed this 100 per cent—it is a matter of record—but at no time along the line, Mr. Speaker, has this government, this hon. Minister, or any of his department, gone to FAME and said, "Can we help?" At no time did they get support from the hon. Minister of Agriculture.

Now what is his job? I have here a report from the *Toronto Globe and Mail*—his friend—page 6, February 8, 1966, which reads as follows:

There appears to be about as much principle in the Ontario bean policy as there is pork in the average can of pork and beans. The Department of Agriculture has not for some time offered much in the way of leadership to the farmers of this province—in fact, it has been chiefly notable for its lack of leadership—but in this year's bean fiasco it has reached a new low.

It is quite a long epistle on the shortcomings of this government in support of agriculture. It goes on to say:

Two members of the farm products marketing board have resigned on the grounds that Mr. Stewart has reversed an important principle he supported only last year.

And finally, it says:

But the greatest fault lies with Mr. Stewart.

Then it goes on to say, in effect, that he is not capable of handling the job.

Mr. Speaker, I think we have established the fact that this government is no friend of agriculture. That is established.

An hon. member: You have established it!

Mr. Sargent: Not having been involved in big business operations before, it was natural that they should make some mistakes, and they made them king-size. Let no one in the government talk about business ability—if ever I saw a corporation with a board of directors bankrupt for personnel like that front bench over there! I think you should not talk about business ability.

Such things as the FAME group had to

contend with—lack of direction, lack of skilled people, such things as amortizing a \$3 million debenture debt over a period of less than three years instead of 20 years, making it inside of three years. They made the mistakes that all big business makes. The fact is that these things happen every day in big business, but no one knows about them. But here is a group of sincere, worried people, with no outside help, no big business help, with the press of the packing houses shooting barbs all the time; they are bound to get into trouble, and they did.

Mr. Edwards: The price of pork is still going up.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, we had FAME, in 1963 and in 1964, getting into dire trouble; and in 1965 it was looking for ways to keep this concept alive. And all this time the public relations men of these big firms are shooting them down. However, at no time, Mr. Speaker, was there any evidence of anything dishonourable in the directorship of this, at this point.

So about November 25, and I hope that is the correct date, this group approached the hon. Prime Minister of this province for help, and you know what happened. The hon. Prime Minister, smiling John, told them with tears in his eyes, "I am sorry, fellows, I cannot help you. I could not possibly help you. If we did it for you we would have to do it for somebody else. Awfully sorry." He said he had no authority to help them; he would be setting a precedent.

Now I have a clipping here—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): What would you have done?

Mr. Sargent: Here is a clipping. I will tell the hon. Minister what I would have done, in a minute. I have a clipping here, gentlemen, from the Toronto *Globe and Mail*. It is a cartoon of the gala opening of the Toronto-Burlington commuter service. It has Mayor Cops and his group on the stage, with guns in their hands, and on the wall of the station is a big wanted poster here with a picture of "Cheap Charlie MacNaughton." "Cheap Charlie" they call him. Well, I think now we should call him "Cheap John" over here.

I have a very interesting parallel to tell you about this. It is a story about a couple. They had raised three sons. One became a doctor, one became a lawyer, and one became an engineer. They had put the boys through school and they all became very successful men. One day the father called the boys home and, "Boys," he said, "your mother and

I have had a rough time. We think we would like to have a little trip around the world. Could you give us a pot of money to enjoy ourselves? We would certainly love to see the world before we pass on." So the boys talked it over and then the doctor son said, "No, Dad, I could not possibly, I have obligations. I have had a lot of trouble. I could not possibly help you." The other two sons also said they could not come through and help their mother and father. So finally the father said, "Well, I think I had better tell you. If that is the way you feel about it, I had better tell you that your mother and I have been so busy, with our noses to the grindstone, that we never had a chance to go out and get married." And the boys said, "Do you know what that makes us?" And the father said, "Yes, and cheap ones, too."

Well, that is my opinion of the way this government behaved. I do not wish to imply that the hon. Prime Minister was telling an untruth, but he was evading the truth. He was hypocritical in his attitude to these people to say he could not help them, because he has set many a precedent for causes just and unjust, dipping into the public till to help people with public money, without authority. Did the hon. Prime Minister tell this FAME group that he and his government have set aside millions of dollars of credit for sick industry in the metropolitan area? If the industry gets sick, he sets credit of money up towards them and he gives them skilled help. Did he tell them that? He said he could not do it, he had no authority. There was no precedent. This is hypocrisy.

There are 13,000 farmers involved, and you tell them you had no precedent, no authority to do this, but you do it for industry. I refer you to past happenings in the ODA where this credit has been used for political purposes, for a slush fund. I can prove this. We have seen the books of this company, Fairfield, and the records state very clearly that the money was used for political purposes. I make this offer to the House: Any time the government wants to establish a commission to find the truth, we are open to do business with it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, in Nova Scotia the government of that province took public funds and started a concept like FAME to help the farmers of that province. Last year they showed a profit. But this hon. Prime Minister says he has no authority, he could not set a precedent for agriculture.

How did the government help out British Mortgage? Did the hon. Prime Minister tell FAME that he bailed out British Mortgage? The trust and loan companies—

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): The hon. member does not know what he is talking about.

Mr. Sargent: I certainly do and I will show the hon. Prime Minister in a moment.

When Atlantic Acceptance Corporation went into bankruptcy on June 16 because of the alley-jacks of scoundrels—using the terminology of a leading Toronto bankruptcy expert in the Toronto papers recently—and thereby hangs a tale. Maybe if we look close enough and hard enough, it may not be the tail of a pussy-cat, but a real tiger. The Atlantic Acceptance bankruptcy threatened to pull down British Mortgage and the whole empire of trust companies across this country. And who should come to the rescue, but smiling John. Again he had his hand in the public till. Here money was no problem at all. The big interests had a friend with the moustache and the little black bag go to the bank and get them a few million dollars, and he did.

We are not dealing with any amateurs here. This is big money we are talking about. Mr. Frost, the former Prime Minister was a constant visitor at this House during that period. I am told he met with the Cabinet. I do not know. Is that true? No comment. This is par.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Is that one of the hon. member's rhetorical questions?

Mr. Sargent: I really would not know. That is a pretty expensive word, I would not know that. The hon. Prime Minister guaranteed the credit of this company up to \$3 million. First he said, to protect the depositors. I will buy that. But secondly, most important of all, I suggest, was to bail out the loan company, because they were in trouble.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a copy of The Loan and Trust Companies Act with the 1964 and 1965 revisions. I have read it, page by page and I find numerous references to reasons why the charter of British Mortgage and Atlantic Acceptance should have been revoked, but nothing was done about it. Where was the government? That was their job.

Nowhere in this Act do I find statutory authority from the hon. Prime Minister to use money, public moneys, to create wealth for

the upper crust of this province. Nowhere does it say that in this book. We are not getting any amateurs here, this is a real pro job. Where is the statutory authority for this? I could quote at some length.

A letter signed by Mr. Harold Lawson, president of the National Life Assurance Company, Canada, and a former director of the British Mortgage and Trust Company. He says in paragraph 1:

The directors of British Mortgage did not know a lot of what was going on. They did not realize that certain so-called secured notes were in fact not secured. We did not realize that a junior note was being called a senior note.

Paragraph 2, and I quote again:

We did not realize that certain short-term notes had not been paid off when due.

Mr. Speaker, is this not the responsibility of the government or the superintendent of insurance and registrar of loan and trust companies? Where was he? Quoting again, Mr. Lawson says:

Some of us did not realize that British Mortgage had invested in Atlantic Acceptance, and it was about two weeks before we were fully aware of the extent of the losses incurred. It was then apparent that almost the whole capital fund of the company had been wiped out. But the shareholders did not know it and the shares were still selling on the market at about \$30.

It was important that the shareholders be told as quickly as possible. But how could we tell the shareholders without causing some panic among the depositors? The moment the depositors heard about it, and some of them took the precaution of drawing their money out, there would be a panic. And if there was panic, the company would have folded, not because of insolvency but for lack of equity.

Now, Mr. Speaker, immediately after June 16 there was quite a period of time when the shares were still selling at \$30 and only the directors knew of the impending disaster. Only the directors knew that the stock would be worthless. Now the point I would like to ask on behalf of the people of Ontario is, how many unloaded at the \$30 figure, and who got out before the balloon burst? How many sold their shares after June 16? We owe it to this House to have a look at the transfer record book. Let us have a look at the transfer of shares; or maybe it is too late, maybe these too have been doctored.

Mr. Lawson goes on:

Trust companies and banks who have depositors are in a different position from other corporations. There is no trust company in the country or any bank that is liquid enough to stand a full-scale run by its depositors. We had first to protect the depositors before we told the shareholders.

I could see possibly that if British Mortgage went under, other trust companies might have gone under. The losses in British Mortgage would have been minuscule in relation to the total catastrophe that might have ensued.

Mr. Lawson says:

The first thing we did was go to one of the biggest banks in Canada. We asked that bank either on its own or in consortium with other banks, to give total support to our depositors, to guarantee their deposits while we notified the shareholders of the losses and arranged to refinance the company. The answer was "no."

I am basically a life insurance man. In the whole of the history of life insurance in Canada, which goes back 100 years, no policyholder has ever lost one cent of the money that was due to him. Such companies have gone under, that is true, but always the rest of the industry has rallied around and supported the policyholders of the company that went out of business. That is a record of which we are proud and I hope it will always be true. I thought that trust companies would feel the same way about their business.

I digress. On good authority I have it that these trust companies wanted to see the disappearance of a lot of small trust companies, so that is why they did not get into the act of bailing this mortgage company out themselves.

And Mr. Lawson says:

It was at the meeting of the trust companies that I first heard the suggestion that the government should pick up the loss. The argument was that the government supervises the trust companies and the government supervision was inadequate, so the government should pick up the loss. In spite of the fact that The Loan and Trust Companies Act says specifically that this is not so.

He says, and I quote Mr. Lawson, a director of British Mortgage and the head of a large assurance company, the National:

The greatest mistake in all this sorry record was to suggest that the government

should be responsible for the company's losses, and an equally great mistake was for the Ontario government to actually agree that it would make money available to the company through certain of the banks.

From the Throne speech we have this now. This has all happened, the horse has flown, we are going to lock the barn door. They say in the Throne speech,

The amendments to The Securities Act and The Corporations Act will provide for fuller disclosures of the financial and trading affairs of companies seeking funds from the public, including control of insider trading and takeover bids.

If the government, I suggest, Mr. Speaker, is going to force business into a full disclosure, how about a full disclosure from the government here?

The provisions of The Loan and Trust Corporations Act also has been revised. Legislative proposals will be placed before you to provide more effective supervision in this area of our jurisdiction and economy.

So we see in effect, Mr. Speaker, the position of this government, discriminating on one hand against the farmers of Ontario, telling them they cannot give them any special treatment but breaking every law in the book to help the big interests, to save the day for the moneyed interests, the trust and loan companies, using public funds.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that an investigation be launched to ascertain whether or not any hon. members of this government, including members of the Cabinet, did hold stock in British Mortgage or Victoria and Grey Trust Company, either before June 16, after June 16 and at the present time.

In the *Globe and Mail* of August 10, 1965, Vincent Egan, a financial writer, said that making government money available to British Mortgage was an unprecedented step. I quote him:

Queen's Park has said that, if necessary, it would take the unprecedented step of making funds available to the capital short of Stratford Financial Company, until it could work out its plans to amalgamate with Victoria and Grey Trust Company.

In the same article, Mr. Egan wrote:

The provincial government said it welcomed the proposed amalgamation.

Now, British Mortgage shares dropped from more than \$30 in mid-June to about \$2.35, and British Mortgage and Victoria-Grey voted

September 14 to amalgamate on a six-for-one basis. After June 16 it was a panic party, but eventually it got good enough after all these negotiations with the concerned people, to trade six British Mortgage shares for one Victoria-Grey share—a six-for-one deal.

Again, the people of Ontario would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister, what was the nature of the deal with Victoria-Grey? They would like to ask the hon. Prime Minister, is there a deal with Victoria-Grey, or is there an understanding with Mr. Leslie Frost? Just estimate, Mr. Speaker, the fortunes that will be made when an amalgamation picks up assets of some hundreds of millions of dollars, and brings them into one full stock company. In the next ten years when all of this is forgotten there will be great fortunes made in stock splits, all because the people of Ontario had their money pledge this credit for this wealthy group, the in-group.

Mr. Speaker, in view of all the close co-operation, using public funds, between this government and the trust and loan companies, I would call for an investigation to uncover a great area for a possible conflict of interest. If this is true, those holding stock in any of these two companies would be barred from holding their seats in this Legislature, and if this government thinks that it can treat with kid gloves the moneyed interests in this province and give the back of their hand to agriculture, they are going to have a rude awakening on the next election day.

Mr. Speaker, the third area of discrimination is in using up public funds in one area and neglecting another. I refer you to the commuters bill.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Now, we will see, Mr. Speaker, the intelligence of this group when they hear the logic behind what I have to say.

Last spring, you recall, we passed a bill for rapid transit between Burlington and downtown Toronto. The motivation, I believe we all agree, in these services is to protect downtown, the hard core of assessment in downtown real estate. We all know in this goodness of government that downtown assessment is the cash box of any municipality and at any expense we must protect that against fringe development. So that is the motivation on any rapid transit commuter service. The motivation here is to protect downtown real estate.

I have nothing against Toronto. I suggest we start a nationwide contest by giving as first prize one week all-expenses-paid in

Toronto, and the second prize two weeks all-expenses-paid in Toronto. We are not against spending money in Toronto, Mr. Speaker, as long as the hon. Prime Minister keeps his word. He told this House last spring that if we spent \$7 million in downtown Toronto commuter service that he would give like money for the same transportation across the rest of the province. He told us that, and nothing happened in the Throne speech about it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I do agree, Mr. Speaker, that the principle of the hard core of assessment in downtown Toronto should be protected because of the great development in downtown Toronto, but the trend across America is to set up their own rapid transit systems with the cost being paid for by the area that will benefit by it—paying the full operating costs and the capital costs. There are plenty of parallels and precedents for this. Now, this bill we passed to bring commuters downtown has a capital cost of \$7.5 million with \$1.5 million a year subsidy in perpetuity.

A commuter service is horizontal transportation bringing people downtown. In downtown areas we have huge skyscrapers. Take, for instance, the Toronto-Dominion bank building under construction—60 storeys high. These skyscrapers have elevators known as vertical transportation, and there is no more reason why the government should subsidize horizontal transportation from Burlington to downtown Toronto than there is for them to subsidize vertical transportation in elevators downtown.

Toronto has to ask the rest of the province to pay for this transportation to downtown Toronto. Here is an example of a parallel in the United States. The San Francisco region has just started on a new—I am quoting:

—technically advanced rail rapid transit system to bring people to downtown San Francisco and Oakland from as far away as 40 miles out. The significant fact is that the passenger will pay perhaps only one-fifth of what it will cost to haul him. The main part of the cost, that is building the railroad, is being borne through a special real estate tax on the people who are going to benefit by it.

I am still quoting, and so it is definite.

Suburban property owners will pay this transit tax and the owners of high-value, downtown San Francisco and Oakland real

estate will pay much more. Yet it was the property owners who pushed the project through. They knew that downtown real estate will be worthless if people quit coming downtown. In fact, why not make urban transport free to the riders, they point out. Buildings as tall as ours would be worthless without free vertical transportation. Lay that idea on its side and it still works.

In essence, the American programmes of this type are paid for by the city affected. But in this administration this government sees fit to lay the charge on every taxpayer in Ontario for a commuter service that will benefit downtown Toronto real estate.

I have no quarrel with this form of protecting downtown real estate as long as every other part of Ontario gets the same treatment. We have had plenty of parallels here in the subway grant, \$20 million was given by this government from the people of Ontario for Toronto subways, and I have a quotation here from the *Toronto Star*, a letter by a taxpayer which says:

What happened to all the clear thinkers when \$42 million were poured into the University avenue subway that today does not take in enough money to pay for the ticket-takers?

That cost the rest of Ontario \$20 million and yet it does not even take in enough money to pay for the salary of the ticket-takers.

This is what I am quarrelling about, the inequity in the operation of this government.

Mr. Speaker, we have revealed three areas where this government has discriminated against agriculture by giving grants to industry that agriculture does not enjoy; a shocking case of collaboration with big business in the bailing out of the British Mortgage and Trust Company, in saving the trust and loan company by using public funds; by the use of public funds to enrich downtown Toronto real estate; in all of these areas, projects costing many millions of dollars. Yet this government could not give one dollar per head from the people of Ontario to protect the way of life of the farmers of Ontario; to give the farmer a chance to help himself, to give him some sort of protection against the octopus packing industry.

A note has been handed to me: "Copaco has closed its doors and is bankrupt. Will the government help?" Time will tell.

Mr. Speaker, I trust this House will think carefully and support the following motion—I am quoting:

"On behalf of the people of Ontario—"

Mr. Speaker: I have to inform the member that it is improper to make a motion to the House during the debate at this time. The debate at the present time is on the amendment to the amendment to the Throne speech proposed by the member for York South (Mr. MacDonald). That debate must go forward to its conclusion before any further amendments can be placed before the House.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will withdraw the motion. I think it is timely then, that there be tabled in this House a list of any or all stocks held prior to June 16, 1965 up until the present time in the British Mortgage and Trust Company and the Victoria-Grey Trust Company, by any member of the Cabinet, any member of the government, any member of the securities commission, along with complete disclosures of transfers of shares in the above stocks on May 1, 1965, to August 1, 1965. I think it is timely to bring into this House legislation—I will try to bring in as I mentioned before—a programme to give a ten-year test for the same, set up along the following lines:

A credit of up to \$3 million for operating capital.

A subsidy of up to \$1 million for ten years.

And to give this concept a chance to prove itself, the government to provide direction and the needed skilled help for agriculture as it does for industry. To further satisfy the government, they could appoint a board of trustees to be approved by the 13,000 shareholders of FAME. It is time we gave agriculture a new deal in this House. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to compliment you on the fine manner in which you have been conducting the affairs of this House under, what we all know, are very trying circumstances. I think you will probably appreciate that certain events which took place in a certain by-election a short time ago are not going to make your life any easier around here. I am sure you are going to do your best to handle it in your usual efficient manner.

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to engage in the Throne debate. I think there were enough speakers and I think the Ministers generally have many opportunities to speak in this House. But as hon. members know, the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) a short while ago, took the occasion in his maiden speech of making a direct personal attack on me.

I am not anxious to, nor will I, engage in a personal feud with anybody in this House. But before I am a member of this Legislature or a Minister, I am a man, and anyone taking the trouble to make a personal attack on me must expect to be answered.

I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that I was rather puzzled as to how to deal with the hon. member for Bracondale. He hardly makes sense. He rarely has made sense. He makes headlines. We are all familiar with that.

It is obvious, sir, from his personal attack on me in his maiden speech that he intends to carry on in this manner, in a manner to which he has become accustomed in the two years he spent in the Toronto city council—that is bluster, invective and irrational and wild attacks, personal attacks, too—and of course, for no reason but to catch headlines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just in case some of the hon. members from outside the city are not familiar with the tactics to which they had better become accustomed—as far as the hon. member is concerned—let me quote from a column of Mr. Bob Pennington of the *Toronto Telegram* on January 3, 1966. It is entitled "Our Man Takes A Look Through a Glass Darkly into 1966" and he gives his prognostication for every month in 1966. For January, he says:

George Ben, MPP, calls the tournament of champions at Maple Leaf Gardens a dung heap and cesspool and demands an inquiry into curling.

His prognostication for February is:

George Ben calls Ontario ski resorts dung heaps and cesspools and demands an inquiry into skiing.

For March: Canada wins the world hockey tournament in Yugoslavia and makes a unilateral declaration of independence. George Ben calls international hockey a dung heap and a cesspool and Clarence Campbell agrees with him.

For April: "Pennington"—that is the columnist—Pennington goes to Las Vegas with the funds for the underprivileged workers of Disneyland shouting, 'They are not as underprivileged as all that.' George Ben calls schoolgirl volley ball a dung heap and a cesspool and Clarence Campbell appoints King Clancy to conduct an inquiry.

For May: Pennington says he will give a stetson to every cricketer performing a three-wicket-game hat trick. George Ben says cricket is a dung heap and a cesspool.

For June: George Ben calls English

racine a dung heap and a cesspool and 10,000 stable boys agree with him.

For July: Gussie Moran stages comeback in the first topless Wimbledon. George Ben calls Wimbledon a dung heap and a cesspool and Clarence Campbell tells him to mind his own damn business.

For August: Canadians playing in the Carling World Golf at Southport, England collapse under the merciless sun. George Ben calls golf a dung heap and a cesspool.

For September: Pennington is fired by the United Church for impaired publicity and leaves for Kenya to write a series of articles on gorillas as a possible new source of recruitment for football. George Ben calls football a dung heap—

For October: Johnny Esaw is appointed coach of Toronto Italia soccer club and is invited to sit on the hot seat by Nancy McCredie. George Ben calls the hot seat a cesspool of dung.

He changed it a little this time. For November: Pat Remillard is signed to play Peter Pan in London. George Ben says Peter Pan is a cess heap of dung.

December: Cassius Clay says he will enter politics after fighting Juliette. George Ben says politics are a dung pool of cess.

[Mr. Pennington finishes] The outlook for 1967 is quite unthinkable. Happy New Year.

Now Mr. Speaker, I only point this out as an example of what a lot of people in Toronto have become accustomed to from the hon. member. As I said, I am a little puzzled as to how to handle the hon. gentleman because I do not want to become involved in a session full of invective going back and forth because I, right at the beginning, admit that he can beat me at this.

An hon. member: Her Majesty's Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Whether I am Her Majesty's Minister or not, I am still a gentleman and a man and anybody who is going to make personal attacks has to expect to get it back.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But I am not going to make a personal attack. I will admit this, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman came over after this unprecedented attack—I do not think there is any precedent for a member in his maiden speech to stand up and make a vindictive personal attack.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Oh, yes, there has been far worse—Robert Macaulay—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I will admit this: The hon. member came over later, because we have known each other for some time and he said, "Allan, there is something wrong around here. Some of the boys here are saying that I have something against you." And I said, "Well, I wonder where they got that impression."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other day I merely corrected the record. That was the implication of the hon. member that I had misled the House and I stated at that time that I would deal in detail with his other wild charges and now I am going to deal with them.

His record in city council is easily described, he was accustomed to attacking civil servants who could not answer back. He is going to become accustomed to the fact that here attacking civil servants merely to catch headlines is not going to be as easy as it was in city council, because here there is a Minister responsible for every civil servant. And the hon. member is going to have to put up or shut up.

I know for a time he is going to get away with all sorts of these wild statements such as the ones he used in his maiden speech. If I can refresh the hon. members of this House, using such expressions as "captious whining," "the stolid impassivity of the Sphinx," "atrophied mental processes," "uninformed and misinformed," "appalling judgment," "consummate arrogance" and all that sort of thing. He will catch the headlines, of course, and frequently get away with this ploy, knowing full well that not too often will the calm appraisal and refutation of his charges get anywhere near the publicity that his colourful invective does.

I say, however, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the other reasons he will find it perhaps a little more difficult here because we have a Mr. Speaker who controls the debates and who will hopefully control some of the language for which the hon. member has become notorious.

It is my guess, too, that those same gentlemen of the press who take delight in reporting his uncontrolled verbosity, will eventually lose respect for his methods unless, of course, he changes his ways and at least attempts to get down to cases and deal with facts. This is what I intend to do right now, deal with the facts. I intend to go over his speech in detail and deal with everything he has said and get down to the specific

cases. I will establish what probably every hon. member has already suspected, that his comments were merely loud, noisy nonsense, with little if any basis in fact. In the process, Mr. Speaker, I hope to provide the hon. member with enough information so that the next time he speaks on matters pertaining, at least, to my department, we might hopefully engage in an intelligent, fruitful debate on those things which concern all serious-minded citizens. If I am not successful in this attempt, Mr. Speaker, I will at least be serving notice on the hon. member that I am not going to let him destroy the morale of my department or its very active programme in his attempt to gain sufficient prominence to replace his hon. leader (Mr. Thompson).

Mr. Speaker, to deal with the specific charges, I quote him: "The hon. Minister is consistently uninformed, ill-informed and misinformed." And I am sure the hon. member for Bracondale was quite happy with the headlines he got on that, because this is not the sort of attack that, as I said earlier, a member usually makes in his maiden speech. The hon. member, of course, is entitled to his opinion. And all I can do is to compare his views, the views of a man who within two or three weeks, has become an expert in penology, with those who are recognized experts and have been in the field for years. Sir, here are their views, and I hope hon. members will forgive me if this seems immodest, but I have to make my case. The following are statements made regarding my knowledge of my work as to whether I am informed or uninformed, as the hon. member charged me. From the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of February 2, 1966, quoting William T. McGrath, executive secretary of the Canadian corrections association:

I agree wholeheartedly that there is a revolution taking place within The Ontario Department of Reform Institutions.

From the *Globe and Mail* again, quoting A. M. Kirkpatrick, executive director of the John Howard society:

We have a Minister who is tremendously interested in his department and has done more study than normally could be expected. He has been receptive to persons outside the department and opened a great many doors.

Quoting Mrs. Margaret Cragg, information officer of the Ontario welfare council:

The Department of Reform Institutions occupies much more space in our publication—

meaning the Ontario welfare council bulletin:—than in former years because of its many new programmes. We have been impressed with your approach—

She was referring to me in an unsolicited letter—an unsolicited letter:

We have been impressed with your approach to the problems of corrections and we venture to hope that many of your staff will find this book a useful reference—

referring to a book she sent to us.

Quoting His Honour Judge C. L. Austen, treasurer of the association of juvenile and family court judges of Ontario, in a letter dated September 24, 1965:

Actually not only the judges present but those who heard you at the last association seminar are very pleased that we have a Minister who takes a personal interest in matters relating to the training and education of youngsters falling into the orbit of the juvenile courts, and we are anxious to co-operate in every way possible in the training schools programme on which you are working.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Could the hon. Minister not get one of his colleagues to read that for him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I did not think I had to go through that subterfuge.

Mr. Nixon: I do not think he could have got them to read it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Quoting Douglas McConney, executive director of the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto on December 17, 1965:

We are very much aware and appreciative of the points made in the department submission of October 20 to the select committee on youth, of the number of senior staff appointments which have been made during the past year and of earlier developments in the spring including the new Training Schools Act.

Quoting from the Elizabeth Fry Newsletter, February 19, 1964:

1. Congratulations are in order to The Department of Reform Institutions for the sponsorship of the first conference on addictions, held at the Alex G. Brown memorial clinic at Mimico.

2. The conference offered an excellent exchange of information on research being done at Mimico. The conference was an unqualified success. We do hope that it

will become an annual event. We left encouraged that research and treatment were going steadily ahead in Ontario and that more and more people are realizing that the punitive approach was not the right answer.

Quoting Mrs. M. Moodey, the corresponding secretary of the Elizabeth Fry society in a letter dated October 13, 1964:

Mr. Grossman has shown great ability in the work he has undertaken and appreciation of the problems involved.

That is the point I want to make. I was accused of being uninformed, ill-informed and misinformed and had a great lack of initiative. I will speak about that later..

The conference on alcoholism and addiction was of service to the social and welfare workers from many agencies and the recent meeting between the after-care agencies and his own staff provided a much-needed opportunity for communication and interpretation. We have been particularly grateful for his study of the county and district jails and the subsequent recommendations for updating these and other institutions.

From the Elizabeth Fry Newsletter, December, 1965:

Ontario's new Training Schools Act proclaimed November, 1965, was greeted at a recent United Nations congress held in Sweden as a leading piece of legislation in the juvenile field.

Want some more? Does the hon. member for Bracondale want some more?

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: From the Elizabeth Fry Newsletter, dated January, 1966:

Mrs. Weinrich and Miss Haslam attended a luncheon to mark the signing of a contract between four counties in the Quinte area and the government of Ontario to share in the building of a regional detention centre. This is the first such agreement and is indeed a forward step. Now better facilities can be built, planned and staffed. This should mark, we hope, the beginning of the end of the inadequate ancient local county jails across the province. Congratulations.

From the Elizabeth Fry Newsletter, February 19, 1966:

It was a pleasure to meet Miss Nicholson of The Department of Reform Institutions. Her speech was informative and stimulating. Certainly Ontario is fortunate in having a woman of this calibre and intelligence

in the newly created position of administrator of adult female institutions. The province is to be congratulated for its foresight in defining this position and thus giving the work with the female adult offender the attention that it deserves. One wonders what is happening in Ottawa.

From the John Howard society of Ontario in its presentation to the select committee on youth, October, 1965:

The Department of Reform Institutions is to be commended for recently announcing the policy of reduction of size of adult correctional institutions to not more than 200 inmates. This leaves the problem of Guelph reformatory which at varying times houses between 700 and 800 young offenders. No immediate decision is perhaps possible because of the proposed transfer of jurisdiction to the federal government of inmates sentenced in effect to over six months.

The policy of building regional detention and classification centres replacing outmoded county jails has been actively pursued by The Department of Reform Institutions and warrants every possible support.

I should say: "Classification centres are replacing outmoded county jails."

Talking of real experts, Mr. Speaker, let me give you the sort of people who inform and advise me so that we will be able to judge whether the hon. member is correct when he says that I am misinformed. These are the people who advise me and inform me—or as the hon. member has stated, "misinform me"—in various capacities on advisory committees and staff:

Lieutenant-Colonel Frank Moulton, director of correctional services, the Salvation Army; A. M. Kirkpatrick, executive director of the John Howard society of Ontario; Professor John Spencer, school of social work, University of Toronto; Professor Martin L. Freidland, faculty of law, University of Toronto; Mr. G. G. MacFarlane, assistant director, probation services, department of the Attorney General; Mr. Joseph McCulley, chairman of the planning committee, formerly warden of Hart House and former deputy commissioner of penitentiaries; Mr. A. H. Bird, chief superintendent, planning branch, Ontario provincial police; Mrs. C. L. Dubin, QC, barrister and solicitor, for years involved in penal reform.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The hon. Minister should hear what some of these people say privately about his department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am going to challenge the hon. member to produce that in a few minutes.

To continue: Mr. G. A. Martin, QC, barrister and solicitor, one of Canada's outstanding criminal lawyers; Major Elizabeth Peacocke, of the Salvation Army; Mr. H. David Archibald, whom I recently announced was appointed—of course I must not take credit for having had the benefit of his advice yet, he is just a new member; the Reverend Martin W. Pinker, chairman of MACTO, who has had a lifetime in after-care work; trustee Monte H. Harris, lawyer, trustee, on board of education of Toronto, member of the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto; the Venerable Archdeacon M. C. Davies, member of the board of directors of St. Leonards House, Windsor; Her Honour Judge Helen Kinnear, first woman King's counsel and first woman county judge in the British Commonwealth; I have already mentioned Joseph McCulley; Mrs. Cameron McKenzie, director of Ontario county children's aid society; His Honour Judge Waisberg is a member of the board of directors of the John—

Mr. Sopha: He is a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I have nothing against him because he is a Tory. I do not know what that means.

Mr. Sopha: He never says anything bad about a Tory.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know that that proves anything. He is a member on the board of directors of the John Howard society.

Recent appointments, again, I cannot take credit for having had any of their advice yet, they have just become members of these boards: Father John Kelly, president of the University of St. Michael's college; Mr. Gerald E. Nori, lawyer, member of the John Howard society; Professor H. R. Stuart Ryan, QC, professor of law at Queen's University; James P. Felstiner, chairman of the training schools advisory board, a consultant on unreached youth for the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto, one of Canada's outstanding detached street workers; Mrs. C. R. Sanderson, first public health nurse to practise in England, for 22 years a member of training schools advisory board; Dr. C. H. Lewis, consultant psychiatrist in the mental health branch of The Department of Health; Dr. J. M. Bennett, school inspector for 42 years, member of the training schools advisory

ory board since 1942; Mr. L. R. Hackl is our Deputy Minister:

The following are members of the staff:

Mr. Douglas Penfold, assistant Deputy Minister, 14 years in the department and who is a registered psychologist; Miss Aileen Nicholson, administrator of our adult female institutions, a well-known psychiatric social worker; Dr. Harry C. Hutchison, administrator of our adult male institutions, formerly chief psychologist of the Toronto psychiatric hospital and the forensic clinic; Dr. Ronald E. Stokes, director of psychiatry, clinical teacher in department of psychiatry, University of Toronto, and lecturer at the school of social work; Dr. T. Grygier, director of research—a joint appointment with the University of Toronto, where he is also research professor at the school of social work; A. Douglas Mackey, director of education, former head of the industrial arts department of O'Neill collegiate and vocational institute, Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people who advise me.

And now, Mr. Speaker, in case there was any suggestion—the hon. member for York South suggested that they said something different privately—I am going to take a calculated risk. I challenge the hon. members, either of them, to go to any qualified people in corrections who will justify the charge the hon. member made that I am “ill-informed” in this work and that I “lack initiative.” That is quite a challenge and I know that is quite a risk, because you can always find someone. But I am still willing to throw that challenge out and I would be pleased to hear from the hon. member when he can get somebody to do that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): He is getting childish.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Speaker, we will leave it at that. The hon. members of this House can be judges as to who knows more about whether I have some initiative in this work—or whether I am ill-informed or otherwise—whether it is the hon. member or whether it is these people I have mentioned.

Next he said: “his lack of initiative,” and a little later asked: “What has the Minister done since assuming office?”

Well, let us see what I have done—or shall I say my department—since I assumed this portfolio just a little over two years ago. I think that is quite a proper question and I think I should not be accused of immodesty

if I answer this question. He asked me a direct question and I am going to answer it.

Number one: We built two new training centres for young men, one in Fort William and one in Monteith. Is that lack of initiative?

We have organized the most extensive and advanced system for the replacement of out-moded county jails, with modern regional detention and classification centres offering a 50 per cent grant towards the cost of their construction. And everyone knows by now this is proceeding at a very satisfactory rate. Is that lack of initiative?

We have obtained the property of the RCAF station, Hagersville, and opened one of the two training schools already established there. Is that lack of initiative?

We have opened two new open forestry camps, one at Wendigo Lake and one at Portage Lake. Is that lack of initiative?

We have established a research department—with an outstanding director, as I mentioned earlier. It is a cross-appointment with the University of Toronto and we have used this research department to tremendous advantage. Does that show lack of initiative?

Mr. MacDonald: Done!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Done!

We have rewritten our training schools Act to produce one of the leading pieces of legislation in the world in this field. The hon. member knows it—and if he does not he should, because it has been quoted all over the world in journals as a leading piece of legislation from which everyone should get some example.

As a matter of fact, I might just read from an editorial in the Toronto *Daily Star* just the other day, February 10, in dealing with a report of the commission on juvenile and youthful delinquency which was appointed by the federal government—the federal Department of Justice. They say here:

The committee was realistic in its recommendations. For example, the age of 10 or 12, not seven, will now be the minimum at which a child can be held criminally responsible. It is ridiculous to label an eight- or nine-year-old child a criminal whatever his offence. Ontario has partly recognized this in the revised training schools Act.

Mr. Speaker, this is a direct result of our Act; and we are not talking “about age 10

or 12," we have already established the fact in the province of Ontario that no child under 12 will be held criminally responsible.

I ask the hon. member whether he thinks this proves lack of initiative?

We are building a new training school in northern Ontario which will be the first bilingual and interdenominational training school in this province. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have undertaken the full financing of the private training schools and in addition have given a \$200,000 grant to St. Josephs in Alfred. I wonder if the hon. member would like to ask the hon. member for Ottawa East (Mr. Racine) if he agrees with the hon. member for Bracondale that we have lacked initiative in respect of the private training schools? He might ask his hon. colleague about that.

We supported the establishment of the centre of criminology. In fact it was our department which started it off with a grant of \$30,000. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have completely reorganized administrative positions within the department and have appointed leading workers in the field to these positions. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have reviewed and reorganized our statistical methods which, incidentally, will help the hon. member get a clearer picture of our work and therefore put him in a better position to give some intelligent criticism; and we are always open for intelligent criticism because we will never be perfect even in this department. Does this show lack of initiative, Mr. Speaker?

We have started the use of plastic surgery as a tool in the rehabilitation process. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have reorganized our method of hiring teachers, thereby solving a shortage of teachers which plagued our department for years, and we have expanded our academic and vocational training programme throughout the department. Does that show lack of initiative?

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Is it not about time?

Hon. Mr. Crossman: If it is about time, the person who starts it cannot be accused of lack of initiative, can he?

We have organized, for two years conferences on the addict offender and these have been attended by people from not only across this province but from other provinces

and the United States as well. We loaned the state of New York our chief psychologist to advise them on the setup of similar facilities for addict offenders in the same fashion as we have. How can the hon. members state that we lack initiative when the state of New York comes to us for advice on a programme which we initiated?

We strengthened and expanded our chaplaincy services and built chapels in many of our institutions. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have met with judges and magistrates and set up an organized programme for them to visit our institutions so that they will be more familiar with our work. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have advanced to the final planning stage of a new women's institution, which the hon. members know will be known as the Vanier institution for women. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have established a consultative committee on regional detention units composed of leading experts in the field and we are also establishing a committee to ensure that all possible opportunities are taken for the effective use of vocational and industrial skills which can be learned within our institutions. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have extended and developed our staff training programme, including the organizing of the first correspondence course in corrections in Canada. A new staff training building is being provided for in the estimates. Does that show lack of initiative?

We have extended our clinical programme to include sex deviates. Does this show lack of initiative?

We have revised our classification programme in the juvenile field with the extension of facilities and the reorganized programmes in the Galt training school. Does that show lack of initiative?

In the adult field we have also revised our classification programme and extended facilities to such an extent that we have been able to reduce the population of Guelph from away over 900 to approximately 700 at the moment, and we are progressing even further in this direction. Does that show lack of initiative?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we have extended and reorganized our parole and placement service for more effective after-care of adults and youngsters and have, at this moment, a bill before the Legislature for the extension of the parole board for more effective use of parole facilities.

These, Mr. Speaker, are just some of the highlights I have been able to put down on paper in the last couple of days. I submit—humbly if I may, after all of that; and I suppose you could argue that I was bragging about our work, but why should I not brag about our work because our people have done a tremendous job in doing it and I want to recognize that.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think the hon. member can claim that I am either misinformed or ill-informed, or lack initiative.

The hon. member dealt with the subject of solitary confinement the other day and protective clothing. I dealt with that the other day and I think quite effectively proved that in this matter not only was he confused but to use his own words, he was “uninformed, ill-informed and misinformed.”

Next he described me as the—

Minister who, with appalling judgment and consummate arrogance rises in this House to speak of the possibility that the government would restrict surprise inspection of members of the Legislature to the institutions which are his responsibility.

Let us deal with that one. The facts are that when I first became Minister it was I who not only invited but encouraged hon. members to visit our institutions unannounced. I asked them to interest themselves in the work; to find out what was being done in their name and in the name of the people of Ontario. So that the hon. member will not have that confused, I will quote from *Hansard* on that, of March 13, 1964, pages 1603 and 1604:

Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member has the privilege, as I invited all the hon. members of this House, to go to any institution without warning. All they have to do is to identify themselves as a member of this Legislature. They can live there for a week if they like and find out for themselves. There may be some—

Then I was interrupted by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) who said:

I might take you up on that.

I continue:

Mr. Grossman: Of course, and quite welcome! The hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) has done it; the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) has done it. I do not say that they lived there, but they have been in and have asked questions and so on—

Mr. Thompson: As long as they would let me out again—

Mr. Grossman: I am sure they will. I take this opportunity of appealing to the hon. members to please do this, so once and for all we will stop putting the stigma of a “custodial approach” on the people of my department. It is exactly the opposite, exactly the opposite.

You are doing them an injustice, really you are, and I would strongly urge that between now and the next session hon. members do this, and do it without warning. Go in and satisfy themselves. Sit down and talk with the guard or the superintendent or any of them there. It is not too difficult for an intelligent man, and all hon. members of this House are intelligent.

Have lunch with them there at the institution, find out about our meals and so on. Hon. members will soon find out what the approach is. I have no doubt that we have members within our department and members of the custodial staff—we have to call them that, this is the designation for a guard and so on—I have no doubt that there are a few of them who we would prefer have a better outlook on some of these things, but you cannot have perfection. However, our department certainly has anything but a custodial approach.

And from *Hansard* of March 10, 1965, page 1156—this was after the great chesterfield debacle:

Hon. members will recall that last year I extended an invitation to all hon. members of this House to visit any of our institutions at any time without notice. It was my feeling at the time that all hon. members who wished to avail themselves of this invitation would do so in the full sense of the responsibilities attached to such a privilege. I hesitate even to use the word “privilege,” because it is my feeling that generally hon. members of this Legislature should feel free to visit provincial institutions and I only use the term for lack of a more suitable one.

However, in the light of recent circumstances the whole matter of visiting our institutions will have to be revised with the possibility that such invitations may be qualified with certain conditions, to ensure the protection of the staff, the inmates and the public.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, hon. members agreed at that time, and would agree now, that there must be some order to such visits. As a matter of fact, the hon. member for

Bracondale proved this just the other day. He walked into Guelph reformatory with someone he called his executive assistant.

Now the rights which are held by hon. members of this House, Mr. Speaker, are accompanied by responsibility. As hon. members, they are accountable to this body and to the people of Ontario. This accountability, of course, does not apply to their friends or assistants or other such people they may want to take along with them. I certainly feel that this was an abuse by a member of his rights in this respect.

And where did I state anywhere here that I would restrict such visits? Of course I did not say that! I said these would have to be done with some semblance of order; and they have to be or they cause havoc. In penal institutions these can be carried out in such a fashion that tensions are created that are very difficult to control.

Now as to his next piece of invective, Mr. Speaker, and I quote:

He is the Minister who rises in this House to make a statement that \$25,000 would not be a large enough salary to lure psychiatrists into full-time jobs in Ontario institutions, and then inanely resumes his seat without dwelling on the problem at length.

At this time I would like to repeat the rather lengthy discussion which ensued before I, as he put it, "resumed my seat without dwelling on the problem at length." Well, let us find out just how lengthy that was. This is from *Hansard*, Mr. Speaker, and I do not have the page number here but I am prepared to provide that to any hon. member who cares to ask for it:

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is one thing I would like to get into the record.

It is, of course, more difficult for any corrective institution to retain this type of staff than it is for any other department as far as I am able to ascertain. This is also endemic across the whole world because in our work there is a great deal of room for differences of opinion. Quite often psychologists, and psychiatrists particularly, differ in their views as to what should be done. Some of them feel frustrated that their views are not accepted and they leave.

As a matter of fact, without mentioning any names, there are a few in the number I mentioned who because of the differences of opinion left The Department of Reform Institutions and went with

the addiction research foundation. After being there a short while they left there as well because of differences of opinion.

As I say, this is not just in our jurisdiction. I have just had handed to me a recent report of the commissioner of penitentiaries for Canada. On page 3 of that report he states: "The situation described in the previous report [that would be the 1963 report] has not changed appreciably as regards recruitment of professionally qualified staff. Half of the establishment for psychologists remains vacant and group counselling is at a standstill in most institutions due to the lack of adequate professional supervision." [That is the end of the quote from that report.]

This, Mr. Chairman, is the federal system. I am not saying that it would not be a good thing to have this professional staff, I am not saying it is a good thing that some of them keep moving around. But again I suggest to the hon. member that one of the problems, as I said earlier, is that there is room for differences of opinion. And as the hon. member knows, I am sure, there is no group of people with greater differences of opinion and their own views than psychologists and psychiatrists.

Mr. Trotter: I still think, Mr. Chairman, and I will not belabour this particular point, if there was leadership given, if psychologists and psychiatrists felt that something was going to be done, that the department had some drive—and again I repeat that this is what has been wrong with this department and I hope the new Minister can change it—but there seems to have been no sense of purpose as to where they have been going. Too many of the old theories have been held by those in command. I do hope that the new hon. Minister will give this department a new look.

Still on this vein I would like to ask, how many psychiatrists do you have in the department now? I think you told us this earlier in your talk but I just want to make a comparison. How many psychiatrists are with the department now?

Mr. Grossman: Thirteen.

Mr. Trotter: Does that include full time and part time?

Mr. Grossman: Yes!

Mr. Trotter: How many are full time?

Mr. Grossman: All of our psychiatrists are part time.

Mr. Trotter: Are all your psychiatrists part time?

Mr. Grossman: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Trotter: Would you take full-time psychiatrists if you could get them?

And I would like to draw the hon. members' particular attention to the following:

Mr. Grossman: We certainly would, but of course the hon. member must appreciate the fact that psychiatrists can pretty well write their own terms insofar as salary is concerned. I have spoken to a number of them personally and no matter what salary you offer them, they would not want to leave private practice. Many of them feel that the kind of work in which they are engaged in private practice is the most rewarding from their own point of view. They deal with a group of people with whom they become personally acquainted and are able to follow them through a good portion of their lives.

They do not find it as interesting to come into institutions where there is merely a fleeting connection with some of those whom they are trying to treat. They have them today, and six or seven months from that day they are gone. They do not feel this gives them sufficient scope.

That is in addition, of course, to the matter of salary. As I pointed out to the hon. member, our part-time psychiatrists get paid \$40 or \$50 for half a day.

Mr. Trotter: Well now, if you are going to pay a psychiatrist full time, what approximately would his pay be?

Mr. Grossman: The hon. member, I think, can judge that by the fact that we are paying them at the rate of, I suppose, \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year.

Mr. Trotter: Would you pay that much if you could get one?

Mr. Grossman: My inclination would be to say yes, except that I would not give a definite answer to that because it is something we have not had to face. We have been discussing this with psychiatrists and have not had anyone get to the stage where he was interested in considering and was therefore prepared to talk terms. So I would not give a definite answer because the hon. member knows that I do not control salaries. This is a

matter for the civil service commission. If I had a prospective psychiatrist prepared to come in full time, I would then discuss it with the civil service commission.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if in his attempts to gain psychiatrists—to hire psychologists or psychiatrists in any of these fields—has he attempted to go abroad to England?

Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I can say from my personal experience when I was in the U.K. that I discussed the matter with the people who were involved in this work in the permanent Home Secretary's office and there was not a hope. They were having the same problem we were and they were quite prepared if it was necessary to outbid somebody else because they were anxious to get more on the staff as well.

Mr. Speaker, surely, does that sound like I "did not dwell on the problem at length," as he charged, suggesting that I dismissed it with a wave of the hand? Of course, I can now say that we have a full-time psychiatrist as well as 13 part-time psychiatrists. Actually, Mr. Speaker, a few days—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will go into that in our estimates; we will discuss that, I am sure.

Actually, a few days after the hon. member made this statement, he asked a question before the orders of the day and was told that we had a full-time psychiatrist—a fact, Mr. Speaker, which was no secret. We had announced it to the press months ago, and in compliance with a request received from the research department of his party, we sent them a copy of our press release. So it was no secret.

I suppose if the hon. member had asked the question a few days earlier, before proceeding with his piece of nonsense, it would have upset his rather stage-managed shock at pretending I was not interested in getting a full-time psychiatrist.

The next quotation includes the statement that I exonerated myself "from all responsibility with the airy statement that this country is not going to forge ahead in penal reform until the federal government creates a separate department to handle penal institutions." That is the end of his quote.

I did discuss the subject of a federal government creating a separate department to handle penal matters. I recommended to the

hon. member's friends in Ottawa the value of having a separate department over correctional services, and I did this in the light of my experience talking with people in this field throughout the world. Everywhere they said how they envied the progress we were able to make in Ontario because of a single ministerial responsibility.

The hon. member's friends, as a matter of fact, have actually taken this to heart and, in case he is not aware of it, Lawrence Pennell is now head of a separate portfolio, in charge of the penitentiary services and national parole board, and control of the RCMP. So maybe it was not such a bad suggestion after all.

The hon. member knows as well as I do that I was not exonerating myself from any responsibility insofar as my jurisdiction is concerned. I have had many plans for progress which are dependent, as all hon. members know, and the hon. member for Bracondale knows, on the implementation of the Fauteux committee report. But I could not honestly recommend the expenditure of vast sums of public money without getting some decision, some directive, concerning plans for the immediate future from the federal government.

Has the hon. member ever tried to get a direct answer from them? In voluminous correspondence I have had promises to think about it. They said they were going to do something about it, followed by statements to the press that there was going to be a committee to study the subject, followed by statements that something was going to happen, then the announcement of a committee to think about what they might possibly do, if they ever got off the ground. I think they will start to get off the ground now with the reorganization that is taking place. I certainly hope they do.

The hon. member then extended his statement by stating: "He is the Minister who says he is concerned about the frightful and deteriorating situation in Millbrook reformatory and at once adds the incredible statement that it is not within the power of The Department of Reform Institutions to change it." Mr. Speaker, this was a deliberate piece of chicanery. It was a quotation taken out of context. Let us find out what I did say in this statement to which the hon. member refers. From the Peterborough *Examiner*, when I gave them a statement as a result of their charges, dated July 30, 1965:

The investigation proved beyond question that the main motive behind the setting of the two fires was the desire

on the part of five inmates to be transferred to a federal penitentiary where sentences are automatically shortened because of a federal statute, which gives considerably greater remission to inmates serving sentences in federal institutions than it does to those in provincial institutions.

A man serving a sentence in a provincial reformatory may receive a total of only 52 days per year remission of sentence, conditional upon his continued good conduct. In federal penitentiaries, a man automatically receives an immediate remission of one quarter of his sentence plus an additional 36 days per year. A man serving almost six years, as some of these arsonists were, on transfer to penitentiary, would automatically have the sentence, in effect, reduced to four and one half years. These men have made many attempts to get transferred to the penitentiary, including an appeal to the supreme court. The fires were their final and successful effort.

Statements made to the effect that they wished to take up trade training did not bear examination in the light of their respective careers. Most have served at Kingston penitentiary previously and all have had trade training available to them in Ontario reform institutions.

Those involved have either never availed themselves of the opportunity for trade training, and/or shown any motivation to benefit from such training. The additional sentence likely to be handed out for arson was a gamble the men were prepared to take, and a risk that any penitentiary sentence of two years would not appreciably change their final discharge date.

This is the statement that I made, from which the hon. member took words out of context:

The jurisdiction of provincial reformatories includes sentences of up to only two years less a day. However, some courts hand down consecutive sentences of two years less a day each, and as a result, we occasionally have men serving sentences well in excess of two years.

These men are obliged to serve their sentences side by side with other inmates who are serving sentences which could be as little as 30 days. The constant turnover of inmates—the many others leaving before them—creates an abnormal amount of discontent, unrest and tension. While the Minister is concerned about this, it is not within the power of The Department of Reform Institutions or the Ontario government to change it.

And the hon. member took those words out of context to suggest that I was absolving myself of everything that went on at Millbrook. I could not do anything about it, I was waiting for the federal government. He knows perfectly well I was referring just to that particular aspect of it—consecutive sentences and the statutory remission in federal institutions.

I will finish the quote:

It should be noted that all five men who set fires at Millbrook reformatory were each serving sentences ranging up to six years because of consecutive sentences.

Hon. members can see that what concerned me was a situation governed by federal statutes, whereby inmates serving time in provincial reformatories were serving sentences far in excess of those normally served in reformatories.

I will not belabour this. I think I have made my point to the hon. members. I want to make it quite forcefully, Mr. Speaker, that what I do not like is the deliberate taking out of context to give an entirely different meaning. As a matter of fact, the importance of this was recognized by the Anglican committee which stated in its report, and I quote:

The Minister of Reform Institutions is to be commended for his attempts to get the present system of consecutive sentencing abolished. Church and public need to bring increasing pressure to bear on the Minister of Justice to have the Act amended.

They obviously understood what the position is; so, to be perfectly honest, did the hon. member. All I can say is that twisting of things around and quoting out of context is one of the oldest dodges in history, and as I said, is nothing but political chicanery.

Next came a detailed piece of research on what had been said 20 years ago by George Drew, whom the hon. member quotes to the following effect:

Inmates at reformatories were to spend most of their time in classes. There would be special schools for guards to ensure that they were fit and competent for their work.

That is the end of the quote. As a matter of fact, we have 17 academic teachers in the adult institutions, as well as even more trades training instructors. Any inmate, and I mean any individual inmate, in any of our institutions, whose behaviour pattern can be helped by academic instruction has that academic instruction available.

But, of course, we should not dismiss the rehabilitation as a simple problem of merely

giving them academic instruction. This is only one part of a huge complex problem.

With regard to the staff training school, I have already discussed the overall development of our staff training programme. The hon. member is now well informed, I hope, that we were the first to have one in this country. When the federal government started a staff training school, it sent observers to study our system. We have continually developed the school.

In the Speech from the Throne we informed the hon. members of our intention to extend and improve our staff training programme with the building of a new staff training school in the Mimico area. We have not been hidebound by tradition. We have initiated and supported university courses. We have fulfilled—in good measure, as a matter of fact—the promises made by George Drew at that time, on this subject.

His next piece of brilliant discovery, and I quote from the hon. member, is:

The heaviest burden placed on the inmates of these institutions, that is Millbrook and Mercer, is boredom, sheer boredom.

This, I think, was probably the only factual statement made by the hon. member in his whole speech. Boredom is the heaviest burden that is placed upon prisoners. Even with a full work programme and an intelligent recreation programme, there is inevitably boredom.

I will say this to the hon. member, that if he had to eat every day from the same table in the King Edward hotel, at the end of the year he would suffer from boredom. No matter how good the food, no matter how attractive the waitress, 365 days of sitting at the same table, with the same people, would produce boredom, of course. There would be no choice of companions, no telephone calls, no real freedom as we know it. Regrettably, this is one of the penalties that those who break the law have to suffer. What this really means, is that they have lost their liberty of choice. In fact, they have lost their liberty, period.

I do not know what point the hon. member was making. We are trying to do something, and we are doing something, about the complete boredom all day that is found in the county jails. This will be solved by the regional detention centre plan.

Next, the hon. member asks:

How do the classrooms in Guelph prepare the inmates for their release? Will the short terms they spend in the woollen

mills, the tailor shops, the body shops, the piggery or the cattle barns prepare them for the place in society they are entitled to by virtue of being part of the country, or have they lost all rights to citizenship and participation in the daily affairs of our province and our country?

The place we consider they are entitled to in society is working along with other members of society, not preying upon them. This is what they are entitled to. They are entitled to become productive members of society. This is what we try to train them for.

We know that they will not necessarily go out working in the same trades. How can one possibly represent all the available trades in this country within reform institutions? That is ridiculous. What we can produce are good work habits. This is what we do, and this is an attempt to train them to take their place working side by side with other members of society, instead of preying upon them.

What is wrong with tailor shops and woollen mills? Thousands of law-abiding people work in tailor shops and woollen mills. And what is wrong with piggeries and cattle barns? Thousands of law-abiding farmers find nothing wrong with them.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister objects to them every time we raise them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The last statement of this crazy mixed-up maiden speech of the hon. member is certainly the most confused of his whole diatribe. He stated, and once more I quote—and I would like the hon. members to indulge me a little further and give particular attention to this one:

A survey several years ago showed that under British probation services, 75 per cent of first offenders have not been convicted again. In contrast, the Canadian prison system here has failed to rehabilitate 70 per cent of those committed to its charge.

This is really confusing the issue, Mr. Speaker. It is just like trying to compare hockey statistics of goalkeepers and forwards. It is like saying that goalkeeper John Bower's average of two goals per game is a much better record than Bobby Hull's one goal per game average. They are two entirely different things connected with the same area, but at entirely different ends of the scale.

To start with, of course, the hon. member should realize that probation is in The Department of the Attorney General and is a

method of rehabilitation without incarceration. Those who fail on probation are sent to prison. They are the ones we get in our reformatories—those who have failed on probation and on suspended sentences after fines and short jail terms. We have a fine probation service in Ontario, which has success rates as high as those quoted by the hon. member, but you cannot compare success rates at completely different ends of the scale.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, he is comparing the success of those who were put on probation with those who were incarcerated. A ridiculous comparison.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister is missing an important point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am not missing the point at all. And the hon. member was not missing the point, he was attempting to confuse it. It is a comparison of those who, in the view of the judge, showed sufficient promise to warrant probation, with those whose poor records indicated they had no such promise and therefore had to be committed. This is what the judge felt. And comparing those two statistics is absolutely ridiculous.

In any case, to carry his confusion further, perhaps deliberately, he quoted supposed depressing figures of the Canadian system within the context of his attack on the Ontario system.

It is not too long ago since the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) attempted the same thing.

I think it was a year or two ago that he was on television and he quoted a statement which no one has ever been able to find any place. He said Canada—that is federal Canada—was supposed to be 44th on the United Nations' list in this field, but he spoke about it in the context of the Ontario system, giving the impression, of course, that while he was talking about the failure of Canada's system generally he was referring to the Ontario system, and he was deliberately confusing it at that time.

This is what the hon. member for Bracondale has done here. He mixes up the Ontario system by quoting Canadian figures, which is an entirely different thing. They are just further examples of confusion, either through ignorance, Mr. Speaker, or for the sake of confusion.

In general then, I hope I have given the hon. members some food for thought. It is an interesting fact, too—and this is interesting, Mr. Speaker—that the hon. member released

to the press only that portion which he felt would get headlines—the reform institutions section, including further reference to protective garments. This whole subject seems to hold particular fascination for the hon. member, hoping I suppose that in some way or other by using the terminology that he did—“baby doll pyjamas”—that he gave the impression that we are dressing men up in female clothing. He has found out, of course, that this is always good for a headline and has not been slow to capitalize on it.

He did not, as far as I have been able to establish, give an equally detailed press report on the other subjects which he claimed were of real concern to him, and on which he elaborated in his speech—the poor, the matter of health for the people, education, and so on. His press release was designed to deal with that which he felt lent itself to lurid headlines.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the outset, I enjoy a good debate but I do not intend to get involved in a constant donnybrook of invective and wild statements with the hon. member. If he is prepared to discuss matters of fact and policy in an intelligent manner so that something constructive can come from it, I shall be very pleased to do so. And I hope the information I have given the hon. member tonight will help him to add something of value to future debates.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the hon. Minister?

Mr. Speaker: You may direct a question, but the Minister does not have to accept it. Ask the Minister if he will accept your question.

Mr. Ben: Will the hon. Minister accept a question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I sat through half an hour, I did not interrupt the hon. member, and every member of this House knows I am never hesitant in allowing them to interrupt me at any time and ask questions, but this time I say “no.”

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will deal with Bill No. 6, which will be in the third reading stage. I would like to deal with second reading of Private Bill No. 18 and take it to the committee stage. This is merely a matter of convenience for the municipality involved in that bill. I have asked His Honour if he might be able to come in tomorrow morning, if we do complete third reading of Bill No. 6, to give it Royal assent. We will then proceed with this debate on the Throne speech.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, February 18, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

CONTENTS

Friday, February 18, 1966

Statement re First Co-operative Packers of Barrie, Mr. Stewart	687
Township of Charlotteville, bill respecting, Mr. McNeil, second reading	688
Township of Charlotteville, bill respecting, reported	688
Medical Services Insurance Act, bill to amend, third reading	689
Township of Charlotteville, bill respecting, third reading	700
Royal assent to certain bills, the Lieutenant-Governor	700
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Farquhar, Mr. Wells	700
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Wells, agreed to	708
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	708

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1966

The House met at 10:30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, as guests, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Winona public school, Winona; in the west gallery, John G. Althous public school, Islington.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to make a statement concerning the First Co-operative Packers of Barrie. The government of Ontario has been approached by the First Co-operative Packers of Barrie to discuss financial assistance to the co-operative, which is in need of working capital.

When the First Co-operative Packers purchased the Whyte packing plant, about a year ago, it was intended that shares of the co-operative be offered for sale to enlarge the membership of the co-operative and provide needed capital. This was not done. The co-operative now finds that, with the lack of capital provided by shareholders, and with a greater need for funds required for the purchase of raw products, the credit established for working capital is not sufficient to meet its current needs or obligations.

Under the provisions of section 12 of The Co-operative Loans Act, the government has provided a guarantee of \$200,000 to the co-operative. This financial support will enable the co-operative to consider reorganizing its operation and re-establish satisfactory credit.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), but he is not in the House and I would prefer to ask it on Monday.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts). Can the hon. Prime Minister explain why the population figures were not given for each of the new ridings in the final report of the redistribution commission, and would he table these figures in the House as soon as possible?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have no explanation as to why these figures were not included in the report. The report was prepared by the commission acting on the instructions it was given by this Legislature when the report of the standing committee on privileges and elections considered the matter last year, so I really have no explanation as to why these figures were not included in this report.

I might say that I really have no idea whether they even exist, and whether the commission, in dealing with the whole problem in terms of the instructions it was given, in its deliberations totalled the figures again for these new ridings it finally recommended. I do not know. If these figures are available, I would have absolutely no objection to them being tabled in the House, but at the moment I do not even know whether they exist. I had no control over the method in which the commission carried out the instructions given by the Legislature. If they are available—and I will find out if they are—I would have no objection whatsoever to having them made public. But, as I say, I cannot guarantee that they are there.

Mr. MacDonald: I appreciate the hon. Prime Minister's comment. I hope he will inquire. I do not know how we, or even the commission can, know whether we are living within the guidelines they themselves laid down if they have not got the population figures. They laid the guidelines, namely, of 25,000 to 50,000 for a rural, 50,000 to 60,000 for a mixed and 60,000 to 75,000 for an urban riding. If they do not have the figures, how do they know whether they were living within their own guidelines?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Well, I can only say that I do not really consider it to be my

position in this matter to defend the commission. The commission was appointed to do a job; they were appointed to do this within the terms of reference given and, as far as I am concerned, they did it as they saw fit.

I would say that the committee on privileges and elections, in referring back the report that the committee brought in, said that they should give consideration to submissions relating to electoral district boundaries to be made by interested persons during such a period as the commission may prescribe. In considering such submissions, the commission also consider population trends and up-to-date population figures, and report to the legislative assembly not later than the next regular session.

There was more to be considered when the report was sent back to the commission. It was broadened to take submissions from the public and from any interested people. It may well be that there were matters taken into consideration over and above this. In other words, their original guidelines may not have held. However, I will see if these figures are available, and we will see if we cannot get them in the House.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Education. He has received a copy of it.

Is the hon. Minister giving any consideration to delaying the opening of the school year until the second day after Labour day instead of the present day after Labour day, as recommended in the report on the Ontario tourist industry by the Ontario economic council?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, some consideration has been given to this proposal. There has been no decision. As a matter of general policy, we do not enthuse over shortening the school year. But the report has been made available to the department. It is under consideration, but no decision has been made.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question? Does he not consider that the extension of one day at the end of the school year would compensate for shortening the school year by one day at the beginning of the year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, there are many compensations one could think of. You could also suggest that you have an extra day during the Christmas or Easter holidays. There might be many ways, but I say to you

that it is under consideration and no decision has been made.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), of which I gave notice yesterday.

The question is as follows: Would the hon. Provincial Treasurer inform us of the results of the joint meeting of the civil service association and the civil service commission negotiating increased wages for the highway employees for Essex, Kent and Lambton?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. member's question, I may say that negotiations proceeded to the level of the Ontario joint council. Since the differences could not be resolved at that level, the case will now be placed before the civil service arbitration board as prescribed by statute. The employees in the southwestern portion of Ontario are among a large group of employees who are covered by this series of negotiations.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 41st order. Second reading of Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Charlotteville.

TOWNSHIP OF CHARLOTTEVILLE

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Charlotteville.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The fourth order, committee of the whole House.

House in committee; Mr. A. W. Downer in the chair.

TOWNSHIP OF CHARLOTTEVILLE

House in committee on Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Charlotteville.

Sections 1 to 6, inclusive, agreed to.

Schedule agreed to.

Preamble agreed to.

Bill No. Pr18 reported.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of the whole House begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: The first order, third reading, Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

THIRD READINGS

The following bills were given third reading upon motion:

Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, third reading of a bill provides an opportunity for further debate. I want to say, at the outset, that I have no desire nor intention to rehash what has already been covered pretty exhaustively throughout second reading and throughout committee of the whole House, nor have I any desire to dam the flood of informational material that is now going to flow out across the province.

However, on that one point I would remind the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) that about a week ago I asked him whether or not there was such material and, if there was, if it would be placed in the hands of the members of this House before it was sent out. The hon. Minister indicated it would. If that promise is going to be fulfilled, perhaps we should have it before one o'clock today, because I suspect that there is going to be some pretty rapid distribution of material in order to meet the deadline of March 1.

I want to remind you, Mr. Speaker, of the pattern of this debate until now, which I think justifies consideration of certain aspects of this medical insurance bill which have not been fully explored. On second reading, the hon. Minister did not speak at the outset; he concluded the debate, dealing, I think it can be accurately said, pretty strictly with the principles of the bill as they related to the province of Ontario. After he had spoken, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) intervened in the debate and, I think quite rightly, considered it in the broader terms of federal-provincial relationships and Ontario's negotiations with Ottawa in relation to the possibility of a federal plan on which there would be a subsidy to assist provinces in establishing medical insurance. A great deal of the material that the hon. Prime

Minister introduced at that time has not been discussed in the House, for the simple reason that it is difficult to deal with those broader aspects while considering the intimate detail of a clause-by-clause debate of the bill. I think the third reading provides that opportunity, and I want to do so now—not at great length, but in some substance.

It was rather interesting, I thought, that after the last federal-provincial conference on health matters the federal Minister of Health made the statement that in his view there was no difficulty involved in the Ontario plan as was proposed by this amending bill, ultimately fitting in to the kind of plan that Ottawa was considering.

That is rather an interesting statement, Mr. Speaker. The most significant aspect of it was that there was no denial at all from Queen's Park. Nobody stated flatly that this was not true. As a matter of fact, I think if one briefly reviews the evolution of the bill, one will see why this might well be the case. As my colleague, the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) has pointed out at one stage in the debate, we have really gone through three stages in the evolution of the government's medical insurance. The first was a proposal exclusively to regulate private insurance. But there was enough protest with regard to this that, in the second stage of the government succession of bills, they continued a regulation of private insurance, but began to introduce the concept of public insurance for the low-income groups and for those who were on categorical assistance.

The third stage of the bill—the one we are now considering—has broadened the public insurance still more. Potentially, it could cover about 40 per cent of the people in the province, but they leave under private insurance the remaining 60 per cent. In other words, you have the nucleus of a public insurance contained in this bill.

It is also, I think, rather significant that of the two amendments that the government introduced, one of them was an amendment that I suggest was perhaps belatedly considered—obviously it was belatedly considered—that the government should have the power, without coming back to this Legislature, to expand the services under this bill. In other words, through that amendment they have secured the power—and we are not objecting to it; indeed, we proposed it and the hon. Minister, in effect, accepted it. He brought in his own amendment and we withdrew ours—without coming back to the Legislature—to expand the public Medicare aspect of this legislation.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Sir, would the hon. member allow me to explain this very briefly?

I would like to put it on the record that my own staff had that same kind of wording in. I rejected it because I felt I was asking for a little more power by regulation than I felt the House was willing to give me. I was delighted, therefore, to replace it when I found the Opposition was willing to give me that power of regulation.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister is again being a little bit disingenuous. Why we would object to him having the power to expand his Act to meet the kind of requirements that we have been shouting for from the outset of this debate I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Government by regulation? That was why I thought you would object.

Mr. MacDonald: By regulation—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): You gave yourself the power to restrict, in the regulations from the very beginning.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the point I want to get to is that if we now have a bill which is, if I may use these arbitrary figures, 60 per cent private Medicare, left to the private insurance companies, and a potential 40 per cent under public Medicare, then the question that comes to my mind, and I am sure it must come to the minds of many people in this province, is why the delay in moving in the direction that the government is going to be forced ultimately to move in?

If this bill is now so framed that it can be integrated into a federal plan, why is the government delaying any longer? Is it that the government is committed to its first love of private insurance and therefore wants to stick with that commitment as long as it possibly can? Is it that the government hopes that Ottawa is going to weaken on its standard? Or is it that the government hopes that Ottawa may give unconditional grants so that the standards will not be something that will have to be negotiated with Ottawa, or have to be met before you get the grants? Then the government would be free to stick with its first love of private insurance to the greatest extent possible.

It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that we, from the outset of this debate, have been a little puzzled as to why the government is so reluctant. It is for that reason, for example, that we gave notice of an amendment on

second reading—an amendment which would have two points: (1) Calling upon this government to enunciate immediately its acceptance of participation in the federal plan; and (2) taking the necessary steps in the interim period, with some alternative piece of legislation, to give coverage to these 1.8 million people whom we agree should have coverage and should have it in the period between now and July 1, 1967, when any joint federal-provincial plan would come into effect.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened to Medicare in this country and, indeed, in this province, as we now see from this bill, is indicative of the malaise that afflicts Canada at the present time. On the one hand, you have the province of Quebec—French Canada—moving with a conviction and a decision to establish what it wants. It knows what it wants and it is proceeding to implement it. Quite frankly, theirs is the right kind of Medicare. It is universal, comprehensive, and it is going to be handled through a government agency. Even if the federal government did not come in with any grants, they are going to move to establish the kind of Medicare that we have been advocating in the province of Ontario in specific terms since November, 1962.

But what about the rest of Canada, Mr. Speaker? What about English Canada? We are going off in nine different directions. Each of the provinces has its own particular plan. They range from public Medicare, such as was established in Saskatchewan by the CCF-NDP government — then opposed by the Liberals but accepted by them now—to the kind of private Medicare in Alberta, to the kind of version that you have in BC, to the kind of opposition, or mood of opposition, that you have from the Roblin government in Manitoba.

In other words, all the nine provinces in English-speaking Canada are going off in their own direction. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this is so indicative of the problem of Canadian Confederation at the present time. The Medicare issue is indicative of the divisions, of the lack of leadership, and I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that lack of leadership, in the final analysis, comes right back here to the province of Ontario.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Why?

Mr. MacDonald: Because in negotiations with Ottawa, historically, Ontario is the natural leader of English-speaking Canada. Indeed, even in Quebec, people like Claude Ryan have indicated many times that Ontario is acknowledged as the leader of English-

speaking Canada. If this government was taking the lead with the federal government, now that they have the assurance—and I am sure it is an assurance that is not going to be welched upon—when a final figure is decided upon they will get a 50 per cent subsidy on the national per capita average of cost, what more do they need to negotiate?

Why do they have to have this at-arm's-length kind of negotiating and bargaining with Ottawa? Why not an acceptance of Medicare, in principle, so that with the leadership of this province they would have an opportunity of assuring the rest of Canada that they were going to get national health insurance for them—finally, after two generations of struggle for it?

In other words, once again you have a perfect example of English Canada lacking an identity; of English Canada not being able to generate a will to nationhood. We could use an important issue like Medicare to achieve a sense of identity and nationhood in English-speaking Canada. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the problem rests basically right here with this government in the province of Ontario. It is a failure of leadership.

Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, the fathers of Confederation faced a very difficult problem of welding the British North American colonies into a confederation. The problems were even more difficult than they are today. But the fathers of Confederation grasped the nettle; they faced up to the difficulties in the situation—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend unduly, but we are considering the third reading of the bill on Medicare. There will be opportunity in this House to debate the problems of Canada and Confederation and some other contents, but we have had a very complete and full debate on this bill. Now the hon. member is using the occasion of third reading to make a speech about Confederation, where Canada is going and where all of English Canada is weak in leadership involving, I presume, nine provinces. I submit to you that it is completely out of order.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the point of order, the hon. Prime Minister dealt broadly with the Medicare issue on second reading and none of us had an opportunity to reply. He was the last speaker, and he dealt with it in the context of federal-provincial relations. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that unless we are given an opportunity to deal with this aspect of the bill now, we are in effect, deprived of an

opportunity of replying to the hon. Prime Minister. I have said it privately and I will say it publicly; I think the hon. Prime Minister has an opportunity, and I welcome him, to intervene in any debate on any issue in this House as the last person if he wants on second reading. But if he introduces, on second reading, broader considerations which legitimately should be introduced, I think we should have an opportunity to discuss them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Would the member proceed with his remarks?

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was stating that 100 years ago the fathers of Confederation faced up to the issue and they welded a unity in this nation. What we have today is an opportunity to achieve reconfederation. Events have cast in the role of the fathers of reconfederation those who are leaders of the various provinces across this country. I have said before and I repeat it, that one of the leaders in that group is a man by the name of John Parmenter Robarts, the man who is most capable of providing the leadership and a fulfilment in the 20th century of the role of a father of reconfederation. But he is not doing it. Indeed, he is using the Medicare issue now before us to frustrate an opportunity for rebuilding Confederation. Mr. Speaker, if you think I am being too harsh, let me bring a witness to bear, a witness normally not unfriendly to this government. I have in my hand an article by Anthony Westall, the Ottawa correspondent of the *Globe and Mail*, published in the magazine on February 5, some two weeks ago. Let me read one or two paragraphs from this, Mr. Speaker. He discussed three aspects of the Medicare issue in specific relationship to the failure of leadership on the part of the province of Ontario:

Ontario Premier John Robarts has been regarded in the past as a reasonable and a responsible provincial leader and a pillar of national unity. But now he is joining in the game of picayune quarrels with Ottawa on grounds which he knows, or should know, are dishonest.

He goes on, Mr. Speaker, to make reference to the fact that in January of this year the Prime Minister referred to the figure of \$14 as being 50 per cent of the national average when, in fact, the hon. Minister of Health later informed the public through a newspaper report that the \$14 figure had been dismissed as far back as last September.

One wonders what goes on in this Cabinet? The hon. Minister learns in September that the \$14 figure has been discarded and four months later the hon. Prime Minister has not been informed! He does not know, for example, that it has been agreed that the subsidy will be 50 per cent of whatever is finally accepted as a national per capita average.

Certainly it is not going to be \$28. I quote again, Mr. Speaker:

Robarts made another misleading statement about federal policy. He said Ontario wanted to follow the recommendations of the Hall Royal commission on health services and concentrate upon educating health service personnel before it offered Medicare services, but was getting no help from the federal government.

Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I think perhaps I should draw to the attention of the member our rules about third readings. I will read the part that is applicable: "Debate on a motion for the third reading of a bill is more restricted than in the debate on second reading, as discussion is strictly confined to the contents of the bill.

I submit that the member has strayed a bit far afield in regard to the contents of this particular bill and I would expect that his remarks should not be too lengthy and he could confine them to the bill.

Mr. MacDonald: I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, it will be over in about three or four minutes.

I was referring to this second point of Mr. Westall's, namely, the argument of the hon. Prime Minister—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): How about your ruling, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: I have asked the member to confine his remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: I have the floor, have I? Thank you. The hon. Prime Minister has laid emphasis on the development of health services personnel ahead of an implementation of any plan—and this, said the hon. Prime Minister, was in keeping with the recommendations of the Hall commission report. Well, Mr. Speaker, as everybody who has read the Hall commission report knows it said quite frankly and bluntly that the need to educate more health services should be no excuse for holding back on Medicare.

A third point was raised by Mr. Westall. I touch on it briefly:

Nor should Mr. Robarts' remarks about taxation revenue be overlooked. While complaining that Ottawa was not offering a big enough contribution to Medicare, he muttered that Ontario provides 40 to 50 per cent of federal tax revenues. The implication was that because Ontario provides the largest share of national revenue it should get some sort of special benefit. The theory is obvious nonsense. Worse, it strikes at the whole basis of Confederation.

Ontario does not pay taxes to Ottawa. The citizens of Canada who live in Ontario pay the taxes on income and profit earned in no small measure by doing business with other parts of Canada. The government of Canada elected by the people of Canada spends the revenues where it thinks best in the interests of Canada.

Robarts' hint that Ontario somehow has a special claim on revenues it contributes to Ottawa is a form of separatism and nothing else. One wonders how he would react if Metropolitan Toronto claimed special privileges from Queen's Park because it pays the largest proportion of provincial revenue.

So much for John Robarts, the pillar of national unity.

That is the end of Mr. Westall's comments.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Yes, and just about the most ill-informed article in many months.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, that happens to be the hon. member's view. As a matter of fact, it does not happen to be my view.

Therefore, I want to come back to a reasoned amendment on third reading, which is within the rules of the House. Our basic plea has been—and we reiterate it now and we put it in the form of an amendment—that this government should enunciate its participation in a federal plan without any further delay, and that it should then make some efforts to establish the kind of interim legislation which would provide coverage for the 1.8 million people between now and July 1, 1967, the target date for the commencement of joint federal-provincial national health insurance in this country.

I move, seconded by Mr. Freeman, that the motion be amended by striking out all the words after "that" and substituting the following:

This House believes that the needs of

the people of Ontario cannot adequately be met by mere tinkering with The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965, and proposes as an alternative that that Act be replaced by legislation which will (a) facilitate the establishment at the earliest possible date of a joint federal-provincial plan qualifying for federal assistance on the terms already announced by the federal government; (b) contain additional interim provisions to provide protection for lower income groups pending the coming into force of a joint plan.

Mr. Speaker: Members have heard the motion by Mr. MacDonald, seconded by Mr. Freeman. The amendment is open for debate.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this amendment. It incorporates much, in fact all, of the argument we set forth on second reading in arguing the principle of this bill, and when in committee of the whole we were discussing it section by section.

Forty per cent of the people of Ontario are now covered by universal coverage and to that extent there is a death-bed repentance on the part of the government in the changes it has made in the old Bill No. 136. The pity and the shame of it is that the government has not gone all the way. Again, if we are to qualify under the proposals as laid down by the federal government, we need a public-operated universal scheme, as well as it being—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I am really going to have to object to this. We are again arguing the principles of the bill which were settled on second reading and this motion is out of order. I would submit to you that what the hon. member for Parkdale is saying is completely out of order. They are now suggesting that we reverse the complete principles embodied in this bill. Those principles were adopted by this House when the bill received second reading and in my view this is out of order.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Trotter: Surely we can speak to it.

Mr. Speaker: You cannot speak to second reading principles; only to this amendment.

Mr. Trotter: Well, I wish to speak to it. I understand—

Mr. Speaker: Are you speaking to a point of order now?

Mr. Trotter: I am not speaking to the point of order except—

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister is really raising a point of order.

Mr. Trotter: Fine, I will wait your ruling on it, then.

Mr. Speaker: An amendment can be proposed on third reading the same as on second reading, and when an amendment is proposed in this manner to strike out words it can be debated in the same way as an amendment on second reading. Therefore, I would have to rule the amendment in order and that anyone who cares to debate it, may debate it. Then it comes to a vote in the same manner as an amendment on second reading. I shall put the question after the debate is concluded.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, may I understand then from your ruling that we can redebate the entire principles of this bill? In other words we can have a complete repetition of the debate on second reading?

Mr. Speaker: No, my understanding is that you can only debate this amendment that is now before the House on third reading. That is the question that is before the House at the present time.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on this point of order, I am a little puzzled by this procedure. I refer to Lewis on page 61, and the comments are not in the form of rulings.

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Singer: You have made a ruling—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member is on a point of order, as I understand it.

Mr. Bryden: He is debating your ruling, sir, that is what he is doing.

Mr. Singer: I am asking for clarification. Mr. Speaker, the point is this. Lewis says:

Slight amendments may be made to a bill during this stage—

this is the third reading stage:

—but if it is desired to make any material amendment it is customary to recommit the bill for further consideration by committee of the whole and to then amend it as desired.

With these comments and the hon. Prime Minister's comments, I just wonder if the hon. Prime Minister perhaps might not be right in saying that if as broad an amendment as this is in order at this time, we are reversing the whole field and going back again. I think this is what Lewis means at the top of page 61 and I would like your further clarification, sir.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Obviously this is not clarification, this is disputing your ruling and you quite rightly have cut me off on a number of occasions in disputing the rulings that you have made.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I am of the opinion that this amendment has nothing to do with a recommitment and I do not think it is that broad that it cannot come within the terms of reference of third reading, where it says:

Third readings are run off usually in batches from time to time during the progress of the session as the number of bills ready for this stage accumulates. This procedure is generally a matter of form, the bills having been thoroughly discussed during the earlier proceedings.

It must be remembered, however, that a bill can be discussed and dealt with when the motion for its third reading is presented to the House. Amendments may be made to the bill during this stage, but if it is desired to make a material amendment it is customary to recommit the bill.

I suppose it may hinge on that particular part of it, whether this is a material amendment or not. At first glance I thought it was a normal amendment on third reading, and I supposed that we would have an amendment of some sort on third reading so I accepted this particular amendment which is now before the House. But I must say that I am going to confine any remarks in this matter, so that we do not go all over the whole bill that has been discussed on second reading.

Mr. Trotter: Mr. Speaker, I will not regurgitate the whole argument of medical insurance, although I admit this amendment is very broad on third reading. But I am glad it is, because this is of immense public importance and we should have as much opportunity as we can to speak on it.

In the amendment, they say that the government is merely tinkering with The Medical Services Insurance Act, and in effect they are not meeting the problem. In its

whole history, and in this bill particularly, the government has been tinkering with the problem. It has been going from expediency to expediency and the mess is piling up. In the meantime a great number of people in the province of Ontario, who should be receiving proper medical coverage, are simply not receiving it.

Despite the goodwill of many of the doctors, we know today that the proper medical services are not being supplied because the individual does not have the money.

If, as the hon. member for York South said, this Conservative administration of Ontario came forward and said: "We support wholeheartedly what the federal government is trying to do" there would be no more argument throughout the Dominion of Canada as to whether or not we should have a universal comprehensive health scheme. It would be a fact in the immediate future. Any of the half-baked schemes in Alberta or British Columbia, or even the privately operated plans, would go by the board and we would have a plan that would cover all Canadians and would have the importance of being portable across the country. We know today that many individuals are transferred from one province to the other; unless you have portability in a scheme you do not have one of the proper ingredients of a scheme that will give the people of the province proper protection.

We are told the government does not admit it—that this bill is brought in in the manner it is because it is trying to put itself in a position to bargain with the federal government. The federal government has made generous proposals and I do not blame a provincial government for trying to bargain with Ottawa. But surely we are entitled to some inspired leadership. In other words it is the old story of tinker, tinker or expediency. We in Ontario and in Canada need something that will inspire the people of Ontario and of Canada. This particular bill is one of the great social issues of our time, and that is why, to my mind, it is a pity that we bring in a bill like Bill No. 6, that has cut up a previous bill, Bill No. 136. I think that only five sections of the old Bill No. 136 remain unchanged. Instead of—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We are right back on the debate. We have heard all this before. It went to a vote and this House voted in favour of the principles of this bill. Here we are right back on second reading again.

Mr. Speaker: Do I understand the member is discussing a federal-provincial plan?

Mr. Trotter: Yes, as this bill relates to the federal-provincial plan, and I have compared it with Bill No. 136, of which this is an amendment. Bill No. 6 is an amendment of Bill No. 136, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965. Yes, the member is right. The first part is to facilitate the establishment at the earliest possible opportunity of a joint federal-provincial plan, qualifying for federal assistance.

Mr. Trotter: It does not say that.

Mr. Speaker: That is the point the member is discussing.

Mr. Trotter: That is correct, Mr. Speaker, I am right on it. Again I emphasize this, because we do not go to Ottawa saying: "We support you." For years, people have been campaigning for a comprehensive universal scheme. They have found fault with the Liberals on the federal level because they have said they have stalled for so long. Be they right or wrong, at last they are coming forward. Yet this government still does not give the wholehearted support to the scheme that is needed. The bill before us covers only 40 per cent of our people. We do not meet the terms of the federal proposal, and the only probable good reason for this bill is that the government is trying to use it as a bargaining agent to get more money out of the federal government.

That may be well and good, but I again agree with what the hon. member for York South said—that we need, in this type of thing, inspired leadership. It is as he said, indicative of the country as a whole, be it the federal, be it Liberals or Conservatives, and the political life in general. We have this tendency of tinkering or using expediency from time to time. As Quebec may have leadership or they know what they want, we here simply do not. This bill makes it obvious that we are again doing things bit by bit. Mr. Frost used to like to do, in his day, a little here and a little there and wait until next year. But next year is practically on us, Mr. Speaker, and it is time that we faced up to the fact. We are told that the family will be protected with medical insurance for \$150 a year premium. How can a much poorer province, like Saskatchewan, supply the same thing for \$24 a year? Obviously, this bill does not face up to the demands of the public and to the needs of the public.

I would again emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this bill should go much further in

supporting the federal government proposals; it should go much further in giving overall comprehensive support to the public.

It should also get the private carriers completely out of health insurance insofar as any standard care is involved. The other 60 per cent of the population should be covered in this bill and it is not. It is a vital and tragic weakness that again we will not face up to a major social problem in the province of Ontario.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the amendment.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, speaking to the amendment, I certainly agree with my colleague, the hon. member for Parkdale. We will support this amendment. I think it is important, sir, that at this stage in this bill we should have had clarification. We have not had this clarification. These were the purposes of my remarks on second reading, as to the basis on which this government was prepared to enter into an agreement with the federal government. One cannot help but think, when one listens to the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) a day or two before, that this province has been indulging in either some sort of a fancy game, or in some sort of a blackmail system addressed to the federal government.

The hon. Provincial Treasurer says that unless we get more money out of Ottawa we are going to have to raise the income tax by four per cent. I do not think it is an unfair suggestion at all, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I think it is the whole object of this to use the Medicare plan from Ottawa as a weapon. You give us what we want on Medicare, although we are not saying in public what we want, then maybe we will go easy on the income tax requests that we are making. Is this government playing one end against the other? I think we are entitled to know this. But, Mr. Speaker, trying to put two and two together and make four, without knowing what the basic facts are, I am afraid one is forced to the inevitable conclusion that this government is being less than frank with the people of Ontario. It is playing some sort of game with the people in Ottawa and it is not, as yet, prepared to tell the House what is going on.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is in the interests of all of the people in Canada, certainly all of the people of Ontario, that we have an arrangement for Medicare with the federal government. I think this government

has moved to the stage where it has just about arrived at this conclusion. The only reason that I can locate is in the thinking of the hon. Provincial Treasurer, when he says Ottawa had better be careful or we are going to have to get four per cent more on the income tax. For some peculiar reason, they are not prepared to say so.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is another point that is very important. In today's *Star*, and I notice that the hon. Minister of Health has just been given a copy of it—

Mr. Speaker: Will the member now stick to the amendment?

Mr. Singer: Yes. Oh, I am. I am sticking to the amendment.

In today's *Star*, and this is most pertinent, Mr. Speaker, there is a story referring to the Ontario medical association, which if it is true, and which, if it reflects the correct feeling of the doctors, either renders this bill before the House completely ineffective, completely nugatory, never to be brought into being, or else it puts this government in the position where it is entering into a battle, at least as bad as the one in Saskatchewan, with the doctors of the province of Ontario. This is what the story says:

More than 4,500 of the province's 6,500 practising doctors—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I simply cannot stand here and listen to this without voicing my objections just on the basis that this is completely irrelevant to a third reading of this bill.

Mr. Bryden: It is entirely relevant.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of anything that could be more relevant.

Mr. Speaker: I would think the remarks that the member is now engaged upon with regard to the doctors was well discussed on second reading and I would ask him to desist from speaking about that particular aspect of it. This particular amendment has two sections and there is not anything in those sections that has anything to do with the subject-matter that he is now raising. So I would ask him, if he is going to make any remarks, to make them relevant to sections in this amendment, otherwise I would have to ask him to terminate his remarks on the basis of their having been covered on second reading.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, the amendment says in section (a) that we want the govern-

ment to facilitate the establishment at the earliest possible opportunity of a joint federal-provincial plan and I am suggesting that the plan as it is here, either with or without the amendment, is not going to work unless the doctors are a part of it.

The whole purpose of this story, which was just published for the first time, indicates the doctors are not going to be a part of it. The doctors say they do not want anything to do with it on the way it is set up and I cannot think of anything that would be more relevant to this than to get a clarification from the government, before this third reading goes through, as to whether or not we are going to have a plan with the doctors' co-operation, or whether we are going to enter into a fight with the doctors, or whether we are not going to have anything.

Mr. Speaker: You will notice that the section also—to follow it through—deals with qualifying for federal assistance on the terms already announced by the federal government.

Mr. Singer: That is right. But Mr. Speaker, my point is this. The amendment says we want a scheme which will facilitate the establishment of a plan that must work. The plan that is here—if the doctors are correctly quoted and this is the feeling of 4,500 out of 6,500 of them—is not going to work. It either is not going to work or we are entering into war with the Ontario medical association, and I think we have got to have clarification of this.

That is why I say I cannot think of anything that is more in order and more germane to the subject of this debate, than the role of the doctors as announced in today's paper. I think this goes right to the kernel of the whole question. How can we have a plan if we do not have doctors participating in it? To continue, Mr. Speaker:

More than 4,500 of the province's 6,500 practising doctors have already signed individual declarations saying they will not take part in the province's Medicare plan as it now stands.

That is, the bill before the House.

They endorsed a series of resolutions passed at a special meeting of the OMA council on January 7. It was sent out in a letter to the OMA's 7,500 members on January 25.

One resolution insists that the fee schedule is not "open to negotiations" except when the profession wants to make special deals on its own.

Another resolution says: "The profession should not enter into any billing or other contractual arrangements with the government." This now means that doctors will insist on billing patients directly and patients will have to collect from the government.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): May I ask—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, if this is the true expression of the medical profession, the most obvious questions are: How can this plan that is before us at present, work? How are all those people on welfare and so on, who are to be in the government plan, going to do it if the doctors insist on billing patients direct? How are all these individuals who are to go into the plan, going to work it, unless the doctors are a part and parcel of this and are prepared to co-operate?

I think this casts grave doubts on the whole approach of the government. The government has to clarify these points. For these reasons at least, these resolutions should be supported. For these reasons the government should take this bill back and consider it a little further, and be prepared to come into this House and tell us two things: (1) What is it prepared to do with the federal government and on what basis; (2) Is it prepared to take on the Ontario medical association or is it not?

Does the government mean what it says? Is it going to be determined? Is it going to pass laws and enforce them or is it not?

For those reason, Mr. Speaker, we will support the amendment. We think that before anything is put to a vote, we should have ample clarity—clear decision from the government—and we have not had it yet.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question? He is willing to read some of the resolutions purported to come from the OMA. Will he read all of them that are quoted in the paper?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support and emphasize the propositions that have been put to the government in relation to this bill. I do not want to abuse your generosity, by going over again the matter that the hon. member for Downsview raised with regard to the apparent position of a substantial majority of the doctors of the province in relation to the bill. I do think, however, that it is imperative that the people of Ontario and this Legislature hear from the government at the earliest possible opportunity as to what its position is in this matter.

I judge from what you were saying a few minutes ago that you might consider it out of order if the hon. Minister of Health tried to state the government's position at this stage during this debate. I believe, however, that all hon. members of the House, certainly members of this group, would be willing to agree to a certain stretching of the rules in order to permit the hon. Minister of Health to make such a statement. We consider it so important we think it should be made at the earliest possible opportunity, preferably before this bill receives third reading. And we believe that if possible it should be made in this House.

We would facilitate matters by raising no objection if the hon. Minister indicated a wish to state the position of the government clearly on this matter. If he does not feel inclined to do it now during the debate on third reading of the bill, then I submit to him, through you, Mr. Speaker, that he should do so at the earliest possible opportunity.

There is another matter which I think also cries out for clarification before the House is called upon to decide whether it finally approves this bill. It arises out of some rather cryptic, teasing remarks made by the hon. Prime Minister when he wound up the debate on second reading. He referred to the fact that spokesmen of the province of Quebec have shown some disposition to have the opting out principle, which has now been accepted in regard to some programmes, extended to unconditional opting out. That, I think, is a fair summary.

I do not want to take time to go into the whole question again, but the hon. Prime Minister had certain comments to make with regard to Quebec's position as it affected this particular bill. He said on page 457 of *Hansard* of February 11:

You can see if this principle is accepted—I do not know whether it will be; so far it has only been advanced by the province of Quebec—but you can see where this could lead. You can see what effect it might have on what we are discussing here this morning.

Namely, the second reading of this bill. I continue:

You can see what an effect it might have on all the national programmes we have in this country.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps our powers of vision are limited, but frankly I cannot see, and I am sure that there are many people in the province who cannot see, just where this

is going to lead. The reason we cannot see is because the government will not state its position.

I can see that a great many different things might arise as the result of this new development, but I cannot see what specific thing will happen, because this government flatly refuses to say what its position is in relation to proposals that have been made by the government of Canada.

I would suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that before this debate is concluded, he should be prepared to state his position, so that the members of this House, the people of Ontario and the government of Canada will see precisely where we are heading. I am going to suggest to him that the close-to-the-vest sort of poker playing that he seems to fancy in federal-provincial negotiations is nothing but an abdication of leadership on the part of the province that ought to be giving leadership in these matters.

The federal government has made certain proposals. It is true that they have not as yet put them in the form of a resolution or a bill before the House of Commons, and I think they can be faulted for that neglect. They are now doing that, I understand—they are bringing in a resolution soon. But the point is that their proposals were quite clear-cut and this government simply sits back and says: "We will not say whether we are for or against them; we will not say if we accept them in principle subject to certain reservations; we will not say if we reject them totally in principle."

The government just does not say anything. It sits at the back of the pack trying to find out how everybody else is going to move before it makes its own move, and I suggest that this province should be giving a lead to all the rest. This is the province with the greatest resources and the greatest population and it should be taking a position of leadership in all our negotiations with the federal government.

The poker-playing approach it uses, and is using here, leads to absolutely nothing, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. In fact—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. member?

Is he suggesting that leadership of the people who live in this province constitutes saying "yes" to every proposition that comes from Ottawa or any other government of this country?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how the hon. Minister of Labour could conceivably have drawn that inference from my

remarks. I said that leadership consists in stating your position and stating it clearly so that people can understand it, both the people at Ottawa and the people of the province. I think that constitutes leadership. Sitting back saying: "We will not say, we will wait and see, we want to wait and see what everybody else does before we decide what we are going to do"—that is, in my opinion, the reverse of leadership.

I was just going to go on to my final point in this connection before the hon. Minister of Labour asked his question. It means that this province really has no influence on the course of negotiations and I think that came out clearly in relation to the Canada pension plan when it followed exactly the same procedure as now. It ended up accepting the principle of the plan but with absolutely no influence at all on the detailed implementation of it. It had views on it—many of which I agreed with—but it came into the picture so late that the whole matter had been predetermined and I hope—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The whole thing has been predetermined and there is no opportunity for bargaining with Ottawa.

Mr. Bryden: Is that now the government's official position, Mr. Speaker, that it has all been predetermined by Ottawa and there is no room for bargaining? I am suggesting to the hon. Minister of Labour—

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, once again I must object, because I think it is a very valid objection. We are so far away from this bill or anything to do with this bill. We are now into a rather acrimonious discussion about relations of this government with the federal government. This is not—

Mr. MacDonald: On Medicare!

Hon. Mr. Roberts: On Medicare nothing!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. Prime Minister was raising a point of order, but he is not so I wish to continue and I would point out, sir, that I could finish in two minutes if these hon. gentlemen would just sit down.

I was pointing out that the way the government approaches these matters with this total lack of leadership means that we have no influence. If it is true, as the hon. Minister of Labour says, that the government at Ottawa predetermines these matters, including the one with which we are con-

cerned in this bill, and they cannot be negotiated, I suggest that they get some backbone over there and go to Ottawa and say: "Look, fellows, we are going to sit down and talk about it."

But I think they have to say in principle where they stand. This is where the difficulty arises. The government will have absolutely no influence on the ultimate development of a national plan any more than they had in the final development of the Canada pension plan if they continue to take the attitude they have been taking, of sitting back waiting to see what will turn up, waiting for everybody else in the country to give leadership instead of giving it themselves.

I would suggest that the hon. Prime Minister clarify his position.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour that the bill now be read a third time will say "aye."

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one comment before this vote is put. I think it is quite obvious that I have checked into this procedure and I really have no intention to answer what was brought forward in the debate on this amendment. It would simply require me to repeat everything I said in this House a week ago this morning. I sketched out at that time the position of the government. I pointed out the various reports that are still to be studied; I pointed out that this is part of a very great whole; the Medicare bill cannot be treated in isolation in the field of federal-provincial relationships.

I recognize full well that this party over here—this small group—take this stand because they want to push this Medicare down everybody's throat willy-nilly; this group over here, the apologists for their big brothers in Ottawa.

But we stand here looking after the interests of the people of the province of Ontario and I just refer hon. members to the remarks I made in this House a week ago today in answer to these points that have been raised this morning.

I consider this motion to be out of order, however, and I certainly will vote against it.

Mr. Speaker: Following the procedure of rule 56, we shall now put the question: Shall the third reading of Bill No. 6 be now read a third time?

All those in favour, please say "aye."

All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of the bill now being read a third time, please rise.

As many as are opposed, will please rise.

AYES

Allan
Auld
Beckett
Boyer
Brunelle
Butler
Carruthers
Carton
Cecile
Cowling
Demers
Downer
Dunlop
Dymond
Edwards
Evans
Ewen
Gomme
Grossman
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
(Scarborough East)
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Johnston
(Carleton)
Knox
Lawrence
(St. George)
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McKeough
McNeil
Noden
Olde
Peck
Price
Pritchard
Randall
Robarts
Roberts
Rollins
Rowe
Rowntree
Spooner
Stewart
Thrasher
Walker
Wells
White
Wishart
Yaremko—51.

NAYS

Ben
Braithwaite
Bryden
Bukator
Davison
Freeman
Gaunt
Gisborn
Lewis
(Scarborough West)
MacDonald
Newman
Nixon
Oliver
Paterson
Racine
Renwick
Sargent
Singer
Smith
Spence
Taylor
Trotter
Worton
Young—24.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 51, the "nays," 24.

Mr. Speaker: The "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: Order of the day for the third reading of Bill No. Pr18.

TOWNSHIP OF CHARLOTTEVILLE

Mr. R. K. McNeil (Elgin) moves third reading of Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Charlotteville.

Motion agreed to; third reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: While we are awaiting the presence of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor, I am pleased to announce that we are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature, and just before the clock showed 12, the grade 8 students from Thistletown public school, Rexdale, arrived in the east gallery.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor entered the chamber of the legislative assembly and took his seat upon the Throne.

Hon. W. Earl Rowe (Lieutenant-Governor): Pray be seated.

Mr. Speaker: May it please Your Honour, the legislative assembly of the province has, at its present sittings thereof, passed certain bills to which, in the name of and on behalf of the said legislative assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

Assistant Clerk of the House: The following are the titles of the bills to which Your Honour's assent is prayed:

Bill No. 6, An Act to amend The Medical Services Insurance Act, 1965.

Bill No. Pr18, An Act respecting the township of Charlotteville.

To these Acts the Royal assent was announced by the Clerk of the legislative assembly in the following words:

Clerk of the House: In Her Majesty's name, the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to these bills.

The Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor was pleased to retire from the Chamber.

Clerk of the House: The second order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence with which so far, at least in my case, you have been most generous.

I would like to speak for a few moments today on the occasion of the debate on the Speech from the Throne regarding a matter somewhat removed from the important and far-reaching matters with which this House has been engaged for the last two weeks. Perhaps it will serve as a change of pace and I hope my comments and my requests, which I will try to make as simple and fair and constructive as possible, will gather some support throughout this House.

Mr. Speaker, as the House well knows, my riding is one of those which has been designated for special assistance under the ARDA programme and, as a so-called depressed area, is available for special tax incentives for industrial development purposes under the federal area development agency.

Hon. members might be interested in a summary of the feelings prevalent in these northern areas as citizens are deluged from time to time with press releases, brave speeches by visiting officials and pronouncements of intended endeavour that emanate from agencies from both levels of government. I could quote all day from such verbiage, but I have no intention of criticizing what may be well meaning but so far ineffective gestures. It would suffice to say that the ARDA directorate and the Ontario development agency as well as the local tourist council under The Department of Tourism and Information are the three agencies which we in Algoma-Manitoulin have counted on for constructive support and effort.

At this point, these three are beginning to look a bit sick as compared to what seems to be more realistic and ambitious approaches by the two federal agencies involved in northern development. I refer to the area development agency and the industrial development bank. It is becoming more evident to the local people that these two agencies are at least doing something other than talk about the problems.

Mr. Speaker, the details of these various programmes will be dealt with later in the estimates. Right now I wish to make reference to excerpts from the Speech from the Throne that refer to northern development and to agriculture. I will pick two areas in which recent legislation, if not more carefully considered, is in a fair way to compound rather than help the problems of rural pov-

erty and depression in the north. The first of these I will need to deal with at some length and I refer to The Milk Act, passed at the last session of this Legislature, which seemed at that time a fairly innocuous but very necessary piece of legislation. It was not until the regulations began to appear that the possibly alarming consequences became apparent.

Mr. Speaker, I admit to feeling fairly comfortable on this topic, having been engaged in both the production and processing sides of this industry, most of my life. I do not hesitate in stating at once that never was effective legislation needed more and never was the commission faced with a bigger or more complicated and important task than this one. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) and the members of his commission have my deepest sympathy. And in this spirit I wish to appeal to the hon. Minister's good judgment regarding proposed regulations under the Act. He will forgive me if my concern is primarily for the effect of these regulations on the dairy industry in northern Ontario and agricultural development there in general.

In order to approach this matter properly it seems necessary to build some background and some reasons for the confusion and utter chaos that had developed in the industry prior to the introduction of The Milk Act. Looking back into the days of the original milk control board of Ontario, then subsequently the milk industry board, it becomes apparent that these boards were not blameless in their lack of ability to enforce the regulations under the then existing terms of their authority. The major area of weakness was that of the board's refusal to implement properly the enforcement of the territorial boundaries part of their authority.

Mr. Speaker, I readily agree that the free enterprise system is desirable but in a major industry—almost a utility, as the milk industry is—free enterprise without some control can be and it was—disastrous. The facts were that there was legislation calling for some protection of producer and processor group areas which was exercised in some cases and not in others. Mr. Hennessey, in the report from his famous milk inquiry committee, was properly critical of this aspect of the board's function. While producer and processor groups were, by licensing, restricted to areas zoned for their protection, it did not take long for a few of the large independents to seize on a technicality to cross boundary lines and invade what they considered the more lucrative, heavily-populated areas of

Ontario. They were able to by-pass existing legislation affecting territorial licences by establishing what we will call wholesale accounts, in some cases through large jobbers and chains, even possibly falsifying records to show that these jobbers in effect took delivery at the plant. There were two immediate results of this expanding type of invasion. These operators were not obliged to provide delivery service, had no collection problems and by virtue of the fact that they were not licensed in these new areas, were therefore not obligated to provide service to other than large wholesale outlets of their choice. This immediately put them in a position with which the local operators could not compete.

The first result of this situation was to eliminate by purchase or starving out smaller, more vulnerable operations. The second result is a situation we have today in which in spite of existing legislation, there just are virtually no territorial boundaries other than those automatically established by distance and transportation difficulties. Since this practice has had the effect of placing the industry under the control of a comparatively small number of large operators, it is absolutely essential that the commission or the marketing board, whichever finally accepts the responsibility, take a really careful look at establishing a policy of territorial boundaries or boundary extensions for the orderly marketing of milk in Ontario.

I think it is fair to recognize at this point that it is possible that this strenuous and cut-throat competition had a beneficial effect, however temporary, on the consumer. And since this is the case it probably worked for the overall good of Ontario except for one thing. As the sales in most parts of the province moved out of the hands of small operators, and into the hands of the big three and a few large independents, the production also moved out of the hands of local producer organizations and individuals into the hands of large producers available to the large milksheds. Mr. Speaker, here is one great reason for some of the pockets of agricultural poverty.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, it is going to be very difficult to reinstitute territorial boundaries, even though in my opinion this is desirable. But unless bold measures are adopted in an attempt to control this trend of the industry, we will be confronted with the inevitable situation of rapidly disappearing small-producer and processor organizations, to the point where this industry will shortly be controlled by the mammoths. I feel sure that the department has recognized

that this was the most important reason for disbanding the milk industry board and the whole official structure of boards and groups which made up the control of the industry.

But I want to point out that merely changing the name of the authority and establishing new faces in position of control—unless a realistic approach is taken to regulations under the Act affecting prices and controls—is merely putting off the evil hour.

Mr. Speaker, one of the important new regulations regarding adjustments in prices of milk for both primary, which is fluid milk, and for secondary, which is industrial or manufactured milk, is aimed at reducing the wide spread between primary and secondary prices. And I am alarmed that these early regulations in this regard may have the very opposite effect. In other words, the new commission seems to be taking the approach of giving more to those that have and less to those that have not.

Let me speak about this for a moment, Mr. Speaker. I just do not believe that regulations which will have the effect in the north of raising the primary producers' price and therefore the consumers' price is in the best interests of producer, processor and certainly not the consumer, until the secondary or manufactured price in Ontario is brought closer in line with primary prices. Let me try to explain this statement. First, this is in direct contravention, in my opinion, of the stated aims of the milk marketing board, which seems to recognize that of prime importance is narrowing the wide spread between these two prices within the structure.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I have sat on both sides of the bargaining table at different times, between producer and processor, and I do not agree that the producers in northern Ontario really wish their top prices raised. Certainly they want, and they deserve, a greater return; but what they really want and need far more than a few cents more per hundred pounds of milk is a bigger share of their own markets.

There is only one way that this can be achieved. You will be aware, Mr. Speaker, that milk for industrial purposes can be purchased for 40 per cent less in southern Ontario than the product with which it competes in northern Ontario. This is the part of this whole question that perplexes and worries me. And the answer to this is to increase the price in northern Ontario?

In 1961 I was invited to prepare and present a brief to the milk inquiry committee

on behalf of producer and processor groups in northern Ontario. I think at that point we were able to convince the committee that large dairy interests in southern Ontario—and I will not name them—should be forced by reclassification to cease and desist from the practice of exploiting northern markets with products which could be bought from producers at considerably lower prices.

It will be interesting to note that these same products were not offered extensively in southern Ontario and in competition with top price fluid milk there but rather in northern Ontario. This will require a bit of explanation, and since it is hard to keep from getting lost in technicalities in this whole question, I will merely generalize on the principle involved.

For many years, in areas where cheaper milk was available manufacturers of milk products, such as powder and concentrated and condensed milks, have been able to purchase this product at roughly half price merely by falling into a classification as industrial milk processors. Large interests were very shortly able to get themselves into this classification with all of the cheaper buying privileges by simply removing some of the water from the milk. This product was classified as liquid concentrated milk and the operators were immediately allowed to purchase the raw product at manufacture or secondary prices. Therefore, not being exactly fluid products in the full sense, they were able to by-pass territorial boundary legislation and immediately move large amounts of these products into northern Ontario where, since there were no large amounts of surplus milk, the product by virtue of adding the water back in was immediately in competition with top price fluid milk.

The Hennessey inquiry committee recognized that the success of the product and the inability of fluid milk to compete had been accomplished by little more than the use of a technicality. And it was expected that one of the first regulations that would appear upon the formation of the new milk committee would be reclassification of this product for buying purposes, which would not have had the effect of taking the product off the market but would merely allow northern producers to compete with southern producers on an equitable basis.

Instead of this, the northern primary and selling prices are to be raised. As far as we know no reclassification of liquid concentrated products is being ordered and the field is opened more widely than ever to

this type of exploitation of northern markets by these large interests.

This is, in my opinion, the second major mistake of the commission.

Third, most of the ills within the industry can be cured by volume. In northern Ontario we do not have this cure, but we should have it to a much greater degree, we would be able to develop our own secondary and manufacturing industry. Producers would be encouraged to develop larger herds and make expenditures against a steadily growing potential market if they could be given assurance that markets that should be theirs could be protected against raiding by products purchased at lower southern prices.

I am sure that given such assurance of a greater share in the market, they could make sure also that consumers would be protected against rising costs.

In my opinion, it is ridiculous to suggest that the necessary milk is not available in the north. The north has many large potentially productive areas full of farmers who have been disillusioned time and again by their inability to compete with the practice I have mentioned. Give them some assurance that the markets are their own and they will produce the goods.

Fourth, some northern processors, to protect themselves and the industry against this poaching on their markets, and having been discouraged at the lack of government action, have introduced products called "reconstituted" products which use only a small amount of milk as basis, but which they have been able to put on the market at lower prices and therefore have managed to save themselves from extinction.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that vast amounts of this type of product might not be in the best interests of the industry, but we also realize that many housewives are prepared to purchase an acceptable alternative product in the interests of economy. We must also recognize that self-preservation is the first rule of business. The fact is, also, that some northern production is involved in these products, and both northern processors and producers are naturally violently protective of northern industry against unfair southern competition, but now even that weapon is being taken away.

The most recent regulation from the board states, and I quote from section 15 of The Milk Act, 1965:

Except as provided in the regulations, no person shall process, sell, offer for sale or have in possession for sale, reconstituted milk.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to examine these proposed regulations. I ask him to stop producing milk regulations detrimental to industry in the north. I ask him also to—

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member a question? Is he opposed to the abandonment of reconstituted milk? Is he in favour of continuing reconstituted milk in the north? And by distributors?

Mr. Farquhar: What I am trying to get to is that the first major problem in the industry should be attacked first, before these particular areas are legislated for or against.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: It is not implemented yet. The hon. member quoted a regulation, but it is not implemented yet.

Mr. Farquhar: I know it is not; I ask the hon. Minister to re-examine this proposed regulation.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not yet said whether he is in favour of the dairies continuing reconstitution distribution or whether he is not. This is a thing I would like to know because I am vitally interested in the point he raised. I think he has made an excellent presentation up to this point; I would like to know what he thinks of this particular aspect of it.

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Speaker, I will clear this as I go along.

I ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to examine these proposed regulations. I ask him to stop producing milk regulations detrimental to the industry in the north; I ask him to recall the fine phrases in the Speech from the Throne related to northern development; to consider implementing legislation that will attack the most vital areas first; and, as The Milk Act is being developed to its fullness, try to keep the horse in front of the cart before the northern milk industry is further exploited and finally destroyed.

There is one further area I would like to discuss that could amount to a constructive approach to orderly marketing in Ontario, and could even cure some of the ills or dangers I foresee in these new regulations. Let us examine the makeup of the commission and the marketing board charged with the responsibility to lay down and to carry out the regulations under this Act.

The commission itself is made up of five members. Next comes the milk marketing

board, the legislative and enforcement arm, made up of 13 producers. Beyond this has been established an advisory committee made up of 16 members, eight of whom are processors and eight of whom are producers. I ask hon. members to note that on this advisory committee, which should be representative of the industry over the whole province, there is only one member north of Huntsville, a Mr. Cazabon, from Sudbury. Would it seem right, or even proper, that such an advisory committee should be made up of 16 members from northern Ontario to rule on, or to make adjustments to control, the whole province? It is no more right that the north be put in a position from which it cannot present, in strength, its problems related to this question.

I have said earlier that lack of population is no indication of lack of problems. In fact, exactly the opposite applies. The problems caused by transportation and climatic conditions are different and unique, even in north-western Ontario as opposed to northeastern Ontario. There are special problems at the Lakehead, for instance, that do not exist in Moosonee, and more representation, at least on this advisory committee, is essential for the proper recognition of these problems. I suggest that there is nothing magic about the figure 16; I ask the hon. Minister to immediately consider appointments to this board from these areas so that regulations affecting the industry can be discussed and decided upon by the people qualified by knowledge and experience to deal with them. So much for The Milk Act.

Mr. Speaker, I want to direct the attention of the House for a moment to another phase of society in the north. I sometimes become quite perturbed when I hear remarks of derision—and sometimes they come from hon. members of my own party—directed toward the subsidization of certain farmer groups in Ontario. We hear remarks about farmers' Cadillacs and 1,000-pound milk quotas and winters in Florida, but I can assure you that, in my opinion, this is not the group that the ARDA programme should be directed toward.

The groups I wish to discuss are those who may have an old pickup truck, one cow and a few chickens, and who may get to Toronto once or twice in a lifetime. Believe me, we have many townships full of these groups, caught in a society that does not understand what to do about it, or which refuses to believe that such utter hopelessness exists.

These farmers are in an age group which

formerly, by farming standards, led a fairly good life on small farms. Now they find themselves on farms that are either too small or too unproductive to compete with modern agricultural techniques. They have burned themselves out in the long struggle to raise large families from the land, and they are now at an age when it is impossible to develop new trades or skills by which they might share in our affluent society. There is now nothing left for them but to try to equip their children for a job elsewhere—send them away and live on an old age pension until they die.

Mr. Speaker, many try to accomplish this by taking part-time work away from the land. But in an area 100 or so miles away from an industry, even this is virtually impossible. What is this Legislature supposed to be doing about these people? I will tell you one or two of the things that we do not need to do to make their lot harder. In Algoma—and I know the same holds true for many of the depressed areas in the north—the low-income factors are directly related to the number of unorganized townships. What I am trying to say is that the conditions that result in low incomes are the same that preclude the possibility to raise the revenue necessary to operate an efficient municipal government in a day when the demands on local government are so high.

In these unorganized townships, and in Algoma alone we have dozens of them, The Department of Lands and Forests levies what is called a provincial land tax. This is a practice, Mr. Speaker, that I want to examine for a few minutes, and I am sorry the hon. Minister (Mr. Roberts) is not in his seat. Residents, farmers and part-time farmers, eking out an existence in these unorganized areas, normally pay a share towards the upkeep and maintenance of their roads through either a local roads board or a statute labour board. They contribute towards area or local public and secondary education through a school board assessment. They pay higher than normal insurance rates, not having any fire protection. They build and maintain their own churches and, on top of this, an assessment through the provincial Land Tax Act. Let us examine this tax.

The Department of Lands and Forests, to my knowledge, does not have qualified assessors within its own personnel and therefore must contract for reassessment services throughout these areas. This is done every three years. I know something about the cost of the collection procedures they have to undertake in many of these areas and the

disputes and applications for appeals; dozens of them are constantly going on. The net proceeds to the department of this whole procedure do not readily come to light in an examination of receipts and costs, but looking at the whole operation and the revenue involved, I am forced to the opinion that the whole operation is a complete exercise in futility. If this is not the case, let me ask the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests just what the department gives in return for this charge on real estate? I assure the hon. members that in Algoma at least, the department does not build roads, at least roads that would in any way benefit farmers. The department certainly provides no fire protection, or it is not available to any farmer that I know of.

So why continue to go through this ridiculous exercise, one that can have no effect but to build up accounts which within five years, in the words of one of the local clerk-treasurers, will complete the job of leaving these people homeless?

It will be understood that my request is not directed to the hon. Minister on behalf of timber licensees or commercial tourist enterprises, although in my opinion there are small commercial and supporting businesses that are unduly assessed. But after all, these people recognize that to a point at least, they are privileged to share in Ontario's economy. I ask the hon. Minister, who is a humanitarian, to remove this tax completely on farmers living in these unorganized townships, whether they derive a living from tilling the soil or not.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged at this point to note that Bill No. 2, standing in the name of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, recognizes that this tax is no longer a sacred cow. I support the principle involved, which to me is aimed towards deriving revenue under the Act from the groups and corporations best able to pay it. I would hope that he has given or will give consideration, by the same token, to removing tax from those unable to pay tax under the Act. I feel I am on safe ground and I look forward to some support from other northern members when I say that the average yearly income of the group to which I refer would approximately equal the average monthly income of the members of this House.

I know the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) knows and understands the conditions to which I refer, and if the whole provincial land tax as it relates to these farmers, cannot be removed in total, at least those farmers who contribute to upkeep of roads

should be relieved of the provincial land tax burden.

I will refer to the recent Speech from the Throne relative to these conditions and the aims of The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act. I quote:

The consolidation of abandoned or uneconomic farm units will be continued in northern Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope to see some real effort in this regard, but I am aware of the extreme difficulties in moves in this direction. I know such a programme will not be immediately successful and I have tried to point out at least one way in which the situation could be even temporarily alleviated. I can see no reason for delay.

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Speaker, just as you can sometimes be fooled when you drive a car, I was fooled when the hon. member before me came to a very abrupt stop.

It is my pleasure to take part in this Throne speech debate, and I would like to begin, as many others have done, by complimenting you, Mr. Speaker. I would particularly like to compliment you on the innovation which you have instituted, that of having the procession, or whatever it is called, of the Speaker and the Clerk, and so on, come from the first floor up here. I think that this will establish a little more pageantry, another tradition to this House, which I think will impress those many visitors and school children who come here. I know it has always impressed me at Ottawa to see this procession of the Speaker into the House of Commons and I think it is a good addition here.

I might add my words of welcome to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) and welcome them to this House.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that for the past two years it has been my pleasure to be a member of the select committee on youth of this House. As a member of this committee, I have had a chance for these past two years, to tour this province and meet with many of the groups interested in young people, indeed meet with many of the young people in all areas of this province.

Being on this committee has given me a chance to get into areas that I had not had the opportunity to visit before and in a way, probably, which a tourist would never have. You visit an area and from serving on one of these committees you learn what the

people think in that area. I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that from my observations, the young people of Ontario are a very good group of people. There is certainly nothing wrong with them. They do have hopes, they have aspirations. They are looking for things. They are looking to us to enact policies and to bring in legislation that will help them attain their hopes and their aims.

I think that we have to keep in mind that, generally and by far, they are a good group of people, and that the unreached youths, the delinquent youths, represent a small portion of the total youth population of this province. We have to keep this in mind when we bring forward legislation and various policies.

However, sir, in keeping this in mind, we cannot neglect the unreached youth, and certainly there is a definite need for specific policies and specific pieces of legislation in this area also. I know that I and all hon. members will look forward to the introduction of the report of the select committee on youth, in order that young people will be able to take an even great part in the affairs of this province.

Part of our studies on the select committee on youth concerned themselves with looking at statistics. I would like to quote from one of the reports that we had by our research officers. Talking about the median age, it says:

Median age represents the age above which and below which half of the population lies, and it is estimated that in the period 1961 to 1971, the median age will fall below 25 years of age.

In 1961 the median age was 26.3 years, a decrease from the high of 27.7 years at the 1951 census. By 1991, 50.6 per cent of the population will be in the zero-to-24 age sector of the population. This increase will come as a consequence of a high birth-rate and a low death-rate combination.

The figures for 1965, Mr. Speaker, show that of a population of 6,731,000 in Ontario, 46.9 per cent of this total population are under 25 years of age. The figures—when you go into the detailed figures—also show that the number in the age group 15 to 24 is increasing rapidly. I think that the implications of the immense influx of young people, particularly in this age group of 15 to 24, should play a very dominant part in our consideration of legislation for the people of this province.

In other words, what I am saying is that in a very few years, more than 50 per cent of the people of this province will be below 25 years of age and we should remember

this when we enact legislation for all the people of this province.

One of the areas that I think is worthy of a few moments' consideration this morning, is one that has already been debated on a resolution, but I am afraid that I did not have the opportunity to take part in that debate. It is certainly a matter of principle and will eventually be a piece of legislation which will affect this very large group of young people we have and which will become an ever-increasing part of our population. This, of course, concerns the matter of lowering the voting age to 18 years.

This is a question, as I said, that has been debated here and in the press and in magazines and on radio—it has been debated in all kinds of forums. Out of all the debate on this matter, I think there are several dominant themes—or dominant trends—that can be pinpointed. One of the dominant trends is, I think, that generally—and I think this can be supported—the people who now vote are not in favour of lowering the voting age. I did a survey in my riding recently—I referred to this in the medical health insurance debate. I asked the question on that survey, "Do you favour lowering the voting age to 18?" About 75 per cent of the respondents said that they did not favour lowering the voting age to 18, and they gave many reasons why. I think that is one of the dominant themes. Many of the people in the voting population today are not in favour of lowering the voting age.

The second dominant theme seems to be that young people are split on this matter. We will find groups who are in favour of lowering the voting age; we will find many who are not. There was a newspaper survey done by the Toronto *Daily Star* which asked a number of young people whether they favoured lowering the voting age and about six said "no" and three said "yes" and gave very detailed reasons. I notice that a group had a meeting at the Eaton auditorium a week or so ago—young people in favour of lowering the voting age and I believe only 35 or 40 attended this meeting.

Certainly, from our discussions with young people in our select committee on youth meetings across the province, there was no general feeling that young people themselves favoured lowering the voting age. Now, I would like, in discussing this matter, to read a few comments into the record, Mr. Speaker, which I think are interesting. These come from a battle about the same subject which took place many years ago, but about another group of people, women. These are some comments that were recorded in a

book that was written about the women's suffrage movement. They are in connection with a speech by Viscountess Amberley of Stroud in 1870, and they are taken from a book published in 1902. I think that this is a very interesting comment when you consider what we hear today generally from a lot of people—that the voting age should not be lowered because all the young people will be radical socialists. They are all going to vote socialist and that is a good reason not to lower the voting age. Others will dispute this point and say that they do not think so, but prefer not to take a chance, but to leave the voting age where it is, Mr. Speaker.

This is a comment made about the women's suffrage movement in 1870:

A teacher was asking her class: How does an ordinary man of the world answer when he is asked if he is in favour of women voting? He does not say, "I am afraid of their influence at elections; they will all be Tories"; he does not say that it would subvert the political and social order of things, they would all be radicals. No, he generally just smiles benignly and says, "I do not think that the ladies wish to vote," and turning if he can, to some pretty doll-like girl, he will appeal to her to confirm his statement.

Men on each side expect that the vote will be a leap in the dark in favour of the other side, whichever that happens to be and opportunists on either side in these days wish for evidence of the truth of Miss J. G. Wilkinson's assertion at the trade union congress in Aberdeen in 1884, that "it is absurd to suppose that women will vote all Conservative or all radical; they will do nothing of the kind."

Now what I am trying to point out, Mr. Speaker, from this quote, is that this argument "Do not lower the voting age because young people will vote this way or they will vote that way" is an old, old argument that has been used time and time again. It was used when the vote was extended to women and, of course, it did not prove true then and I do not believe it would prove true now.

Young people, Mr. Speaker, will vote just the same as those over 21; there will be a percentage that will vote for one party and there will be a percentage that will vote for another party, and this will change from election to election.

Going back to look at the women's suffrage movement it is interesting to note that there were a lot of women opposed to extending the

vote to women. As an example, in June, 1888, in a newspaper called *The Nineteenth Century*, there was inserted the following advertisement:

A Woman's Protest. The undersigned protests strongly against the proposed extension of the parliamentary franchise to women, which they believe would be a measure distasteful to the great majority of the women of the country, unnecessary and mischievous both to themselves and to the state.

This was signed by 104 well-known English ladies.

Also back in those days, generally the press was against extending the franchise to women, during the women's suffrage movement and one interesting editorial in the *Saturday Review* of July 1, 1886, had the following editorial:

We have no right to bamboozle anyone and least of all have we a right to bamboozle women by pretending to give them a sugar plum and really give them a dose of salts. What does voting imply? It implies soliciting, reproaching and humbugging and cajoling. Why are respectable women, because they happen to be spinsters or widows and live in houses of their own, to be exposed to the impertinent intrusions of agents, canvassers and candidates, to be besieged alternately by the adulation of fools and by the insolence of bullies?

Of course, we would not agree with the last comments about canvassing during elections, I am sure, but the interesting thing here is that it was suggested that all manner of evil would happen to women if the vote was extended to them. I would like to quote further from one pamphlet that was printed in favour of women's suffrage in 1847. It said:

The wise, virtuous, gentle mothers of our state or nation might contribute as much to the good order, the peace, the thrift of the body politic as they do to the well-being of their families which, for the most part we all know, is more than the fathers do.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in quoting from these books, I am not, of course, arguing the point about whether women should vote or not, but trying to show that the arguments used for and against lowering the voting age to 18 are the same old arguments that were used back in the days of the fight for the women's vote. The arguments that the young people themselves do not want the vote, and that if they are given the vote they will all vote radically, or they will vote for one party or the other. Of course, I do not think

that either of these are true. Mr. Speaker, from looking at these matters myself, and considering them over the past few months and listening to the various debates here and in other areas, I think that because of the increased level of education of our young people—and certainly we can prove this, more young people are staying in school longer. Retention figures from all our secondary schools will show this now. Young people are becoming better educated. This, I think, is an indisputable fact.

Because of the increased interest of young people in politics and world affairs, I would like to tell you that we had a meeting of the Young Conservatives in our riding last night and I was surprised and very pleased to find 35 young people were there, many high school students. There is an increased interest among these people in politics and world affairs; I think because of these things, Mr. Speaker, the time has come to lower the voting age to 18 years. I think that it should be considered soon in this province, and I hope that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the members of the government will consider it, as we are considering it in our select committee on youth. I, personally, feel that the voting age should be lowered to 18 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will continue with this debate. Next week we will be into estimates; I believe the first department to be dealt with will be The Department of Reform Institutions. By Monday I hope to be able to give you a list of five or six of the major departments ahead, in order that you may prepare yourselves.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Will there be estimates on Monday?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There will be no estimates on Monday. There seems to be some question of whether there will be a night sitting. I believe the Whips are discussing it. I am not in a position to say at the moment whether there will be or there will not be.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, February 21, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Monday, February 21, 1966

Gasoline Handling Act, 1966, bill intituled, Mr. Simonett, first reading	711
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, first reading	711
Law Society Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	711
Conditional Sales Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	711
Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	712
Change of Name Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	712
Judicature Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	712
Devolution of Estates Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	712
Licensing and regulation of nursing homes, bill to provide for, Mr. Dymond, first reading	712
Condolences re passing of the Honourable Paul Comtois, Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Thompson, Mr. MacDonald	715
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Wells, Mr. Trotter, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Thrasher, Mr. Gaunt	716
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Yakabuski, agreed to	738
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	738

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 21, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE GASOLINE HANDLING ACT, 1966

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves first reading of bill intituled, The Gasoline Handling Act, 1966.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, this is a complete revision of this Act. It was last revised in 1936.

The purpose of this revision is: First, to confine the scope of the Act to the safety aspect of the handling of gasoline and the associate products to which the Act will apply; second, to provide for the creation and administration of a complete and up-to-date safety code.

The administration of this Act was transferred on January 1, 1965, from The Treasury Department to The Department of Energy and Resources Management.

THE ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Simonett moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, at the present time, by order-in-council, we have permission to build and lease spur lines up to ten miles. We would like to increase this to 20 miles.

THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, may I ask if that bill has had the requisite two days notice?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I have not checked the order paper today, Mr. Speaker, but I thought it had. I shall check now.

Mr. Speaker: I understand that notice was given on the 17th.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, a brief explanation to the House: This small amendment to the Act gives authority to the benchers of the law society to delegate their powers with respect to the compensation fund to referees and to committees of themselves, that is the benchers, in order that the workload may be handled without undue delay.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This bill, and a companion bill which I propose to introduce immediately, is to facilitate the method of financing the sale of rolling stock of railway, oil and steel companies.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Attorney General a question in regard to this matter. Does the introduction of this bill preclude the introduction of the so-called Katzman bill?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, not at all, Mr. Speaker. This is just one very small amendment to meet a situation which is giving us

some concern and some difficulty, but it will in no way obstruct or delay report No. 3 of the law reform commission. The bill is being improved from that report and we are proceeding with that, I can assure the House, with all due despatch.

Mr. Singer: I would like to see it in this session.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would hope so; I think we may count on that.

THE BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, this is the companion bill of which I spoke a moment ago and the purpose of it is the same as the amendment to The Conditional Sales Act.

THE CHANGE OF NAME ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: The purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is to permit an unmarried mother to change the name of her child.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this new provision is to clarify the law with respect to costs awarded to the Crown, and to place the Crown in the same position as any other litigant.

It will enable the Crown to recover costs in proper cases where the solicitor or counsel who acts for the Crown is a salaried law officer of the Crown. A similar provision is to be found in The Supreme Court Act, which is Revised Statutes of Canada, 1952, chapter 259.

In the second section included in this amending Act, it is required that the report

of the auditor of the official guardian's accounts, be transmitted to the inspector of legal offices instead of to the Provincial Secretary.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would permit a question on that? Will the fact that these amendments are to The Judicature Act preclude other amendments dealing with injunctions at a later stage in the sittings of this House?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would not think so, if it were deemed the policy to bring in such amendments. There have been quite frequent occasions where two bills have been in the House to amend the one Act, but they are generally consolidated at the end.

THE DEVOLUTION OF ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the first section in this amending Act makes a change in the law of devolution of estates in the case of a person who dies intestate and is survived by a spouse and children, and then the spouse remarries and dies intestate, leaving the children by the first marriage still infants. This amendment will provide that the surviving step-parent will not be entitled to the preferential share of the estate but only to the distributive share.

The other three sections are complementary to the amending provisions which we have introduced with respect to The Registry Act.

NURSING HOMES

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of nursing homes.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to authorize The Department of Health to license and regulate nursing homes in Ontario, and prescribe standards for their establishment, maintenance and operation.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege.

Following my remarks on the Throne debate last Thursday, there appeared in the *Toronto Daily Star* last Saturday, the following article:

FROST CALLS MPP'S DEMAND FOR TRUST PROBE FICKLE

Former Premier Leslie Frost described a demand for a probe into last fall's merger of the British Mortgage and Trust Company and Victoria and Grey Trust Company as fickle from a man who doesn't know any better.

Edward Sargent, Liberal from Grey North, said in the Legislature Thursday that the government had come to the rescue of big business by using public funds to guarantee the credit of British Mortgage up to \$3 million in order to protect depositors. He said Mr. Frost, a director of Victoria and Grey Trust Company, was a frequent visitor to Queen's Park during negotiations that ended with the government agreeing to the guarantee.

"Any statement that I discussed," said Mr. Frost, "this matter with the Cabinet is completely unfounded and untrue. I did not discuss it with Mr. Robarts or Mr. Allan either."

Mr. Frost described the transaction between Victoria and Grey Trust Company and British Mortgage and Trust Company as a takeover and he said this was done in a manner which was in the public interest.

So that there be no misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, that the public of Ontario will not get any false information on this whole sorry mess, I make the following statement: The press statement was that Mr. Frost said I did not know any better. Another press statement is that I was heckled unmercifully. Another press statement was that the government was not taking this seriously.

May I say that I have never been more serious in my life than I am today, when I state that if a government can break the laws that we pass here in this House by not revoking the charters—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: —of these companies for their illegal use—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member would now like to correct the statement that was made about him, I understand.

Mr. Sargent: I am going to correct it eventually.

Mr. Speaker: But I would ask the member to come to the point immediately in order to not abuse his privilege of rising in the House on a matter of personal privilege.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out the fact this government is breaking the laws that are passed in this House by not revoking the charters of these two companies; and furthermore, Mr. Speaker, they further compounded the felony by making public funds available without authority—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Sargent: —contrary to law, to bail out the offenders.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid the member is not getting to the point which I requested.

Mr. Sargent: I will eventually.

Mr. Speaker: The member—

Mr. Sargent: I will do it in capsule form then. The director of British Mortgage, Mr. Lawson, states that the government action was illegal; hundreds of editorials across the province say that the act was unprecedented; the chartered banks turned them down; the trust companies turned them down—

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: The member has a point of order.

Mr. Bryden: I have refrained from getting up till now but this is getting beyond all reason. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman did not have a point of personal privilege in the first place. He just had a disagreement with Mr. Frost, which is an entirely different thing. And he has not said anything yet that is in order. If this hon. member is to be allowed to make statements like this before the orders of the day, then the rest of us will govern ourselves accordingly.

Mr. Speaker: Before the member proceeds, I will have to ask him to desist from making any further remarks if he does not come to the point where he was misquoted, or correct some misinterpretation by the paper.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Mr. Frost states that he did not talk with the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) or the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). He inferred that his visits to this House were of a social nature.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Once again, I would have to join my friend, the hon. member for Woodbine—

Mr. Sargent: I am getting to the point, please sit down.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I try to be as indulgent as I can because of the complaints of the Opposition; but this is obviously, completely and absolutely out of order. I would like to suggest, sir, that if this type of privilege is to be allowed to this hon. member, then we are heading for complete confusion in this House. I am prepared to abide by your rulings, and the rules of the House, and I think every other member should do the same.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member please be seated?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Speaker, I will not be seated.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. If I ask the member to be seated, he has to obey the rules of the House.

Mr. Sargent: You have broken the rules of this House by passing these laws—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I ask the member to be seated. When the Speaker is standing and he asks the member to be seated, he should take his seat; otherwise I shall have to ask the Sergeant-at-Arms to remove the member.

Mr. Sargent: You are giving privileges to the trust companies that you are not giving to other—

Mr. Speaker: I have asked the member to be seated.

Mr. Sargent: If you can break the laws for the trust companies, you can break them for me, too.

Mr. Speaker: I have asked the member to please be seated. When the Speaker is standing it is courtesy on the part of the member to take his seat.

Mr. Sargent: When is the hon. Prime Minister going to reveal these facts to the House, then? What kind of a democracy have we?

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! The member will have to desist from making any further remarks, as I rule him out of order.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Is the hon. Attorney General aware that the docket in magistrates' court H, at 87 Richmond street west, Toronto, lists over 300 cases to be dealt with by April 15 next? If the answer is "yes," what steps is the hon. Attorney General taking to relieve the congestion in that court? And if it is "no," what steps will he take?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware as to how the hon. member arrived at his figure. He says 300 cases. According to the information I have received, there are approximately 843 charges pending in the magistrates' court H, for the period February 21, 1966 to April 15, 1966.

Of this total, 506 constitute new charges and have not been before the court, while 337 constitute charges that have previously been adjourned to a date within this period of time.

I am further advised that the caseload is, in the opinion of the administrator, no heavier than what it has been for similar periods for past years, and that with approximately 23 or 24 cases being disposed of each day, it is anticipated that this existing caseload will be properly dealt with over the period specified.

While new charges may be laid with appearance dates being fixed within this specified period of time, approximately 40 to 50 per cent of these cases will be dealt with on a plea of guilty; many of the remaining charges will be adjourned to future dates for the convenience of counsel and their clients. At the same time, many of the new charges that have been fixed for appearance within this period of time will be adjourned to other dates. The balance between the new appearances with the adjournments will likely result in a balancing of the figure, so that it will remain relatively constant during the period.

Since these cases will be dealt with in the period specified, we do not contemplate taking special steps with respect to this court. As the hon. member may be aware, we have had several meetings with the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto requesting accommodation for the magistrates' courts, but since this is so related to the pending discussions about the old city hall, I am not in a position to make any definitive statement at this time, as to negotiations that are underway.

I have taken the liberty of providing this answer in some detail, because I know the hon. member's concern since it is difficult to state a simple and short answer to this

rather complicated question of caseloads in the metropolitan courts.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, there are two points I would like to raise.

First, a question to the hon. Minister of Health: Can the hon. Minister give the House a further report on the ban on milk pick-ups by the medical officer of health in Pittsburgh township because of quarantine from scarlet fever?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The ban was lifted February 11, 1966.

Mr. MacDonald: The second point, I think you will concur, is a non-controversial one. I hope I can have all hon. members of the House join with me in paying tribute to something within my own riding, something I rarely rise to draw attention to.

On Saturday, at the end of a nine-day tournament which originally started out with 78 hockey teams, the Weston Dodgers finally emerged as the champions in the pee wee international hockey.

The news reports indicate they had gone seven games without a defeat; that in the course of the finals in the championship they had three shutouts and allowed only seven goals, and therefore their goalkeeper was awarded the particular tribute as the best goalkeeper in the whole tournament.

I repeat, I am sure all hon. members would like to pay tribute to this group of future NHL stars.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I have a question of the hon. Prime Minister, notice of which has been given.

Would the hon. Prime Minister inform this House the cost of the advertising campaign of The Medical Services Insurance Act, and: (1) When were the advertisements distributed to television and radio stations, and when was approval of the content given by the hon. Minister of Health prior to their distribution? (2) When did the government book time for the commercials with television and radio stations traffic department? (3) What advertising agency and/or commercial films production house was assigned to produce commercials? (4) What fee was involved for the following: the advertising agency; the production house or film company, and Mr. Aldred, the announcer?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: As you can see from this question, it is going to require a little

research, and I would hope to have a detailed answer for the hon. leader of the Opposition tomorrow. I was not able to get the complete answers to all the parts of that question, but I think I will have them complete for you tomorrow, at this time.

Before the orders of the day, I would like to refer to the tragic death this morning of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, the Honourable Paul Comtois, when that very historic Bois de Coulonges, as it is called, outside Quebec City was destroyed by fire, just some 100-odd years since its predecessor was destroyed in the same way.

This has been a very great shock to all of us. We regret his passing and to his widow and to his family, I think I speak on behalf of all of us when I tender deep condolences.

On behalf of the people and the Legislature of this province, I have extended by telegram our sympathy to members of the legislative assembly of Quebec, to the legislative council, to the government and the people of that province.

I think M. Comtois was particularly well known to the members of this Legislature, in that he had entertained many of us in Government House during the course of a visit we paid to the Quebec capital two or three years ago. He was very kind and gracious to us, and I know that I am speaking for all of us when I say that this great, great tragedy has its effect on every one of us. We extend our most heartfelt sympathy to not only his immediate family, but to those people in Quebec whom he represented and of whom he was the Queen's representative.

Mr. Thompson: I would like on behalf of myself and my party to concur with the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister. I know that all of us feel a sense of tragedy at not only the fire, but in particular at the death of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec and we would wish to extend our sympathy to his family on this occasion.

Mr. MacDonald: As the hon. Prime Minister has indicated, some of us in this House had the opportunity of visiting Quebec in a visit sponsored by the press galleries two or three years ago, and on that occasion not only experienced the hospitality of M. Comtois, but also had an opportunity to see this historic government house, which had been there for some 100 years. Certainly for those of us who were on that visit, we have a sense of personal loss, since we know of the building and had an opportunity to meet the man.

We in this group would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader

of the Opposition in expressing our condolences to his immediate family and to the government in Quebec.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order; resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion to an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): In rising this afternoon to continue my remarks in this Throne speech debate, I would like to begin by saying a few personal words about the death of another person today—a very close personal friend of mine, who I think is well known to many of us in this House. I, and I know many in this House, would like to join with many in our province and nation who are paying tribute today to George Hogan, a young man—I guess just a year older than I am—but one who I think has made a significant contribution to our party, and to this province of Ontario.

George was a personal friend of mine, whom I have known for many years. In fact, it was he who invited me to join the Conservative Party when we were both at Malvern collegiate in 1946. He got me to come out to my first Young Conservative meeting and since then I have remained a Conservative.

I am sure that all of us feel as I do, that our deepest sympathy goes out to his wife and to his daughter.

It is just a month since the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) issued his white paper on the report of the Royal commission on Metropolitan Toronto, headed by Dr. H. Carl Goldenberg. In that statement, the hon. Prime Minister indicated in broad terms the principles which the government would apply when they bring forward the detailed amendments during this session to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

The hon. Prime Minister's statement, while not satisfying everybody, presents a practical, acceptable and equitable plan which, I think, applies the valuable lessons of experience gained over the years both here in Metropolitan Toronto and in other jurisdictions throughout the world.

The truth of this statement can be justified by the fact that during the last month, since

the report was issued, it has gained a high degree of acceptance by the large majority of the people in Metropolitan Toronto.

In the white paper issued by the hon. Prime Minister, he accepted and endorsed the main principles of Dr. Goldenberg's report. These are: 1. The continuation of the two-level federated system of metropolitan government; 2. The consolidation of the constituent municipalities rather than total amalgamation; 3. An increase in the authority and responsibility of the government of Metropolitan Toronto; 4. A metropolitan-wide uniform school tax levy to provide a basic educational programme for the metropolitan area; 5. A reform of the system of representation. In other words, representation by population.

I feel that the key proposal in this report is the strengthening of the power, authority and responsibility of the central government of this area. That is, the metropolitan council and at the metropolitan school board. I feel these two bodies must assume responsibility under a two-level system in an even greater way for decisions and for planning in this whole area.

I suppose each one of us, had we been given the authority to make the decision, might have come up with slightly different proposals—some more radical and some less radical. Personally I feel that the six-borough system is the right one at this time for this area.

I think I personally would have preferred six boroughs of more equal population in which the rigid adherence to the old municipal boundaries was completely forgotten and new communities were forged using the natural boundaries of expressways, super highways and valleys in order to bring people together rather than to divide them. However, I think the point now is that we have accepted the six-borough system and as I said a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, the fact that in less than a month it has gained a high degree of acceptance among the people of this area speaks well for this plan.

This high degree of acceptance does not seem to apply to the editorial writers of the three Toronto daily newspapers. However, I would like today to read into the record part of an editorial from the *Mirror*, a weekly newspaper distributed in Scarborough and North York; and I would like to point out that this weekly newspaper has a total circulation of 125,000 in Scarborough and North York and this is only 30,000 copies short of and daily circulation of the Toronto *Globe*

and Mail in this Metropolitan Toronto area. The editorial reads as follows:

MORE STRENGTH ON NEW METRO

For four years Scarborough has been fighting for its political existence. On Monday, Premier John Robarts chose to preserve the basic idea of Metro government despite four years of sustained pressure for amalgamation from Toronto politicians and Toronto newspapers. He thus preserves this township's existence. He also gives this township more strength in a reformed Metro. Instead of one voice on metropolitan council, this township will have five.

For the people who live in Scarborough and Metro government, Monday was a day of victory. Scarborough has reached maturity and status in an exciting urban government. Robarts' Metro reform demonstrates a government philosophy that preserves the values which permit the reasonably intelligent and reasonably well-informed citizen to understand the local government of which he is a part.

This new Metro government enables the citizens of this municipality to participate in the management of the affairs of their community without undue difficulty. It also recognizes an important democratic principle of representation by population.

The Premier has recognized the pitfalls of amalgamation. An amalgamated government serving more than a million persons becomes incomprehensible to the majority of citizens. The people see little or no purpose in their attempt to influence the state of affairs. They feel the government increasingly tends to leave decisions to experts and planners.

Our Metro government has been an outstanding success and it has been recognized as such around the world. This became more apparent during the Goldenberg hearings when a number of municipalities and individuals quoted praise for Metro by experts from cities around the world.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this editorial expresses my opinions and the opinions of many in our area of Metropolitan Toronto, regarding the white paper presented by the hon. Prime Minister.

However, I would like to deal with one area of which there was no mention in the white paper and, indeed, no mention in the Goldenberg report, and yet one which I think merits consideration as we overhaul the metropolitan government in this area. This is the area of hospital capital construction grants. I would hope that in drafting the de-

tails of legislation this area would be looked at and some definite changes in the system that is now in effect in the metropolitan area will be suggested.

During my remarks last year, Mr. Speaker, in the Speech from the Throne debate, I outlined a proposal for the formation of a Metro-Toronto hospital co-ordinating council. I am very happy that the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) saw fit to establish such a council and it is now being organized in order that it may be in full operation in a very few months. This will bring to the hospital field in this area an element of co-ordination which has been lacking and which I feel is badly needed.

At this time I would like to renew my plea that the Metropolitan Toronto hospital co-ordinating council, as one of its first duties, survey the whole area of public fund-raising for hospitals in this Metro area. I strongly feel that there should not be individual hospital drives, but one hospital drive raising money for all metropolitan hospitals in order that the moneys raised from the business and industrial communities in our area may be used over the whole area; not just for some of the hospitals, but for all those hospitals which need funds.

At the present time, Mr. Speaker, we have downtown hospitals that are conducting fund-raising drives here in this area, and as part of their drives they are covering most of the big business community in Toronto and they are making it almost impossible for suburban hospitals to carry out any real public fund-raising drives. I feel that because of the interdependence of everyone in Metro on his neighbour and of every community on the community or municipality next to them, money collected from hospital fund-raising drives in this area should be collected jointly for all hospitals and shared with all the hospitals that need funds.

Mr. Speaker, carrying this concept logically one step forward, I feel that all municipal funds for hospital construction grants should be raised by a uniform tax levy over the whole of Metro, with no special levies for hospital purposes in any of our individual municipalities such as we now have in Scarborough and North York. This would mean that there should be just one municipal grant—a municipal hospital construction grant—to hospitals in this area and this grant would come from the metropolitan council. Of course, this grant should be larger than the present Metro grant. It should be raised so that it would be roughly one-third of the capital cost of a hospital bed.

If we adopted this proposal, Mr. Speaker, it would mean that none of the five boroughs for the city of Toronto would have the power to raise money for hospital capital construction. Only the metropolitan council would have this power and this, I feel, is a very logical step because, as I have already said, hospitals are really a metropolitan responsibility because of our economic interdependence in this whole area. If we can spread the cost of school construction over the whole of Metro, as we now do, why should not hospital construction costs likewise be spread over the whole of the metropolitan area?

I hope that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) will look carefully into this proposal during the detailed drafting of the amendments to The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

I would like now, Mr. Speaker, to pass on to another subject I would like to deal with this afternoon, and that is education. In its second annual report, just recently published, the economic council of Canada recommended that "advancement of education at all levels be given a high place in public policy and that investment in education be accorded the highest rank in the scale of priorities." I agree with this statement, and I am very happy that our government agrees with this statement, and particularly that our hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) agree with this very important pronouncement of the economic council of Canada.

Of course, the recent Budget which was presented to this House just a week ago shows that the hon. Provincial Treasurer not only agrees with this statement in voice but also in action. The Budget shows that the total net expenditure for The Department of Education is forecast at \$575.5 million for the coming fiscal year, an increase of \$124 million over the current year. It further outlines that the amount required by the universities and colleges of this province from the federal government and our government together for 1966 and 1967 is estimated at \$122 million; the portion of this to be provided by the Ontario government is \$91.4 million, an increase of 41 per cent over the current year, or \$26.8 million.

Education costs money, Mr. Speaker; it costs a lot of money, but it must be accorded the highest priority in our list of spending and our people must realize that we will have to sacrifice through taxation in order to provide the educational opportunities for the young people of this province and of this

country in order that we may assure an even greater future for Canada. We all must realize that education is the escalator in a free society. The development of our human resources rightly deserves our highest priority and our greatest sacrifice.

In the last few years under the capable leadership of the hon. Minister of Education there has been much forward movement in The Department of Education, Mr. Speaker. We saw the introduction of the Ontario tax foundation plan; the extension of free textbooks to grades 9, 10, 11 and 12, the introduction of new financial arrangements in connection with the cost of operating schools for retarded children; the introduction of a programme of colleges of applied arts and technology; the reorganization of The Department of Education and the appointment of a new Deputy Minister; the introduction of a programme and new emphasis on educational television; and the formation of the Ontario institute for studies in education.

And of course, Mr. Speaker, this government has also created the new Department of University Affairs. It set up the university capital aid corporation and in the past few years has established new universities in this province.

Another important step, I think, Mr. Speaker, taken by the hon. Minister of Education, was the establishment of a commission on the aims and objectives of education. This commission is under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Emmett Hall. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that this committee has an exceedingly important task to carry out and I look forward with great anticipation to the report which they will present.

Now today I do not want to presume on what they will talk about in their report but I would like to present a few random thoughts of my own on the aims and objectives of education, and a few thoughts on what I think the schools of tomorrow will be or should be like.

Mr. Speaker, before my election to this House, it was my privilege to serve as a trustee on the Scarborough board of education for seven years and as chairman of the board for two of those years. In the last couple of years I have had the privilege of being a chairman of the programme advisory committee of the Canadian educational showplace. And I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, based on my experience to date in educational matters, that education perhaps more than any other field has a traditional way of doing things.

I found that very often new and fresh ideas get pushed aside. They get pushed aside, however, not on their own merits or lack of merits but because administrative convenience too often blurred the judgment when new ideas were suggested.

In education I think that tradition very often gets in the way of progress. I think the merits of many new ideas in education get only lip service from people in education, while uppermost in their mind is the red tape and the administrative inconvenience that would be needed to put these ideas into effect.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there are still many today who see the school as a fairly rigid, well defined organization with a very rigid, very well defined job to do. I think that many of these people fail to look at our schools, and the job that they can do, with a broad enough perspective.

Not so many years ago when our country was very young, the approach to education naturally was quite narrow. The overwhelming emphasis was on reading. Little else mattered if a child could learn to read. However, hand in hand with reading, came writing and then arithmetic, and these became known as the "three R's" as we have heard them referred to many times. When we look at that very narrow type of curriculum and approach of the schools of the past, when we look at their emphasis in developing the young receptive minds of children in those days, we cannot call the programme we have today narrow in its approach to developing the young and receptive minds of our youngsters.

But still, Mr. Speaker, I feel that our approach should be even broader. I feel it should be even more comprehensive than it is today. By this I am not necessarily suggesting that we just slip new courses into the curriculum; although I will admit that I sometimes become very agitated when I hear people in education say that the curriculum is full already and there is no place for any new courses. This is a harping back to the traditional way of doing things, letting administrative inconvenience, I feel, override a new idea that has come along.

However, what I am suggesting rather is that educationalists conscientiously take a wider responsibility in developing each of our youngsters to his full potential as he moves through the primary grades into high school, into community college, into university, and then out into the world. For some time now I know that some educators have recognized that courses of study required to

obtain a high school diploma, or even a college degree, do not necessarily equip a student to meet the challenges and responsibilities which will inevitably confront him as an adult.

Recently in the United States, the following question was posed to the presidents of leading colleges and universities throughout the country. This was the question, Mr. Speaker:

To what extent, if any, should the school of tomorrow stress courses and programmes specifically calculated to prepare students for the problems and the challenges that they will face as adults, such as (a) the need to compete for employment opportunity, (b) their responsibility as heads of families, (c) their responsibilities as citizens to foster and maintain good representative government as well as world peace?

The results of this survey showed that a significant number of the university presidents believe these things: (1) That students are indeed finding it more difficult to cope with the practical problems of daily living; (2) That there is an immediate need to provide students through formal schooling as well as through the home, the church, the synagogue and the community, with practical work tools so that they can successfully cope with these problems.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, that if these views continue to prevail and become accepted by our educators we will witness a formal introduction and a development of a new dimension in education. Specifically, we could call it education for living. Mr. Speaker, at this time it is certainly not my place to suggest the manner or means by which an education for living programme could be integrated into our educational process. Certainly I think that this is the type of thing that the committee headed by Mr. Justice Hall should be grappling with. However, I would like to present a few of my thoughts on this subject.

The teaching of facts, the transmission of knowledge, is a basic responsibility of our schools. They must give our young people a firm foundation in the course subjects, which would of course include reading, mathematics, history, geography and, particularly, English.

I agree, Mr. Speaker, with our emphasis in recent years on the teaching of a second language in our schools, usually French. However, I think we must watch that in our desire to teach French in our public schools, and to teach other foreign languages in our secondary schools, we do not downgrade the whole matter of the teaching of English

and of communication skills—that is, of writing, reading, speaking, public speaking and spelling, with a high degree of efficiency.

I think particular emphasis needs to be placed on this. Much of our success in life depends on our ability to communicate. Our students should be capable of handling, to the fullest degree, the English language. I think that particularly biting is a remark that is attributed to Yale University's late president, A. Whitney Griswold, who said this, Mr. Speaker:

Every college student should be required to take two years of English so that he may become familiar with some language besides his own.

Our schools, I think, should also show our young people how and why they should be good citizens. They should also give them a grounding in habits of diligence, perseverance and clear thinking. Our educational system should be geared to make sure that each child will eventually be able to think for himself, that he will know right from wrong and that he will have healthy, wholesome attitudes towards himself, towards others, towards his country and towards life.

I think there is no question that the current curriculum revitalization in this province, which we are now experiencing, is taking a giant step in this direction. But I think we have to go one step further. There is more to this whole process than what falls between nine in the morning and four o'clock in the afternoon. There is a need for the greater involvement of the whole family in the educational process.

During a recent trip to Flint, Michigan, with the youth committee, we all saw a marvellous example of this in the community school programme in that highly industrialized city. To many of us on that committee, there seemed to be much benefit to be derived from this type of programme.

I would like to tell you about an experience of my own, at the neighbourhood public school in our area, where my child goes. The principal recently introduced a programme which I think illustrates this community school concept I am talking about. Every evening for a week, the school held curriculum meetings for parents. The purpose was to explain just what the school and the teachers are doing with our children during the day.

Grade by grade, the teachers explained the curriculum, showing each of the parents what was being taught, how and why. The meetings were a tremendous success. They were attended by over 600 parents, where

you are lucky to get 75 or 100 out to the normal home and school meeting. And most certainly I would say these meetings did a lot to create closer ties between the parents in our community and our public school.

This particular school has gained new respect and new status in our community. This type of project is to my mind a step towards the concept of the school as a family community centre in the evenings.

There is much more that could be done and there is so little that is being done in this regard at the present time. Let us take the whole matter of family life education, or sex education. Some people say that it is none of the school's business. Others say it is. Some of the loudest voices—but I do not feel that they are necessarily the majority—claim that the responsibility of telling our children about the mysteries of life and reproduction belongs only to parents. But I feel there are enough young people in trouble today, many more than perhaps we realize, to convince me that most parents never seem to get around to tackling this responsibility. This was certainly my experience from the hearings we held on the select committee on youth.

Why could not our schools set up a series of evening meetings on sex education and family living, to be attended by both the parents and their children? Let the parents bring their youngsters. Make it a joint project; the home on the one and the school on the other, working together as a community agency to further this type of education.

I feel that if sex education is to be taught in the schools, beginning in the elementary schools, as I feel it should, we will have to work out some type of programme like this, where we can join the parents and the school in the responsibility for this type of education. It will have to involve both the teachers, the students and the parents.

This same kind of evening programme could be expanded and set up for youngsters and their parents who are having difficulties in school, for recreational activities for fathers and sons and for mothers and daughters. The number of worthwhile evening programmes that could be set up in present school buildings for parents and their children is limitless. There is no doubt in my mind that this kind of project could create a valuable new kind of mutual respect and rapport between the home and the school. This could be something quite tangible and yet quite subtle. It could reach right down to make the nine-to-five job of the teacher easier and more effective. This whole thing all ties in with the concept of education for living.

I think the test of the effectiveness of the education for living concept would be the extent to which it imparts to each student the ability to think clearly, objectively, dispassionately and independently. Students would be taught that learning to think is not just a matter of the quantity and quality of the books read, courses taken, facts, rules and principles committed to memory, or grades obtained. But rather the ability to apply the knowledge obtained to practical, everyday problems and experiences, making careful observations and evaluations of the results, so that they can be used for future application and use when these problems again arise.

I believe students would quickly realize that a truly educated man is not one necessarily possessed of a number of academic degrees alone, but one who, in addition, has so effectively developed his ability to think, that he inevitably ensures for himself and for his family, and eventually all of society, a more peaceful, harmonious and satisfying way of life.

By embracing this concept, our educational system would be assuming greater responsibility for preparing the individual student for his role as a total member of society and of the community, and not just as a worker or an employee or an employer.

For a few minutes I would like to look at some of the other directions in which I think education is moving. I think that as the years go by, the schools will be paying increasing attention to each child as an individual. The recent emergence of non-grading in elementary schools will, without question, mushroom. This is the system whereby our present grades—one, two, three, four, etc.—in elementary schools vanish, and all students move through the curriculum at their own speed, depending on how they can progress. I personally think this would be a good thing. From what I have seen of it, non-grading represents an ideal. It is a complex system that can be very difficult to set up and difficult to operate. Its merits, however, will overpower its difficulties.

Non-grading seems to me to be the most feasible plan known today to allow our youngsters to break out of the group patterns of the present. It will allow them—in fact, it will force them—to proceed at their own best rate.

If a pupil is bright, a non-graded system will not keep him waiting. It will encourage him along and upwards as fast as he can go. If a pupil is below average, a non-graded system will take the pressure off; pressure that could make him feel substandard and

inferior, because he could not match the average.

I think I am quite safe in saying, and in speculating, that non-grading or an adaptation of it will become the pattern of the future. Its advantages and benefits are overwhelming. The group will no longer set the standard of what and when each child learns. Each youngster will set his own standards.

There is an interesting experiment along these lines at present being conducted in Perth avenue school in Toronto. I have talked to the vice-principal about this, and it is an exciting programme. I am sure we will see it expand in the Toronto board of education system and probably in many other systems.

The schools we visited in Flint, Michigan, had a non-graded system in elementary schools. They said it was a very significant system and one that was working well for the young people in their area.

It is also interesting to note that when there is a non-grade system, when a youngster starts school, he receives a complete battery of tests. When these tests are given, one of the by-products of this system is that emotionally disturbed children—children with perceptual handicaps and children with other learning disabilities, are noted at the time these tests are given. This is much earlier than under our present system and certainly the early detection of these learning disabilities is a definite advantage.

I am sure that this will be very helpful to the teachers in our system, who realize that in the future they are going to have to assume, to a much greater degree, the detection and the assistance of children with learning disabilities. The non-graded system, and the testing and the screening that goes with it, presents the ideal setup for detecting these learning disabilities so that they can be pinpointed early and the teachers and the other ancillary staff can take the necessary action to see that these children receive the proper treatment and the proper courses so that they may advance to their full educational potential, the same as our normal children.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I think that today our schools are designed like egg crates. Standard box classrooms are arranged along a corridor and they are all about the same size. I think that the design of the school of the future is going to change quickly.

Tomorrow's schools will be based on large rooms in which 100 or 200 people can easily sit with no partitions or anything to disturb them so that classes can be grouped and regrouped depending on the course that is

being studied or the task that happens to be under study at that hour or on that day. Then, as the curriculum dictates, these large rooms will be able to be blocked off by movable partitions; they can be snapped in place to form small rooms of any size. I think that this kind of change in school architecture will be very desirable and I hope that The Department of Education is working in this direction at the present time, both in regard to giving leadership in new design features and also in revising the basis on which capital construction grants are made to schools so that they do not adhere to a rigid grant per classroom basis. If the classrooms vanish and the school becomes four or five large rooms, there will need to be a revision in the grant structure.

Third, I think that in a few years—perhaps longer than a few years—but definitely we will see a federal office of education established, perhaps as part of the new Department of Manpower in the federal government. An office established not to interfere with the provincial constitutional rights in the field of education but as a research and co-ordinating office, as an office that can handle the disbursement of federal grants to education. I think that this is something that is definitely on the horizon.

Fourth, I think that we will see our schools rather than operating roughly 1,000 hours a year as now, in a very few years we will see them operating at least 4,000 hours in the year. By this I mean that in future education will become a lifelong process for everyone. I think that the schools will be working both day and evening, for our young and middle-aged and for the old. They will be open for education and re-education, for training and retraining, for the arts and culture and recreation and for civic purposes. Portions of the building will be designed for children only, but adults will find accommodation there in the late afternoon and in the evenings, 52 weeks of the year.

Last, Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the signs of the future is this, that since education is everybody's business support will, some day in the future, derive more and more from the provincial and federal governments and less from the homeowners of a municipality. Up to the present time I think that it has been desirable that every homeowner should be required to support, at the municipal level, educational services.

But ideas and times are rapidly changing. We are, to some extent, in an international educational race. Education is now becoming the first business of a modern country and

education that is left largely to the whims and generosity of local governments risks our national security. For in the long run, our liberties will be secured not by military force but by a universally informed people. The school is a weapon; it is a battleship, a fortress, in the national fight to raise the standards of our people and to protect their rights.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that eventually we will see a larger degree of support coming from the principal benefactors, the province and the nation, from the provincial government and the federal government.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario for the leadership that he is giving to this province and to this country.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this needs to be said. I feel personally that when the history of this time of delicate dialogue between province and province and between province and national government is written, I think that history will record what many of us now believe, that here is one of the truly Canadian statesmen of our time. Here is a man who is leaving his mark not only on this province, but on all of Canada. I personally feel that history will show this perhaps to an even greater degree than we now realize.

Mr. J. B. Trotter (Parkdale): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to pay my respects to you as the Speaker of this assembly. On occasions we have challenged your decisions but I assure you, sir, that you are personally respected and carry out the duties of your vital position with dignity and good will.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I may say you carry out your duties with a great deal of charm. I have even been told by women spectators that you are so charming it was a pity you did not have more opportunity to speak. I must say, Mr. Speaker, in my own personal view if I had a magic wand and could bring about improvements that this slow moving government is too lazy to implement, I would create a special constituency for you. I know it has been suggested on many occasions, but nothing has been done. It would be the constituency of Queen's Park and make you its member and you would be the permanent Speaker of this House. I would even raise your pay.

But alas, Mr. Speaker, I am not the government, I have no magic wand and all I can give you is to pay you my respects.

I note, Mr. Speaker, that you have attempted to improve the dignity of this

House by marching in with your staff each day as we open. Well, I do not know if the innovation helps, but I am sure that the extra walking is both good for you and your staff.

But, Mr. Speaker, while you are making changes, I wish you would make one change immediately. It is the one thing that detracts from your dignity as a person and from the dignity of your office and that is that silly hat that you wear. I note that you are in the Speaker's chair a very short time before you take it off. The hat is completely out of style for modern-day government. After all, Mr. Speaker, the government of Ontario, with the exception of the federal government, is the biggest business in the province and I can hardly conceive of a chairman of a board of directors wearing that hat, I can hardly conceive of you teaching school wearing that hat or selling insurance wearing that hat. So please, Mr. Speaker, send the hat to the Royal Ontario museum. You look much better without it and I am sure it will improve the dignity of this House.

While I have this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my congratulations to the two new members, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) and, of course, to remind you once again, despite all the predictions that were going to take place in those by-elections, that they are both Liberals. I think this has set a pattern for future elections here in the province of Ontario. I may, while I have this opportunity, extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder on the Speech from the Throne; they did an excellent job considering the limitations they have because of their party politics.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that the government of Ontario is the biggest business in the province, second only to the federal government. While this is quite true, it is much more than that. The government of Ontario must give inspiration to the people of this province, for Ontario is not only our home but is the conservatory where we nurture the hopes and aspirations of the people of Ontario. Each member of this Legislature, by spending what abilities and energies he has, gives a part of his life to the government. And, by so doing, we each give a small part of ourselves that will live on in the government of Ontario long after we as individuals are forgotten.

It is for that reason alone, Mr. Speaker, that we should expect in the Speech from

the Throne food for thought, and inspiration to do great things for the people of the province of Ontario. Instead of food for thought we get a sickening mishmash. Instead of inspiration, we listen to 24 mumbled pages deliberately designed to say nothing. And this at a time in our history, Mr. Speaker, when we need answers to the great problems which face our province, and which face Canada.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at just a few fields in which the government today should carry out bold and imaginative action, and where instead it just staggers from expedient to expedient leaving a mess to posterity.

The Department of Municipal Affairs is a disgrace. For many years it has been obvious municipal government is completely outdated. The Baldwin Act of 1849 which fathered our present system of municipal government may have been good in its day, but in our day it is like an albatross around our necks. Because of our lack of regional planning, because of our outdated and overburdened property tax system, many regions of Ontario are shackled in attempting to develop economically, and our legislation pertaining to health and welfare is a disorganized patchwork.

Mr. Speaker, the present Tory government governs Ontario under laws that were passed in order to settle disputes over the breaking of a farm fence and damage done to stray cows. What we need are laws that will meet the demands of a rapidly expanding urban population, an industrial economy, a technological revolution, and supply services to our people for a high standard of living.

Despite all the expert knowledge that is available, despite the suffering of hundreds of municipalities, the limitations of the property tax still has not dawned upon the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner). The limitations of the property tax are more than obvious to the suffering homeowner.

It should be obvious, Mr. Speaker, that municipalities should be relieved of services that have nothing to do with property. The property tax was meant to service property. The Baldwin Act was passed over 100 years ago. But it would seem that the present Tory government is completely unaware that probably more changes have taken place in the world during the last 50 years than in the previous 5,000. Many of the old truisms are not necessarily valid today. And many ways of doing things that were once taken for granted are being questioned.

The demands of the public today for education, health and welfare, hospitals, and the administration of justice, are far greater than ever dreamed of in 1849. It was never meant that municipalities should pay for such services. Municipalities were meant to finance the basic civic services such as roads, water-works, police and fire protection. The present administration is appallingly stupid. And as a result of the government's stupidity, there is an inability on the part of many people to maintain their homes in good repair. Many areas of Ontario fail to receive the services they should receive, simply because the government of this province fails to measure up to its responsibilities.

The large volume of annexation and amalgamation proceedings in this province, and our wide variation in the quality of services and tax levies, make an overwhelming case for regional government in Ontario. Many of the local governments that are still in existence today were set up to co-ordinate local administration to cover an area where it was a day's journey by horse or by oxen to reach the administrative centre.

We live in the jet age but we use oxcart methods. Some regions, like the Toronto region, have problems of tremendous growth. Other regions, like the Georgian Bay district, and the eastern townships of Ontario, have tremendous economic problems because they have been neglected by the provincial government. Surely, provincial government has the responsibility to see to it that every section of Ontario obtains a basic minimum level in education and in health and welfare, in the administration of justice in local services.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is the farm community of Ontario that has probably suffered most because of the lethargy of this Tory government. Agricultural labour now forms only about eight per cent of the labour force of Ontario. Thousands of family farms have passed into history. The farmer's son has drifted to the cities to obtain employment in our factories. In most cases the farmer's son has had less opportunity than others to obtain a good education or to learn a trade; as a result, once there is a layoff at the factory, it is the farmer's son who is among the hard core of the unemployed in our large urban centres.

This government has not taken, and tragically does not give any indication of taking, bold overt action by means of regional planning or any other type of planning to assist the farm communities. Of the approximately 950 municipalities which are in the province of Ontario—I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is some

place in the neighbourhood of 973—most of their boundaries no longer bear any realistic relationship to local responsibilities and problems; producing, as a result, a multiplicity of municipal bodies, with fragmented authority and overlapping functions. The time is long overdue to really find the role and functions of local government and overhaul The Municipal Act and related statutes accordingly.

I know that the government set up a select committee on municipal affairs and they gave a very full report; but where, Mr. Speaker, is government action? The Speech from the Throne gave us 11 lines on municipal affairs, two of which told us that the new legislation will establish a development board as a municipal corporation to provide services in Moosonee. I am glad to see that Moosonee is going to receive some help. But I have no confidence whatsoever that this administration has any intention of going to the heart of the problems that face us in municipal affairs.

The present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is always telling us that he does not want to interfere with local autonomy. But, Mr. Speaker, this administration is always passing legislation that interferes very drastically with local autonomy that amounts literally to taxation without representation. For example, last year in this House we passed The Child Welfare Act, which made the local municipalities legally bound to provide certain welfare services and pay a share of the costs. The costs, so far as the municipalities are concerned, will be borne largely by the over-taxed homeowner. Much as child welfare legislation is needed, the cost should be borne by the province.

And even more recently, Mr. Speaker, some local councils wished to stack their present pension plan on top of the Canada pension plan, but along comes the present hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs—and I hope he will not be there too long—and tells the municipalities they just cannot do that, he will not let them.

Where, oh where, Mr. Speaker, is local autonomy in that instance?

So you see, Mr. Speaker, when the government wants to shirk the responsibilities that it has, it will hide behind that phrase local autonomy. But when it suits its own purposes it just could not care less about local autonomy.

So again I say to this House, through you, Mr. Speaker, that in The Department of Municipal Affairs we need bold action in order to get out of the oxcart age. We need stronger units of local government on a

regional basis so that we can co-ordinate planning and development of urban and rural land uses and interurban transportation; and all these other problems that a growing and complex society must solve if it is to give its people the standard of living and the services to which they are entitled.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly speak on a subject on which I have spoken on every occasion that I have had an opportunity on the Throne debate and that is on mental health. Practically anything to be said on it to this date has been said before, but I keep repeating it and repeating it, because I feel it is a matter of utmost importance that should be emphasized again and again.

As in other years, Mr. Speaker, I looked in vain for some word and for some hope in the Speech from the Throne that there might be a bold and vigorous plan to attack mental illness throughout the province. I made my first speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne in 1960 and at that time, and on every Throne debate since as well as on other occasions in this House, I have laboured away on behalf of better mental health facilities.

This government moves at a snail's pace in regard to the problem of mental illness. During my years in public life I am appalled at the lack of initiative both on the provincial and the federal levels of government. When the government in Ottawa passed its legislation which made possible universal hospital care, I believed that it was wrong not to include mental and TB patients in the scheme and I made no hesitation in saying that I believed that the federal government has a great responsibility toward improving the lot of mental patients. It is a problem so vast that it is time that all governments woke up to the extent of the cost of mental illness.

The cost of mental illness, Mr. Speaker, is simply tremendous. I have used the example before and I say it again. It is this: It has been calculated that the cost of running Canada's mental hospitals for a year, paying welfare charges for families of the mentally ill, plus the indirect cost of loss of earnings, family breakdowns, suicides, crimes and accidents, if eliminated, would wipe out personal income taxes for every Canadian earning up to \$5,000 annually.

I do not think that the public in general are aware of the fact that approximately half of the patients who are in our hospitals in Ontario and in Canada today are mental patients. It is time that we treated mental

patients on the same basis that we treat those who are physically ill; but today we spend one-sixth as much per patient on a mental patient as we do for a person who is being treated for physical illness.

It is true that the province of Ontario has done something on this problem; yet when one considers the need for bold action, it is shocking that no leadership is shown by the government of the province of Ontario. Neither the government of this province nor the people of this province have faced up to the fact that mental illness is the biggest single social and medical problem not only in Ontario but in all of Canada. In its various forms, mental illness keeps more people in hospitals than all other diseases combined, including cancer, heart disease, TB and every other crippling disease.

The time has come to treat mental illness on the same basis as physical illness. Instead of spending approximately \$5 a day on a mental patient and \$30 a day on the patient suffering from physical illness or injury, we can give some equality of treatment.

Perhaps when we can get rid of that monolithic pre-Confederation house of horrors at 999 Queen street we may be making a step forward. When you pack hundreds of people into a place like 999 Queen street west, Toronto, how can even the ablest of medical staff accomplish much? And believe me, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness and in all frankness, there are many extremely able and extremely dedicated men who work on the staff of our mental hospitals. I have always been impressed with the medical men working in our hospitals. I have always admired their dedication to their patients, despite the fact that the people of Ontario, through its government, give them very shoddy support.

You know, Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 200 people at 999 Queen street who are there simply because they are old and there is no place to put them. No doubt some effort is being made to change this, Mr. Speaker, but the fact still is that insofar as The Department of Health is concerned in this province we are crawling out of the dark ages. And what bold action do we get from the Speech from the Throne? We get this, under the word "health," Mr. Speaker:

The increasing involvement of the government in the varied field of health services has resulted in a complete reorganization of The Department of Health. Entering into this planning is the development of the administrative patterns which are concerned with co-ordination,

long-range planning and priorities and phasing.

Then under the title of healing arts, we get this from the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker:

It is the purpose of my government to establish a committee to inquire into all matters pertaining to the preparation, education, training, licensing, control and disciplining of all those involved in the practice of the healing arts.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is Tory mumble-jumble that we are going to do very little, if anything. Again it is the old story of staggering from expediency to expediency—and leaving the mess to posterity.

Mr. Speaker, I have one final item that I would like to deal with. I think it is important to all of us, not only as citizens of Ontario, but particularly as Canadians. Mr. Speaker, I was thoroughly disgusted with the performance of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) last February 3, when in reference to a speech by the Quebec Minister of Health, Eric Kierans, he said this:

If he makes any more statements of this kind, I would prefer he made them in his own jurisdiction. If he wants to commit economic suicide, he can go do it there.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, Mr. Kierans when he made a speech recently in Toronto, was referring to the American government's so-called "economic guidelines." Mr. Kierans said that such guidelines would have a disastrous impact on the Canadian economy. Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that Mr. Kierans was very much in the right; and yet here is our Minister of Economics and Development very much disturbed because Mr. Kierans' speech would be reported in financial centres throughout the world under a Toronto dateline and could be construed as having the support of Ontario. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, here is one of our own Ministers in Ontario all in a great sweat because a Minister from a sister province came to Toronto and spoke the truth and has probably disturbed the Americans.

Perhaps Mr. Kierans was indiscreet, when he wrote his letters to the American government, but I do not think that the Canadian nation will be very strong or last too long unless we have a great many more "indiscreet" Canadians from Bonavista Bay to Vancouver Island.

Our hon. Minister of Economics and Development, Mr. Speaker, thinks it might upset their applecart. Whose applecart? The

American applecart? Is our hon. Minister going to go tip-toe around saying: "Oh, gee whiz, do not upset the American applecart"? It would be high comedy if it was not a national tragedy.

Here are the cold, hard, economic facts that might be the requiem mass of a nation. Here is the proportion of foreign ownership and control of our major industries: Oil and natural gas: Foreign ownership—60 per cent (Foreign control, 69 per cent); Mining—62 per cent (59 per cent); Manufacturing—54 per cent (59 per cent); Pulp and paper—51 per cent (46 per cent); Rubber—88 per cent (99 per cent); Agricultural machines—47 per cent (54 per cent); Auto parts—90 per cent (97 per cent); Electrical apparatus—73 per cent (78 per cent); Chemicals—65 per cent (79 per cent).

Mr. Speaker, how can we possibly expect to maintain a Canadian identity, to seek our own individuality, if we keep selling out to foreign control—mainly the Americans? Take the rubber industry, sir, where 99 per cent is foreign controlled; we have hardly anything left to give away, let alone sell. It amazes me that there are Canadians who see no harm in letting our banks, trust companies, insurance companies, and our newspapers, come under the domination of foreign financial interests.

The hon. Minister of Economics thinks that Mr. Kierans is committing economic suicide. For a certainty, we will commit national suicide unless government, both provincial and federal, takes bold action, because it is just not a federal matter. Let us remember that Ontario is the most powerful financial jurisdiction in Canada, with the exception of the federal government. We could have a tremendous amount of influence in how our industries are going to be owned and controlled, and it is time that we spoke up.

Of course, we need capital—just as the United States of America needed capital when it started to build as a nation. The comparison is often made of how the United States needed foreign capital to build itself, and we in our time need the same. But the Americans never made the mistake of allowing their most vital economic establishments to come under foreign control.

It is one thing to borrow money by means of mortgages and bonds, and another thing to sell the equity, the control of one's resources, to foreign capital. Let us bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that even in a country like Mexico, where they want foreign capital invested and where sale equities do take place, they still insist that 51 per cent of a

company is owned by the people of Mexico. Yet we sit blithely back and say, "It is government interference."

Certainly, the American government, whenever called upon on various occasions, have not hesitated to interfere in many of the activities of their own companies. And whether we are active in provincial politics or federal politics, it should be obvious to all that if governments do not take bold action we will most certainly toss into the ashcan the efforts of Macdonald and Laurier, as well as hundreds of thousands of Canadians who have gone before us.

I am one of those people who does not want this country to be the largest in the world over which the Stars and Stripes is flying.

Whether we like it or not, it is obvious that a great deal more active leadership from government, both provincial and federal, is required. Some say it is interference with private enterprise. But after all, the American government, that great mecca of private enterprise, is not hesitating to interfere, not only with American enterprise in the United States, but in Canada.

It is obvious that the United States subsidiaries here are no longer profit-seeking extensions of their parent companies. They are instruments of Washington. The American Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Fowler, when he announced what has become the "guidelines," emphasized that international companies in the United States "had not only a commercial importance, but a highly significant role in United States foreign policy."

So, here we Canadians find that the bulk of our manufacturing, mining, and petroleum industries are foreign controlled, and now these foreigners who control us are ordered by their government to serve the aims of American policy and seek approval for the reinvestment of earnings, dividend and financial policies of their foreign subsidiaries.

All this theoretical nonsense about dealing with independent decisions of thousands of businessmen has gone forever out of the window. We are dealing with hard-boiled American policy. And I do not blame the American government. It is only reasonable that it would act in its own national interests. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that we Canadians started to act in our own national interests.

It is necessary to remind even the Tories that Sir John A. Macdonald believed intensely in the Canadian nation. Even Lord Carnarvon, who was the Colonial Secretary at the

time Confederation came into being and who is the man who first moved The British North America Act in the British Parliament, said this:

We are laying the foundation of a great state, perhaps one which at a future day may even overshadow this country.

Perhaps Lord Carnarvon at that time thought he was being kind to the colonial boys who were sitting in the gallery listening to his speech at the British Parliament. But the truth of the matter is—and I believe this sincerely—with our resources, with the extent of our lands and with the tremendous possibilities of our people, it is quite conceivable that in the not-too-distant future our capacities will greatly outdistance those of the mother country.

But if we are to do this, we have to show far more confidence in ourselves than we have in the recent past. We must make up our minds that we no longer are willing to sell our heritage for a mess of pottage and for a quick profit.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development who was a director of some American companies, says that any he has had anything to do with are efficient, they are up here, and they make a profit. They would not be here, Mr. Speaker, if they were not making a profit.

I do not object to seeing foreign capital here, but I object to allowing so much of it. It is a matter of degree. So much of it is invested in equities that we are literally about to lose control of this country. It may not happen immediately—it is not that obvious—but remember that in the history of this country, and virtually in the history of the world, the flag follows trade, and in trying to look ahead, in looking over 25 years or 50 years ahead, we can see there will not be a Canadian nation.

One of the saving graces we have is men like Mr. Kierans. I do not agree with everything they say—but certainly one of the best insurances we have today that there will be a Canadian nation is the fact that the province of Quebec is waking up. Some of them disturb a lot of us in English-speaking Canada, but it still may well be that what they are doing in Quebec will save this country because we have become so lethargic. It is just good for business. It being just good for business on the short term, is it good for Canada in the long term? I say that we have, both on a provincial and a federal level, been making a mistake over the last quarter of a century and we are continuing

to make a very serious and a disastrous error in our policies.

Mr. Speaker, what are we going to tell the rising generations of our own people—people we want to settle and stay in Canada? Shall we spend half a billion dollars each year to give them an excellent education and then tell them to go to the United States where the pay is higher? Shall we tell them to use all kinds of enterprise and work hard and build a business and sell out to the Americans or to sell out to the highest bidder? Is this to be our future or our vision of the future of Canada?

I think that this is simply not something for us to contemplate. In the old days, if they became successful they liked to go to London and get a title. While, of course, this has become nonsense, there are still a few people who do this, and it is a pity. I have often said the only title that anyone should get these days is "Lord Grand Duke of Bunk and Nonsense," because I cannot envision a red-blooded Canadian wanting to decorate himself with some fancy aristocratic title.

But maybe, Mr. Speaker, this is some of the illness that has perhaps retarded the growth of the Canadian nation, and that is our spiritual dependence upon the United Kingdom and our geographical proximity to the United States. These are problems we have to face. But the truth of it is we have actually come a long way and we could do much better if we would but will it.

I think that this is going to be an issue in our lifetime that we have to face up to. It will be decided in our lifetime whether we are going to have a Canadian nation.

It is not a question of being anti-British or anti-American. Let us face it, we would not be speaking here as free people if it had not been for the British people; and today our best defence are those people who are to the south of us. But remember this, Mr. Speaker, that when Thomas Jefferson was retiring from the presidency of the United States he advised his countrymen to "marry yourself to the British navy." Jefferson is the man who wrote the declaration of independence, but he was shrewd enough to realize that at that time, in his day, the most powerful and greatest protection the American nation had was the British navy. That did not mean he wanted Americans to become stereotype Englishmen; just as in our day the fact our greatest protection is the American war potential should not mean that we become stereotyped nephews of our Uncle Sam.

We serve ourselves best by being ourselves,

just as the Americans serve Great Britain best and help to defend Great Britain by being themselves and growing strong. By catering after old ways and taking outmoded steps and not being ourselves and not facing up to the world as we live in it, we will not serve the future generations of Canada or liberty in general.

I think it is shocking, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister of the government of Ontario would rather dance to the American fiddler's tune than listen to an outstanding Canadian from a sister province.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. Speaker, we needed in the Speech from the Throne strong evidence of boldness and inspiration. We received neither, and it should be the lament of all citizens of the province of Ontario. I think we in this province have a long way to go to give inspiration and leadership, not only to the people of Ontario but to the people of Canada.

As it was said in this assembly just a few days ago Ontario is in a very key position, just as it was in the days of Macdonald. Macdonald said what is good for Canada is good for Ontario, and I believe that is true in 1966. What is good for Canada is good for Ontario, and we here in Ontario have to take far bolder action and show far more interest in what is happening to this country on the economic level, because we are selling out for a mess of pottage. When we look in the years ahead we are going to regret deeply what we have done for the last 25 years.

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that from now on the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will bend more of an ear and give more of a friendly listen and follow some of the advice of men who are up to date and are anxious to preserve the Canadian nation.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, last week during the Throne debate my colleague, the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) dealt briefly with the ever-increasingly serious problem we are facing in regard to the pollution of our lakes, rivers and streams on the North American continent. I want today, sir, to expand somewhat on the other aspects of our environment that are affected by pollution and also present what action the New Democratic Party feels this government should take to deal with this most serious problem.

The pollution of our air, our water and our soil is becoming dangerous. Health hazards for humans and animals are mounting each year. We breathe filthy air; many of our waters are nothing but sewers; our soil is

being poisoned by chemicals; our fish and wildlife are infested by radioactivity and pesticides; we eat contaminated food.

Overall pollution of our environment is our major health problem in the coming years. What is the provincial government doing to cope with pollution? Next to nothing. The government of this province does not even understand the scope of the pollution problem.

Let me make it abundantly clear that in my point of view a demonstration of disaster is not required. We have learned enough from sources other than the provincial government to know that we have a stupendous, multi-million-dollar task on our hands.

What would it cost to clean up our air, our water and our soil? No one knows, simply because a concerted campaign against overall pollution has never been attempted. Ontario's losses from air, water and soil pollution amount to about \$494 per person per year. This figure, calculated, amounts to a total of \$437 million annually, the highest rate of any province in this country.

The biggest hazard of pollution is that we still allow sewage to be discharged into our lakes and rivers without adequate treatment. In many cases this poisonous sewage gets no treatment at all. The resultant water pollution upsets the ecological balance; it depletes the fish population; it makes our lakes and rivers unsafe for swimming, dangerous for irrigation and undesirable for recreational purposes.

Besides the pollution of water from human wastes the biggest offender is industry, yet I am not prepared entirely to blame industry alone. There are no laws setting effluent standards for industry. Since industrial pollutants are far more insidious than domestic sewage, their removal calls for specialized measures, measures we have not yet attempted to develop. Many industries have already started to deal with their own industrial wastes, but I maintain that all industries must be made to follow this example, either by persuasion or by coercion.

We know that 34 years from today our air will contain 25 per cent more carbon dioxide than at present. This enormous increase comes from burning coal, oil, natural gas and from the exhaust of millions of automobiles. This continuous air pollution will modify the heat balance of our atmosphere. What does that mean? It could mean a drastic change in our climate to the worse. What then happens? Nothing we do in the year 2,000 can stop this climatic change.

I concede to you, Mr. Speaker, that long-term air pollution does not necessarily impede

our health, yet it has been shown that the probability of death between the ages of 50 and 70 from lung diseases is twice as great for persons living in a polluted-air area, than for those who live in a clean environment.

Pollution is constant and much of it is invisible. Factories, furnaces, automobiles are constantly spewing harmful gases into our atmosphere. We cannot rely on shifting winds to protect our health. It is not that the Ontario government is ignorant of the dangers of pollution. It has been told, time and again, but has chosen to ignore the clear warnings by experts.

May I quote briefly from the bulletin of the conservation council of Ontario, of October, 1965:

In the long view of history something much more definitive than space and nuclear technology may characterize this period. Mankind has reached a level of population which makes it possible for him to change his environment on a scale never before known. What he does in space may be far less important in the long run than what he does to the earth, air, water, plants and animals which support his life on this planet.

Incidentally, the author of this quote is the United States Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to outline very briefly the inherent dangers of pollution to our environment. Let me now be more specific. I would like to suggest the following measures as the minimal effort of the Ontario government:

Unless the government wakes up to the fact that everyone in the province has a constitutional right to a healthy environment, it is gambling with the lives of people and animals. The role of all governmental authorities—local, provincial, and federal—in pollution problems should be complementary and mutually supporting. The Ontario government should work in co-operation with the appropriate American agency in the significant areas of water pollution to bring about more effective pollution abatement of downstream water use. In particular, I am referring to the multiple problems of the upper St. Clair River and its effect on the Detroit River. The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare has charged Canada with not being vigorous enough in its efforts to improve the situation.

In specific regard to air pollution, the special importance of the automobile should be recognized. Exhaust control systems on all new cars and trucks should be considered

as standard equipment. Conclusive proof is available from tests done in the state of California to show that the hydrocarbon rate can be reduced by 70 to 80 per cent and the carbon monoxide rate by 60 per cent. Regulations should be imposed which would require registration before new substances are added to motor fuels. Many of these additives are not eliminated by the combustion process and thus cause further pollution.

Precise measurements of the nickel and carbon monoxide contents of the atmosphere should be undertaken so that these can be compared with the standard value. We recommend that the Ontario government stimulate industrial development of more economic processes for exclusion of sulphur compounds from stack effluents. The Ontario government should encourage the development of atmospheric instrumentation needed for warning systems to predict strengths and locations of intense pollution in metropolitan areas.

The Ontario government should expand substantially its own and sponsored research into the acute biological effects of common air pollutants, and the effect on man and animals of chronic low level pollution such as domestic and industrial fumes, fallout, and motor vehicle exhausts. The Ontario government should establish a clean air Act, for the control of exhaust systems such as afterburners, to reduce the large amounts of unburned hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide that are now released.

Turning to the question of water pollution, I would like to quote from a statement made by the President of the United States:

No one has a right to use America's rivers and America's waterways, that belong to all the people, as a sewer.

This statement is in no way inapplicable to the situation in Ontario.

Within this frame of reference, the Ontario government should immediately encourage a group of federal, provincial and municipal officials to study all problems caused by outmoded, combined sewerage systems. This group should undertake an intensive study of the broad area of disposal of sewage, trash and garbage which would incorporate the use of the innovations developed in the technology of solid wastes. This agency should also consider the problems of sewage treatment and water supply as a single combined system. This agency should undertake an intensive study of the interaction between various disposal systems as they affect the interrelationship of solid, liquid and gaseous pollution of the environment. All municipalities should be responsible for providing a

minimum of secondary treatment plus adequate disinfection of the effluent.

It has also become clear, Mr. Speaker, that pollution can take many forms. The proper use of pesticides, for example, is not simple; and while they destroy harmful insects and plants, pesticides may also be toxic to beneficial plants and animals, including man. The Ontario government must recommend that measures be taken to ensure that continued exposures to small amounts of these chemicals in our environment will not be harmful over long periods of time.

The Ontario government should, through The Department of Agriculture and private industry, accelerate the development of improved equipment and methods for applying pesticides more selectively. We recommend that the wasteful routine treatment schedules of pesticide practices should be replaced by treat-when-necessary schedules.

The Ontario government should immediately urge the federal government to pass legislation regarding the labelling and packaging of pesticides to ensure public safety. In particular, I am referring to the use of spill-proof containers and child-proof household sprays. The Ontario government should immediately impose a legislative ban on the importation of any pesticides not already registered under The Pest Control Products Act, as it did in the case of the imported plastic cooling devices.

The Ontario government should appoint a permanent committee to study the development of new pesticides which are more effective and break down more quickly. It should also research the mechanisms controlling sizes of pest populations, to accurately predict pest population trends. Man is now able to change his environment on a scale never before known. However, unless he is able to predict the ultimate effect of these changes, and govern himself accordingly, he may find that the natural community will no longer be able to support him in the style to which he is accustomed.

As a result of this situation, we recommend that the Ontario government take the following steps in the area of land conservation:

The Ontario government should engage actively in the development and demonstration of new or better equipment and methods of the handling, treatment, and use of farm animal wastes;

We recommend that The Department of Mines take steps to improve the storage and turnover of junk auto steel;

The Ontario government should initiate

development and demonstration projects for new and improved systems of collecting and transporting solid wastes to show what can be done to approach the problem from other than traditional methods;

A tax should be devised to provide an incentive for eliminating the long-term storage of junk automobiles;

The Ontario government should improve its research facilities to include deeper studies of pollution on wildlife and fisheries directly and through their environment; it should also study the effects of common pollutants on beneficial insects, crops, forests, domestic animals and birds, and agricultural lands; this agency should make suggestions as to new or additional courses of action and it should report its findings annually to the Ontario Legislature;

The province should give leadership and provide the co-ordination necessary for the development of an outdoor recreational programme that will meet imaginatively the enormous demand for recreation expected in the future;

A provincial environmental quality survey should be instituted immediately which would provide information as to the average condition of the environment—in this way a basis for comparison would be established for populations under pollution stress;

We recommend that the Ontario government draw more heavily on the experience and technological skills of private industry in developing instruments and devices for measurement of pollution;

We recommend that every opportunity be seized to acquaint young people with careers in fields related to environmental pollution;

We recommend that the Ontario government be authorized to award, on a competitive basis, grants to universities and other qualified institutions for research and research training in scientific and engineering fields related to environmental control;

We recommend that the Ontario government be authorized to provide grants covering up to 100 per cent of costs to universities, or other non-profit institutions, for the establishment of projects devoted to research and research training in environmental health, science and engineering.

One of the most subtle and yet most dangerous forms of pollution is radioactivity. Much has been said but much less has been done. We are all familiar with the Elliot Lake situation. In fact, the Deputy Ministers' committee reported on the subject of radiological pollution in 1965. In this report,

they recommended that 10 to 3 picocuries of radium-226 per litre of water should be adopted as the initial objective to be attained in public drinking waters in the Elliot Lake and Bancroft areas.

It would be interesting to inquire as to the source of the Deputy Ministers' information, for I doubt the accuracy of it. I would now like to quote from a bulletin of The United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare—radiological health data:

Radium-226, one member of the uranium series, is the most hazardous, with a maximum permissible concentration of 3.3 pc/litre for the population at large. The 1962 public health device drinking water standards set the limit for radium-226 at 3 pc/litre for public water supplies.

Does the committee actually believe that the citizens of Elliot Lake and Bancroft have a greater tolerance level for radium-226 than the average American?

It is obvious that the recommended standards for healthy drinking water in uranium mining areas is not only inaccurate, but exceedingly dangerous. We recommend that the Ontario government take steps immediately to correct this gross error. We recommend that:

1. The Ontario government should install water-softening equipment in the appropriate uranium mining areas; this equipment has a 98 per cent effectiveness in removing the highly toxic and radioactive radium-226 from the drinking water;

2. The Ontario government should institute a medical examination programme for the people of suspected areas of contamination in order to assess the effects of such contamination;

3. The Ontario government should establish a radium monitoring network to provide needed continuous data on radioactivity contributed by uranium mining and milling operations; the purpose of this network would be to define both natural and industrial sources of radioactive pollution, and to measure either improvement or worsening of waters due to the continuance or abatement of these pollution sources.

It should be noted that the uranium-processing mills in the Colorado river basin in the United States have successfully maintained negligible radioactivity contributions through their efforts to provide proper treatment and containment of milling waste products.

I think that, from my recommendations, it is evident that an overall antipollution programme is not going to be cheap. I have spent considerable time finding out what other countries are doing. My recommendations are the quintessence of this research and I challenge the Ontario government to prove that pollution is not a problem.

Again may I emphasize that a demonstration of disaster is not required. Many kinds of pollution can still be prevented by employing ecological foresight. This, unfortunately, the government has not done. We need basic research, immediate action, and sufficient funds to deal with the pollution.

At this moment, responsibility in dealing with pollution is either non-existent or widely separated among government departments. In many cases of pollution, no one has been assigned to look into it. The result, quite naturally, is an inexcusable hodgepodge. From all these factors, one conclusion emerges very clearly: Every Ontario resident is affected by pollution, directly or indirectly. We are already certain that pollution adversely affects the quality of our lives. And I have great misgivings about the future, where pollution could quite easily shorten our lives.

In view of these facts and expert predictions, no government can morally afford to sit and await what might happen. Time has already been wasted. But if we start dealing with pollution today, we will at least have the assurance that our future is secured.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would repeat a quote by the President of the United States of America:

Of all the reckless devastations of our natural heritage, none is more shameful than the continued poisoning of our rivers and lakes.

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, I envy you your ability, when the House is in an uproar, to be able to stand up and bring the House to order with a whimsical smile on your face. I really do envy you.

I would like to welcome the two new hon. members for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) and Bracondale (Mr. Ben). I, too, came in on a by-election and I know how you feel. I welcome you and hope that you will enjoy the House as much as I do.

Mr. Speaker, a situation has developed that has to do with planning a community. There is an old axiom, which I learned from many years in the real estate profession, that has

convinced me that planning is for people. Planning a community is good; it is like rearing a child—you should not confine activities to such an extent that you stifle initiative, creativeness and intuition.

When you plan a community you must not create a monstrous straitjacket of limited vision; for if you do this, the natural growth of the community is bound to suffer. I believe that any community should be planned so that we will work and play and live and shop in one area. We now have a great problem with our traffic and I believe a planned community such as this would do a lot to alleviate the traffic problems.

We have a community that has recently gone through annexation, that has increased Windsor's population from 117,000 to 190,000 good people. We are on the threshold of unprecedented industrial growth. We are determined, as a people, to continue to capitalize on our strategic location to enhance the recently concluded trade pact with our neighbour to the south. However, Mr. Speaker, we are developing a serious problem in the area of planning the community's growth. The municipal government has allowed itself to be entranced by planned growth and a development programme which, in my opinion, will stifle our growth and our tremendous industrial potential in its envious stage.

Our municipal government has seen fit to import a planning consultant from Toronto, and possibly the basic problem is that he is too far from the city of Windsor since this man's place of origin might have deteriorated his comprehension of Windsor's desire to become the industrial giant of Ontario. This man has come up with a scheme that will place Windsor in a planned straitjacket. He has come to the conclusion that the growth in the city of Windsor, encompassing residential, commercial and industrial growth, can only take place in the most easterly part of the greater city of Windsor, which was formerly a vast expanse of vacant land in the east end of the former town of Riverside. He has convinced our planning board, and is coming terribly close to convincing the city as well, that there is only one area in Greater Windsor where future development can take place. The reason for this may seem plausible to provincial planning, since in that section of the greater city of Windsor we have a sewage treatment and a water filtration plant near at hand.

The argument, of course, is that the municipality's financial capabilities will not be strained in confining its extension of essential services to this pocket of recommended future

growth. The problem as I see it is that everyone over the next five or ten years wishing to buy a house or build a factory must build in this particular area.

Further, industry that wishes to locate in Windsor must locate in this confined area. Textbook planning principles must be fully satisfied with this constricted concept of growth, but I doubt whether industrialists and people wishing to buy a home can live in this straitjacket. The great danger here is that Windsor will lose a golden opportunity to provide the wide range of industrial sites with varied facilities that industry today generally demands. Industry's requirements are very diversified. There is a need for a variety of transportation facilities, including railway sidings; motor transport facilities, with the highway and thoroughfares to provide easy access and egress from planned sites; water shipping facilities with warehousing and docks near at hand. Mr. Speaker, if this area is planned as such it will not provide these amenities. This wide range of facilities cannot possibly be provided in the little pockets located by our Toronto planning consultant. The danger is even more pronounced when we reflect on the distinct possibility of a small handful of even two or three enterprising developments acquiring the land in this restricted development area for residential construction.

Now under these conditions, do you control the price at which houses will be sold to the ultimate purchaser? Is it proper to plan a planning concept of this kind to create a monopoly in the sale of future homes and industrial sites? This frightening desire on the part of the government to control every last vestige of a free citizen's choice of a place to live, work and play is sometimes carried to extremes.

I am sure that unless the Windsor civic government examines itself it might be denying the very freedom that Canadians have a right to expect.

How do planners with this concept of development hope to assimilate, in one pocket of a little community, people who have a variety of cultural, financial and social backgrounds? Surely they must consider the point that people have the right to build their homes in an environment which is compatible with their background. Surely these planners cannot expect to force everyone over the next 15 years or so to move into only one restricted area of his choice.

The city of Windsor has made tremendous strides during the last three years and the future certainly looks bright. The former

administration of Mayor Michael Patrick led the groundwork for this potential growth. The Windsor *Daily Star* has been a potent force in welding the community into one vibrant unit and the Greater Windsor foundation, which is a grassroot citizenship to which most of our influential and ambitious citizens belong, has established an atmosphere in Windsor that gladdens the hearts of everyone who can recall the dejected spirit of the people of the city of Windsor during the middle fifties.

Mayor John Wheelton and his new administration have the ability and the know-how to carry the city through to a glorious future. I sincerely hope that under John Wheelton's leadership the city council will not accept a development plan which will stifle the future growth of Greater Windsor.

There is an alternative to this planning straitjacket that is looming on our horizon, and that alternative must be found in order to make it possible for an industry to decide tomorrow, for example, to locate in a great industrial area around the Detroit River which was formerly the town of Ojibway; or for that matter to use the many industrial sites in the west end of the city. The need at the moment which threatens the prospect of such a development taking place in the west end of our city is a lack of a sewage treatment plant and other municipal services.

Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of financing for capital works Windsor was forced last year to put its funds in an interceptor sewer that cost approximately \$2 million. This interceptor sewer will not be used until the year 1968. We have, you might say, buried into the ground, for four years, \$2 million at six per cent; which is \$120,000 a year over four years, which is almost \$400,000 wasted.

This is my money, your money and somebody else's money! Surely we can get a system of planning that will bring these interceptor sewers and plants into focus at the same time so we do not waste this money.

The city of Windsor has come through a difficult period of financial stabilization. A large debt has been reduced to the point where Windsor's per capita debt is one of the lowest in the province of Ontario; and possibly for that matter in all of Canada. Its credit rating is one of the very best. To maintain proper municipal physical policy it is absolutely essential that the city of Windsor place a ceiling on its capital works programme; or in other words the creation of new debts to finance the construction of sewer treatment plants, arterial roads and

all that goes with the development of a progressive community.

Windsor must not be left to handle this problem alone. The alternative to this restriction on the creation of capital debt is in my opinion provincial assistance. The Ontario water resources commission is ideal in playing a part in such a plan. Many communities in Ontario I am sure can use an expanded financial participation plan for the development of services under the sponsorship of the OWRC.

At the present time the commission is restricted, as I understand it, to the financing and operation of sewage treatment plants, interceptor and water filtration plants and other works for municipalities. Even today the limited services which the commission is empowered to handle are reluctantly accepted by the Ontario municipalities. My hope would be that legislation would be brought in to extend and broaden these services.

I understand now that there is a third plan for municipalities such as this to finance and I quote:

In August, 1965 a new provincial financial arrangement was extended to include sewage works as well, both on an area and an individual municipality basis. This will mean that sewage will be accepted and treated at provincially owned plants with a charge levied on the basis of volume. Some of the advantages of this new programme will be immediately apparent. No capital debt as such will have to be undertaken by a municipality. This will be recovered over the years through the water and sewage rates based on usage.

Another major benefit arising from this programme is that the province may construct oversize works, depending on the anticipated growth of the municipality. The cost of oversizing will be carried by the province until the added capacity is utilized.

Through the development of such a project, on an area basis, the benefit to any individual municipality will be greater since the cost of the works will be amortized over a longer number of years.

Furthermore, it will mean that the earlier problems experienced with respect to compromises in the degree of necessary treatment and type of construction will be eliminated. The certainty that this system of financing will give a new stimulus to the construction of water supply and pollution control works in the province is evident

from the fact that almost 100 applications have been received from municipalities desirous of entering into this arrangement.

Only the small municipalities will accept the rather stringent set of rules set down by the commission. The larger municipalities that can sell debentures at approximately the same cost that the commission charges for its financing refuse to participate with the commission in sewage works. I think with this new plan that the larger municipalities will be enticed to come into this plan of financing. The reason for this, I believe, is because of the unrealistic policy of the Ontario water resources commission to charge the municipalities not only the cost of retiring debt but operating costs and administrative expenses in addition, and insist on charging municipalities for the creation of a sinking fund or depreciation reserve for replacement.

The requirements of the municipality to pay into this reserve fund is so high that it discourages all municipalities who have the ability to sell debentures in the open market at a reasonable rate of interest. With this policy, the commission has the effect also of requiring today's citizens not only to pay for the construction of the facility which it finances, but also to establish a reserve for replacement at some time in the future.

The period for replacement in some cases is unrealistic in that it is set for much too brief a period. I urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to establish a committee to study this set of rules, so that the commission can play a more successful role in providing the finances for construction of sewage plants and other sewage facilities throughout the province. That again is where I think this third plan will be very good for larger municipalities.

The pollution of our waters is one of the important problems facing the province today. Surely we cannot let this condition continue. We have an obligation to future generations who will inherit a terrible situation unless this water pollution is cleaned up at a rapidly accelerated rate.

In my home town, such a change in Ontario water resources commission policy would undoubtedly be received with open arms. This would permit Windsor to complete the second sewage treatment plant in the west end of the city, together with an interceptor sewer serving the former town of Ojibway, those parts of Sandwich West, Sandwich East and Sandwich South, which have recently been annexed to the city of Windsor, and that part of Sandwich West

which has remained as a separate municipality, with the sewer service required to permit immediate development.

I am not advocating a plan of uncontrolled growth. I would certainly recommend strongly that the need be shown for these facilities before these large expenditures on sewerage works and roads is permitted. However, if that need is evident, the inability of the local municipality in financing these tremendous projects should not be inhibited. Let us not be timid, sir, about extending financial assistance to these municipalities. We all know a system can be devised whereby these loans by the commission to the local municipalities can be paid back. It is only necessary that the term of repayment is not restricted to an unrealistic short period of time. There is immediate need to get on with the solution to this problem of growth.

In Windsor, it is of prime importance that this problem be treated as one of extreme urgency. Opportunities for industrial growth must be encouraged. I am anxious that people in my constituency and in all Greater Windsor are permitted to take advantage of this opportunity for industrial growth—to enable the young children of today to find a future in the industrial expansion of Canada in their own neighbourhood, rather than finding it necessary to scatter to all corners of the country.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in the Throne debate, it is always traditional that one conveys to the Speaker the congratulations and best wishes of the House for the fine manner in which he conducts the affairs from time to time. I will not say any more about that, other than I want to be associated with all the remarks that have been made by hon. members in that connection. I do this to avoid repetition.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Bracadale (Mr. Ben) on their respective elections to this House. I also pay tribute to the voters in those ridings, because I think they exercised wise and very deliberate judgment on those occasions, and I am sure that the hon. members will, as representatives of those ridings, contribute a great deal to the affairs and to the goings-on in this House.

I also want to pay my respects to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I think it is traditional that these two people are given this role. They are

bright young lights who are showing lots of potential within the party. In this sense, I want to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder, because we will be watching them very closely from here on in.

I want to deal with a number of things this afternoon. Before I get into the main body of my speech, I would like to comment on two or three things that have been brought up from time to time by hon. members in the Throne debate.

The one that is of particular interest to me at this point, is the matter brought up by the hon. member for London South (Mr. White), in regard to disabled pensions. Over the course of my office in this House, I have had occasion to encounter a number of people who have made application for disabled persons' allowance, and I am always amazed at the degree of disability required before one is able to actually qualify for disabled pension.

As the hon. member for London South very aptly pointed out, one almost has to be disabled to the point of not being able to lift a hand, or I think as he put it, flutter an eyelid. In my mind, this is wrong. I think this government should approach Ottawa and do everything possible to encourage them to loosen the reins and perhaps bring in an amendment to the Act, in order that the stringent regulations as they apply to the disabled persons' allowance would become more relaxed, making it easier for some of these people to qualify for such a pension.

The other thing I want to mention is in connection with my hon. friend's remarks—from Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), I believe. He was talking about a number of things, but the one item I want to make reference to is his remarks about education. I say at this point that I agree with his educational theories. I think they are valid and I just want to make that point. As far as I am concerned, the schools have failed to take full account of the evidence which shows that many children can learn both at an earlier stage and more rapidly than the school assumes, provided we are prepared to be flexible in our methods and arrangements for learning. It is particularly clear that there are very few programmes in Canada extending from kindergarten through university which really challenge gifted students.

The secondary schools have traditionally had a strong academic bias and a tendency to regard vocational training as second-class education. Consequently, it is not surprising that we ignored the changes taking place in

the labour force until it was brought forcibly to our attention that school dropouts simply were not employable, and that schools were not providing enough highly trained graduates.

I want to turn to another facet of the educational structure, and this deals particularly with the capital grants as they apply to the building of new schools.

It has been said that taxes are not a penalty, but rather a system by which we agree to pool our resources and public spending to buy those services which we can more efficiently purchase as a group. Because of the mobility of people, a situation has emerged where a high percentage of the labour force may be resident in one municipality and employed in another. This creates a situation where the industrial and commercial tax base in a municipality may bear no relationship to the services required for the people by the municipality.

This inequitable tax base results in the inequitable tax burden as between municipalities. The same mobility of people creates concentration of requirements for educational facilities in areas without corresponding concentration of assessment.

It has been the case for a number of years that the biggest single item on one's tax bill is education. This has been so for some years, as I say, but the squeeze continues to get tighter and tighter. The cost of education continues to spiral and this has created real problems for the municipalities. The municipalities have been crushed underneath the load. This has resulted, from time to time, in many people suggesting that the government take over the entire cost of education. Indeed, the Ontario federation of agriculture has taken the position that property should bear the cost of services to property, and that people should bear the cost of services to people. The claim is made that each year real property becomes less representative of the total income-producing wealth of the nation. Of course this would mean that property would be relieved of the burden of paying for educational costs and that senior levels of government should bear the burden of the educational costs.

Without arguing the pros and cons of this particular situation, I want to, as I said at the outset, get into the area of capital grants for school construction and the need for raising the limits. This point was particularly underscored last year—1965—because of the high construction costs. The unemployment rate was at its lowest in years. All the contractors had more than they could do, to the point

where in many cases only one construction company offered to bid on a school construction project. I know this was the case in my own area, and I am sure it applied right across the province.

In the Budget this has been partly recognized. There will be an approximate 50 per cent increase in spending for education. Education takes the largest share of revenue derived from the increase in taxes—nearly \$158 million. The budget of The Department of Education will reach \$575.5 million. Much of the money will be used to increase grants to school boards by \$52.4 million, partly to pay for increases in the government grant formula announced a few weeks ago.

The province will also set aside the entire proceeds of the Canada pension plan contributions for investment in educational facilities and aid to municipalities. This means that, on top of the direct provincial grants, universities and school boards will share in a \$267 million bonanza of low-interest loans from the Canada pension plan fund. The \$267 million is expected to be available in each of the next ten years, as the pension plan builds up contributions to be paid out in the future.

As I understand it, Ontario can borrow from the fund at an interest rate equal to the rate the federal government pays on long-term securities. Apparently the government is going to lend the money to the universities and to the school boards, at about the same rate that it pays. This would mean that the government would be lending the money out at roughly 5.4 per cent a year, or about one per cent below what they can borrow the money at now. This could possibly lead to lower interest on debentures for other purposes.

Large amounts of money will be required for construction of educational facilities for elementary and secondary schools as well as universities—a well-established factor. If these funds are made available to municipalities and school boards then they will be able to plan their capital programme in a more effective manner.

When one looks at the future budgetary needs of the province, it is perfectly evident that the pattern of budget requirements for education fits very well with the development of the Canada pension plan. This will tend to relieve the terrific burden on the municipalities for educational costs. However, all these things will only allow the school board to cope in part with the ever-increasing cost of operation. Let us study the present situation, as it applied in 1965.

There was a capital grant of \$20,000 per classroom, with the school board obtaining only a percentage of that \$20,000. For the sake of example, let me use my own area. The percentage, as applied to the \$20,000 capital grant, was 80 per cent. This means that the highest possible grant that would be available would be \$16,000—80 per cent of \$20,000. This percentage is arrived at by considering a number of factors, such as the basic tax relief grant, the equalization grant, and the capital grant.

Once again using my area as an example, this year I was told that the average cost per classroom was \$31,000. This meant, in effect, that the capital grant from the department took care of only 50 per cent of the cost of constructing a classroom. This means also that the burden placed on the local municipality in this kind of situation is almost intolerable.

The fact is that the authority to raise the limit rests entirely with the Minister. The last time that this grant was raised, according to my information—and, Mr. Speaker, I should point out at this juncture that I called The Department of Education and inquired about this matter—it was approximately 1946. Costs have risen tremendously since that time—it goes without saying.

Let me quote a few statistics since 1961 to illustrate my point. These figures were obtained in the DBS reports, business and finance division, operation section: In 1961, the labour content for construction of public buildings in the province of Ontario was \$172,666,000. In 1965, the labour content in the construction of public buildings in Ontario, accounted for \$208,145,000, or an increase of 17.3 per cent in labour costs in the five-year period.

The other components in assessing building costs, namely, the cost of materials used, amounted to \$1,077,333,000 in 1961 as it related to the construction of public buildings. In 1965, the cost of materials used accounted for \$1,577,175,000—or an increase of 34 per cent in the last five years. This means that the total cost of constructing public buildings has risen 51.3 per cent in the last five years. That being so, then it certainly follows that there has been a drastic increase in construction costs, both in terms of labour content and cost of materials used since 1946—the last time the ceiling capital grants were raised.

Let me underline this matter by reading to you from a letter which I received from the Culross-Teeswater school area board.

This board is in my own area. It was one of the many representations that I have had from time to time in this connection. I want to read from the letter. Mr. Speaker, I should point out that the Culross-Teeswater school board was involved in the construction of a new school this year.

Approval has been received from The Department of Education of grants to the amount of \$237,556 for construction of a new 11-room classroom school, plus one general purpose room, for a total of 12 rooms. The architect's final debenture estimate, including full contract price, architect's fees, furniture, contingencies, and so on, was \$326,297. The lowest of three tenders, open November 9, 1965, was \$398,000. Other tenders were \$419,500 and \$430,198. The major problem the board is confronted with is a definite need for improved classroom and playroom facilities, plus the fact that the Culross school area board is in a low-assessed district with the main source of taxation revenue derived from farm and residential assessments. The total assessment—

and I am still quoting from the letter:

The total assessment for 1965 taxes is \$2,287,293.53, which means that one mill will raise approximately \$2,200. The present mill rate is 14 mills for a farm and residential, and 16 mills for business and commerce.

Now if the board were to accept the above-mentioned tender, it would mean that the total elementary school mill rate would increase from 20 to 22 mills if the present grant system is continued. In the opinion of the board, this figure is excessively high even with the cost stretched over 20 years which is the term customarily used for debentures.

We, the board of trustees of the Culross-Teeswater school area, do therefore request The Department of Education of Ontario that immediate consideration be given at the January session of the legislative assembly to the increasing of the amounts of grants per classroom approved by The Department of Education for school construction in comparison with the continual increasing costs of construction in order that costs of elementary education can be kept at a reasonable level.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it is redundant for me to elucidate any further. The matter was very clearly and accurately stated in the letter from the board.

In addition, however, I would like to point out that from 1946 to 1959 the municipal tax load had moved from \$13.9 million to \$42,290,000, an increase of more than 200 per cent in 13 years. During the same 13-year interval, the net income from farming operations registered an overall increase of 29 per cent, so you can see the situation, Mr. Speaker.

I am urging that something be done to rectify, at least in part, this type of situation. Whether this can be done by simply upping the maximum from \$20,000 to \$30,000, or thereabouts, or whether some change is needed in the entire grant structure, I am not prepared to say. It is a very complex and complicated area, so it follows that a layman in these matters cannot set out in precise terms what should be done. There are so many formulae involved in the establishment of a grant structure that it is impossible for anyone, except the experts in The Department of Education, to figure out the basis and the mechanics upon which the desired results should be achieved.

However, of one thing I am sure: Something must be done in the way of alleviating the financial burden on the municipalities for educational purposes. I therefore urge the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis)

to give this matter his immediate attention, commensurate with the urgency and the importance of the matter.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I would like to proceed with second readings, from orders No. 6 to 12 on the order paper—and second readings of the private bills. We will deal with private members' business between 5 p.m. and 6 p.m.

In the evening we will go into the estimates of the Provincial Auditor, the Lieutenant-Governor, myself, and The Department of Reform Institutions. When I say myself, I mean The Department of the Prime Minister.

Following The Department of Reform Institutions will be The Departments of Highways, and Tourism and Information. I will arrange for this list to be given to the Whips.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario

Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Third report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Reuter	741
Third report, standing committee on standing orders and printing, Mr. Ewen	741
Reading and receiving petition	741
City of Hamilton, bill respecting, Mrs. Pritchard, first reading	741
Statement re retail sales tax on construction contracts, Mr. Allan	742
Statement re mass picketing at Tilco Plastics Ltd., Peterborough, Mr. Wishart	742
Parole Act, bill to amend, Mr. Grossman, second reading	743
Grand River conservation authority, bill to establish, Mr. Simonett, second reading	743
Kenora Rink Company Ltd., bill respecting, Mr. Gibson, second reading	743
Toronto aged men's and women's homes, bill respecting, Mr. A. F. Lawrence, second reading	743
Strathroy-Middlesex general hospital, bill respecting, Mr. Olde, second reading	749
City of Port Arthur, bill respecting, Mr. Freeman, second reading	749
Huntington University, bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, second reading	749
Guelph district board of education, bill to establish, Mr. Worton, second reading	749
L'Institut Canadien Français de la cité d'Ottawa, bill respecting, Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence, second reading	749
Town of Thorold, bill respecting Mr. Morningstar, second reading	749
Gananoque high school district, bill respecting, Mr. Apps, second reading	749
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Yakabuski, Mr. Smith, Mr. Boyer	749
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Boyer, agreed to	758
On notice of motion No. 7, Mr. Worton, Mr. Kerr, Mr. S. Lewis, Mr. Singer, Mr. Eagleson, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Roberts	758
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Cowling, agreed to	769
Recess, 6 o'clock	769

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's third report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the Greater Niagara general hospital;

Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the town of Weston;

Bill Pr20, An Act respecting the police village of Baden;

Bill No. Pr22, An Act respecting the board of education for the city of London.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr17, An Act respecting the Canadian national exhibition association;

Bill No. Pr29, An Act respecting the Excel-sior Life Insurance Company;

Bill No. Pr34, An Act respecting the city of Sudbury.

As the following bill has been withdrawn, your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted:

Bill No. Pr13, An Act respecting the township of Michipicoten.

Mr. D. W. Ewen (Wentworth), from the standing committee on standing orders and printing, presented the committee's third report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee recommends that the petition of the corporation of the city of Hamilton relating to the proposed Salada planetarium be accepted and that for this purpose the provisions of Rule 66, respecting advertising, and Rule 63, with respect to time for presenting the petition and the time for introducing the bill, be suspended; special fees provided by subsection 3 of Rule 64, having been paid.

Clerk of the House: The following petition has been received:

Of the city of Hamilton praying that an Act may pass confirming an agreement with Salada Foods Limited and the Salada Planetarium Foundation of Hamilton.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

CITY OF HAMILTON

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have the answers to a question asked me by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) yesterday.

The sum of \$518,900 for advertising, informational literature, application cards, return postage and so on, has been approved by the Treasury board.

1. (a) Radio tapes were despatched to radio stations on February 10 and film was despatched to television stations on February 11. These materials were designed to communicate the broad outline only of the plan; (b) Materials were approved by the Minister on February 9, 1966.

2. Contracts with broadcast media were authorized at the end of December, 1965.

3. Material was produced under the direction of McKim Advertising Limited by Peterson Productions Ltd. and Wilder Productions.

4. (a) The commission that accrued to the advertising agency for the referred to TV production was \$3,262.50; (b) The production cost of the TV commercials in question totalled \$18,485.19; (c) The total payment to Mr. Aldred for the five radio commercials employing his voice was \$400.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): How does that compare with the Canada pension plan advertising?

Mr. Speaker: The Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan).

Mr. V. Singer (Downsview): For \$500,000, they did not get very much.

Mr. Speaker: Order

Hon. Mr. Roberts: The hon. member is disappointed, I know.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement before the orders of the day.

Our sales tax branch has had a number of inquiries from contractors about the effect of the announced increase in retail sales tax on construction contracts entered into at fixed prices prior to the Budget announcement made by me on February 9.

The hon. members may recall that when the retail sales tax was introduced in 1961 there was a somewhat similar situation. On fixed price contracts entered into prior to the Budget announcement contractors would not be able to reimburse themselves for their additional expenditure due to the retail sales tax. The contractor is considered to be the consumer for purposes of retail sales tax. He is not in the same position as, say a retail merchant who collects the tax from his customer and remits it to the Treasury.

In 1961, we exempted such fixed price contracts which were entered into prior to the time of the announcement about the inception of retail sales tax from application of the tax. I should like to inform the hon. members that we propose to take comparable action at this time, so that construction contracts entered into on a fixed price basis prior to February 9, 1966, will give rise to retail sales tax at the three per cent rate. Contracts entered into after February 9 will be treated as ordinary transactions and contractors will be subject to retail sales tax at the five per cent rate with respect to tangible personal property consumed in the performance of the contract from April 1, 1966.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, I should like to welcome to the Legislature, in the west gallery, students from Gravenhurst high school, Gravenhurst.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I feel that the remarks I am about to make should be made to the House in the light of an article which appeared in the *Toronto Telegram*, the noon issue, today.

In that newspaper, there is printed on the first page an article with the headline "Pickets Plan to Defy Court."

The article reads as follows; it is headlined Peterborough:

Two hundred labour council pickets here are prepared to defy a court order limiting picketing outside a strikebound plastics plant.

The mass picketing is scheduled to start tomorrow morning, despite an injunction that states that only 12 members of the striking textile workers union can parade at the gates of Tilco Plastics Ltd.

The labour council has the full backing of Ontario federation of labour president David Archer, who led the mass picketing at the strikebound Oshawa *Times*.

This article attributes to the textile workers union at Peterborough an intention to openly defy an order of the supreme court of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I attempted to reach Mr. Archer and was successful in doing so only a moment ago. I spoke with him on the telephone and read the article to him and particularly drew his attention to the last paragraph, stating that this mass picketing is being done with the full backing of Mr. Archer.

I must say to the House that in fairness to Mr. Archer he says that he has not advised such action, and in our discussion I was able to say to him that I felt that no friend of labour would advise defiance of the law. He did admit that he had advised members of labour unions that they might hold rallies, but he was not in favour of what is called mass picketing, which would be certainly a defiance of the law and would amount to, I think, watching and besetting if nothing else.

However, I had prepared my statement after having attempted to reach Mr. Archer, and without success up until a moment ago. I prepared this statement and I propose to read the rest of it, having stated that I have now seen him and discussed the matter with him. I feel somewhat reassured from the remarks which he made and which indicated to me that he felt a responsibility in the matter and he would use his influence to exert that responsibility.

I say that no man who is a friend of labour would advise that the law be defied or set aside. All the rights which labour enjoys are protected by law and any action which would set the law at naught is the first step toward the destruction of the rights which labour, along with all other citizens, enjoys.

The man who would counsel that type of action, which is here indicated, would be no

friend of labour. If they were to take that type of action—as suggested in the newspaper article—I would point out that they are taking the first step toward destroying their own security.

In answer to a question from the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) on February 7, I indicated in what I hope was clear and explicit language the views of this government toward any citizens who would undertake this type of action. I repeat here, Mr. Speaker, that any person who defies the law or seeks to bring about disrespect for the judgment of the courts of the land is seeking, whether he realizes it or not, to destroy the society in which he lives and in which his own rights as a citizen are maintained and guaranteed.

It behooves every man for his own security, for the future of his children and for the reputation of his country, to see that the law is respected and obeyed.

Above all, it is the duty of the state to see that law and order are maintained and that the law is upheld. In this, the government has the right to expect the support of every citizen since it acts in the interest of all.

In order, Mr. Speaker, that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of any man as to our position in this matter, we have met with a responsible leader of labour and have indicated our express intention that any violations of the law arising from disobedience to the laws of this country, or the orders of our courts, will be prosecuted in the manner that our community demands. If any person shows contempt for our courts in these matters, he will be brought before our courts to answer for that contempt in the manner prescribed by our laws. Nothing less will serve for the preservation of the laws upon which our country has been founded.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Attorney General permit a question on his statement? Will he obtain and table in this House as quickly as possible a copy of the injunction to which he refers?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I could undertake to do that. I do not know how soon I may have it here in the House, but I will be glad to get it. That injunction is, of course, on file in the court where it was obtained; and of course it is a public document and can be seen by any person.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the hon. Attorney General.

In view of some pronouncements about an eviction order in Hamilton, does the same statement apply to threatened actions in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not know exactly to what the hon. member refers, Mr. Speaker. I can only say that the law of this land will be upheld.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE PAROLE ACT

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions) moves second reading of Bill No. 28, An Act to amend The Parole Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GRAND RIVER CONSERVATION AUTHORITY

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves second reading of Bill No. 32, An Act to establish the Grand River conservation authority.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

KENORA RINK COMPANY LIMITED

Mr. R. W. Gibson (Kenora) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr2, An Act respecting the Kenora Rink Company Limited.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TORONTO AGED MEN'S AND WOMEN'S HOMES

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr5, An Act respecting the Toronto aged men's and women's homes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in respect to the principle of this bill. To be consistent with the protests that I made in private bills' committee in respect of the principle enunciated, I can accurately and fairly say that at one time in the deliberations of that committee, I had won the support of my friend, the hon. member for St. George. He and I had agreed upon an amendment to one of the clauses in section 1, which was all but carried until

the hon. member for High Park (Mr. Cowling) came in. The hon. member for High Park is like one of the Bourbon kings; he neither learns anything nor forgets anything. He divided the committee on partisan lines and in the result a very unsatisfactory compromise was, in my opinion, reached.

If you will look with me, Mr. Speaker, at section 1, subparagraph 2 of the proposed section—the bill has only one section—you will see the matter that was an issue with respect of the principle of this bill.

This organization comes to this House and wants to acquire a grant of powers to invest moneys. Of course, the moneys that this group invests are, in every sense of the word, trust moneys, for their money is gathered, I suppose, from a variety of places including public subscription for the purpose of the furtherance of the objects of the corporate organization.

In paragraph 2 you will see that the organization wants:

—powers to invest and reinvest property, proceeds of real and personal property that come into the corporation, subject to any trusts in any manner for the time being prescribed by statute for the investment of trust funds.

2. In the bonds, debentures or other evidences of indebtedness, any company incorporated under the laws of Canada, whether such bonds, debentures or other evidences of indebtedness are secured or unsecured.

Those are very wide powers. I would submit, sir, that other evidences of indebtedness would include a promissory note, for example, which had no more guarantee than the assurance of the maker of the note that he would repay the money.

I would think that the affairs of the Atlantic Acceptance Corporation—which, of course, is in another field of corporate finance—are much too recent in the minds of all of us, and particularly in the mind of the government, to permit the grant of such wide and loosely phrased powers of investment as encompassed within the four corners of that paragraph.

Surely, when other people's money comes into the hands of trustees, there ought to be quite severe inhibitions about the type of security in which that money can be invested. Of course, that is consistent with the law of the land. There are several statutes in force in this province where very strict inhibitions are imposed by the Legislature, and have been imposed for many

years, upon the investment of trust moneys. I recall that the solicitor, a very alert young man from a good law firm, had as one of his arguments in protesting the adoption of this section, that some very good people make up the board of trustees, the board of governors or whatever the governing body is called, of this association. This argument, of course, completely misses the point. It is not the good people that presently run an organization of this nature with which we need to be concerned; it is the people who might gain control of its affairs, and whose identity, characteristics and qualities of discretion, honour and integrity we know nothing about.

It is for those uncertainties, after all, that legislatures make laws. In short, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that this Legislature, being entirely too conscious of the harm, distress and, indeed, the ruin that can result to people in our province from loose borrowing and lending practices as evidenced in the affairs of British Mortgage and Trust and Atlantic Acceptance, would want to go beyond that which is prudent and discreet. I have no desire, and I do not use the floor of this Legislature, to criticize civil servants, but the emissary that we heard from the Attorney General's office, supposedly stating the policy of that department of government, left many questions unanswered in respect of the supervision that the Attorney General's department or the Provincial Secretary's department exercises over charitable foundations.

It raises this question of whether the general law respecting the investment of trust funds is good enough. If it is found in the mid-part of the 60's that the policies of the Legislature enunciated in the statutes, The Trust and Loan Corporations Act, The Insurance Act and other statutes governing financial institutions, if they are no longer realistic or meet the needs of the day, then perhaps those laws need to be revised to some extent. But then, I ask rhetorically: If those laws are good enough, why should another group such as this—albeit it is a small group, carrying out very worthy purposes in the community in advancing much needed relief of human suffering and work toward the amelioration of the affairs of an important part of our community—come to the Legislature and ask for the grant of powers that have no limit and no control over their facility to invest? Examples were used. This paragraph would permit the investment of trust funds in penny stocks on the Toronto stock exchange, companies without even a scintilla of financial responsibility. I have

mentioned that it would permit the investment of funds on the basis of a promissory note.

You will recall, sir, that one of the things being investigated by Mr. Justice Hughes is the lending of some \$650,000 of Stratford people's money to the president of Atlantic Acceptance Corporation on a promissory note.

For the purposes of comparison, Mr. Speaker, will you look at the Strathroy-Middlesex general hospital? It is an organization from the very area represented by the first citizen himself. They come to the Legislature, they ask for a revision of their powers, and note the way they put it: The board of that hospital asks for powers that it may invest in such securities as are authorized by law for investment by trustees, any moneys that at any time come into its possession in connection with the hospital. That is all the Strathroy-Middlesex general hospital wanted—power to invest money along those avenues that the Legislature of the province imposes upon the investment of trust moneys generally.

Then why, I ask, should the Toronto aged men's and women's homes feel that the facility, the discretion, to invest trust moneys that come into its hands—as provided by the general law of this province—is not sufficient; at one time in the bill, indeed, the amount of power they wanted, sir, was unlimited. They had included power to invest in bonds, debentures or other evidences of indebtedness of any state of the United States of America. I wonder how the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) would feel about that one, when he is engaged in a programme dedicated toward the attraction of capital into this country. This small organization wanted to have the power to go into the United States and buy the bonds of Alabama or Nevada or Idaho, or Utah, to enumerate some of the states with a lesser degree of financial strength. The draftsman of it simply contended this: "We will go to the Legislature and we will ask for unlimited powers to invest these trust moneys."

They almost did not get the power, Mr. Speaker. As I say, my friend, the hon. member for St. George and I had worked out a compromise which would have given them the power to invest their trust moneys only in institutions of a certain degree of financial strength. We had arrived at that point—institutions which had proved their financial responsibility. Indeed, if you look at paragraphs 3 and 4 you will see that the powers limited in there appertain to institutions of good financial strength.

What will happen, of course, is that this will set a precedent for other charitable organizations to come to the Legislature and ask for similar powers. I have sat on the committee on private bills long enough to know that as soon as a protest is enunciated by a member of that committee, somebody gets up and says, "Well, you did the same thing for so-and-so a couple of years ago. We only ask for the powers that you gave the town of Duntroon or you gave the township of South Dumfries." And so it goes. Once the precedent is set, it is like the first set of tracks across the newly fallen snow. Everybody wants to travel down them. Indeed, the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner), himself, the most constant attendee from the Cabinet ranks at the committee, often faces this when he tries to protest a grant of power. He is met with the argument that somebody else got it, and often, as I told you last year, sir—and it continues into this year—I am the only friend there, who consistently supports him.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): He is a great snow tracker.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, he is a great snow jobber. Well, there it goes and I protest only that I took the time of the House only in order to be consistent with what I said at the committee at the first meeting. I should report that it was put over a week and at the first meeting of the committee there seemed to be virtual unanimity that these powers would not be granted. They were sent away to think it over and perhaps revise the thing. At the second committee meeting, Mr. Speaker, I did not anticipate the attendance of the hon. member for High Park who apparently—I do not think I do him a disservice; he did not pay much attention to the discussion, and I do not know if he was there at first meeting—but when we were working out the compromise to limit their powers, he suddenly intervened and the first thing we knew the committee was split in partisan minds. We and our friends to the left voted against this section. He marshalled the support of those of the same political stripe as himself and I said to him in closing, as I say it to him here: The private bills committee, after all, is the most democratic institution that emanates from this House, where often we do not divide on para-party lines. I voted against my Liberal colleagues there and I have seen Conservatives vote against their colleagues.

So I said to him, "You should not come here and divide this committee on party lines," and his answer—let us put it in the

record—was, "There is nothing wrong with that; it is all in the game." So I said to him, "Is that what we are doing, in attempting to carry out our responsibilities, playing a game?" And he said, "Yes, that is what we are doing, we are playing a game." So that was the fate of the deliberations of that committee.

In the final result, the Toronto aged men's and women's homes walked away with the grant of powers they had asked for. This grant of powers in the final analysis means that in respect to the trust moneys that come into their hands there is no limit at all on how they may be invested. They may invest them tomorrow in some penny stock in the unlisted market and when they are swept away and somebody comes along and asks the treasurer or the president, where the money went, the answer will be, "We invested it in Long Lost Echo gold mines and the company went broke. We did it under the power granted to us by the Legislature. We got that power from the Ontario Legislature and we exercised it. We have no responsibility to anyone when the investment turns sour."

That is my complaint, sir, for what it is worth.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): What section is that last power under?

Mr. Sopha: Paragraph two of section one.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, as usual I am not much impressed with what the hon. member had to say, and especially those lovely things about me. Really very fine.

Now this same speech was made in the private bills committee. I do not know whether the hon. member has ever visited these homes specified in the bill or not. I have. I am very familiar with them and I have had many friends and constituents there.

Has the hon. member ever visited these homes, Mr. Speaker? No, he is not saying anything; so he really does not know what he is talking about.

Now the people who operate these homes—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Did the hon. member say his prayers last night?

Mr. Cowling: Yes, I say them every night. Yes, I do. And I very often pray a bit for the hon. member, too, that someday he might see the light.

Mr. MacDonald: Charity begins at home.

Mr. Cowling: That he might see the light, I hope. I think we should all pray for him from time to time and I am sure that the hon. member for Sudbury needs our prayers from time to time.

Mr. Sopha: We all do.

Mr. Cowling: I know he does.

I was very much impressed by the list of Toronto citizens who take an active part in the operation of these wonderful homes. Now, the hon. member, I do not think he knows any of them; and after all, for him to be speaking with such authority on a Toronto situation is somewhat amusing, too.

The hon. member took a little dig at me and I did not mind it because it is all part of the game, about dividing the committee on party lines. I did not realize I had that much sway with the committee members, Mr. Speaker. I have not had up to now, so things must be looking better.

Mr. MacDonald: That is the truest thing the hon. member has said so far.

Mr. Cowling: Yes. I am going to say another little prayer for the hon. member tonight.

We heard the arguments; we heard the very reasonable argument by the solicitor representing the homes. I have every confidence in the fact that if given these powers of investment the people responsible for the homes would use it with discretion and they were not getting any more power than that which appears in many other similar bills.

Now the people presenting the bill were satisfied with the arrangements, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member who introduced the bill was satisfied with the present arrangements. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and his staff were quite prepared to go along with what they were asking in the bill; and after all, that is a pretty powerful array of talent advising the committee on whether to support the bill or not. I was quite satisfied that this bill was going to do what the people wanted done and yet not implicate the government in any way that they did not wish to be implicated.

Now it is interesting to note that in a bill following this one—I wish the hon. member for Sudbury would pay a little more attention, I feel that what I am saying is falling on deaf ears. I did not see him making any notes there.

In the next private bill we had, the hon. member for Sudbury made a motion and

almost all the members of the committee from all sides supported his motion.

Mr. Sopha: That is reasonable.

Mr. Cowling: Yes, it is very reasonable. So for him to suggest that the votes are always divided on party lines in the private bills committee is just ridiculous. I think if he would think that over tonight, during the late session, he would probably come to the same conclusion.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, this point has had very serious consideration by the private bills committee. No doubt we will be hearing from the hon. member who introduced the bill, but I would like to see it passed in its present form.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak against the passage of this bill on second reading, for the reasons mainly given by the hon. member for Sudbury. We intend to vote against it for the simple reason that in clause 2 of section 4 of the proposed bill there is no test of financial stability of the corporation in which an investment is to be made; and yet the bill does contain, in clauses 3 and 4, very realistic tests of financial stability.

If, as the hon. member for Sudbury has said, the matter had been allowed to continue in discussion in the committee I am quite certain that a test of financial stability would have been introduced and agreed to in clause 2 of section 4. But the debate was cut off and for that reason, and because the bill is inadequate as it stands, we intend to oppose second reading of the bill.

Mr. A. F. Lawrence (St. George): Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of the bill I first of all would like the House to understand my position. I am sure it is the same position many hon. members of the House have found themselves in, in the past, as the sponsor of a bill relating to an institution in one's own riding.

I may say I seem to have found myself in hot water in respect of the activities of the private bills committee over the last few years, so this year I determined by hook or by crook—I do not think I actually had to bribe our party Whip—but in any event I was successful in getting my name off the list of members of the private bills committee, just so that I would not get into any controversial item regarding any private bill this year.

When this organization approached me I first of all said: Well, is there anything controversial in it? On being assured that there

was not, I indicated I would be pleased to sponsor it; and now I find myself again in hot water.

But may I very briefly just say this: First of all, for some of the hon. members of the House who were not in the private bills committee this particular private bill came before that committee on two successive occasions, and the arguments that we have heard here today were very fully developed in that committee on those two meetings. As a matter of fact the wide terms of investment powers that were asked for by the Toronto aged men's and women's homes were in actual fact restricted by an amendment to the bill in the committee, which finally passed the committee.

On the first occasion that it came before the committee the committee felt that it did not have expert information before it so it held the matter over until the next meeting of the committee when we had before the committee the counsel for the public trustee. He pointed out—and, I think, quite rightly pointed out—that the terms of the bill, which we later amended in the committee, the terms of the bill were first of all approved by the departmental officials of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs; secondly, they had been very fully considered and approved by the counsel and the legal people in the public trustee's office; third, there is a restriction right in the Act, and that restriction is that all of those terms of reference are subject to The Charitable Gifts Act. So that when my learned friend, the hon. member for Sudbury, comes before the House and says that the people who have investment powers in regard to these charitable institutions can vary trusts, or if he leaves that impression, it really is a false impression. Because if a devise or a bequest has been left to this charity for a specific purpose or subject to a trust, they, of course, under the terms of this Act cannot vary the terms of that trust or vary the terms of that bequest and it has to be used for the purposes in the trust, Mr. Speaker.

Fourth, there is another restriction here, that is not in the bill but it is in the laws of the province of Ontario nevertheless, and that is that this is a charitable institution subject to the regulations under The Charitable Institutions Act. The counsel for the public trustee who was before the committee came along and pointed out that under the terms of that Act there is a paternalistic outlook from this government, and they do audit the accounts of all the charitable institutions under that Act quite frequently. I am not too sure whether it is twice a year, but it is

at least annually; so that there is that restriction on the investments that are made by this group.

Finally, may I say that I was rather worried myself with the wording in the bill, first of all where it says "bonds, debentures or other evidences of indebtedness." And, like the hon. member for Sudbury, those words "or other evidences of indebtedness" scared me. I think there were members of the committee who were quite aware of those dangers until it was pointed out to us that that is the phraseology and term that appears in all of the statutes respecting bonds or debentures. It seems to be a legal term that is added on wherever those words appear in regard to the investment powers of any institution.

Mr. Sopha: *Ejusdem generis?*

Mr. A. F. Lawrence: I am not too sure, but in any event it is there. They would have those general powers even under The Trustee Act in regard to bonds and debentures. Quite frankly, I think the words are meaningless, but nevertheless they are there; they were copied from the Act, from the investment powers which this Legislature has seen fit to give to a great many other similar charitable institutions. The same is true with the words whether they "are secured or unsecured." I believe that that again is a meaningless term. Perhaps one day we should look at these terms in all of our statutes to clean them up. They really are meaningless terms, because a bond or debenture, as far as I understand it in any event, would have to be a secured indebtedness. But the solicitor for this institution who was before the committee had very valid reasons for including those words. As I say, they have been given to similar and other charitable institutions within the past few years by this Legislature. I believe it would penalize this very worthy organization to cut down in a discriminatory way their powers of investment from those of other similar institutions.

Mr. Speaker: As many as are in favour of the motion will please say "aye."

As many as are opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

As many as are in favour of Bill No. Pr5, being now read the second time, will please rise.

As many as are opposed will please rise.

AYES

Allan
Apps
Auld
Bales
Beckett
Boyer
Brown
Carruthers
Cecile
Connell
Cowling
Davis
Demers
Downer
Dunlop
Dymond
Eagleson
Edwards
Evans
Ewen
Grossman
Guindon
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
(Scarborough East)
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Kerr
Knox
Lawrence
(Russell)
Lawrence
(St. George)
Letherby
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McKeough
McNeil
Noden
Olde
Peck
Pittock
Price
Pritchard
Reilly
Reuter
Robarts
Rollins
Rowe
Rowntree
Sandercock
Simonett
Spooner
Thrasher
Villeneuve
Walker

NAYS

Ben
Braithwaite
Davison
Farquhar
Freeman
Gaunt
Gibson
Gisborn
Gordon
Lewis
(Scarborough West)
MacDonald
Newman
Nixon
Oliver
Paterson
Racine
Reaume
Renwick
Singer
Smith
Sopha
Spence
Taylor
Thompson
Whicher
Worton
Young—27

AYES

Wardrobe
Welch
Wells
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yakubski
Yaremko—63

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 63, the "nays" 27.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

STRATHROY-MIDDLESEX GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr8, An Act respecting Strathroy-Middlesex general hospital.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF PORT ARTHUR

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr9, An Act respecting the city of Port Arthur.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

HUNTINGTON UNIVERSITY

Mr. Sopha moves second reading of Bill No. Pr12, An Act respecting Huntington University.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GUELPH DISTRICT BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr14, An Act to establish the Guelph district board of education.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

L'INSTITUT CANADIEN FRANCAIS DE LA CITE D'OTTAWA

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence moves second reading of Bill No. Pr16, An Act respecting l'Institut Canadien Français de la cité d'Ottawa.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF THOROLD

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr23, An Act respecting the town of Thorold.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GANANOQUE HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr24, An Act respecting the Gananoque high school district.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

Clerk of the House: The first order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. P. J. Yakubski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride and privilege that I rise to take part in the Throne speech debate of this, the fourth session of the 27th Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, it would not be fitting if I proceeded without first paying tribute to the magnificent way in which you have handled the affairs of this House since your election to that office. I feel that I can speak for all hon. members when I say that your conduct of operations here is beyond reproach. We are proud of you and I am sure the good people of Ottawa West are pleased with their hon. member.

I was interested to learn that when the third session of the eighth provincial Parliament was opened on February 10, 1897, a great engineer and gentleman bearing a Polish name read the Speech from the Throne on that occasion. Colonel Sir Casimir Stanislaus Gzowski had been appointed administrator of the government of the province of Ontario because of the absence and illness of the newly appointed Lieutenant-Governor, the Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick. In that capacity he was called upon to deliver the Speech from the Throne in 1897. Colonel Gzowski had been exiled to the United States for the part he had played in the Polish uprising of 1830. Twelve years later he came to Canada where he donated freely of his talents and energies for almost three generations. He, like the Poles all through history,

cherished freedom above all. To my knowledge, from the time that Colonel Gzowski read the Speech from the Throne in 1897, until the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) made his maiden speech in 1959 or 1960, no voice of Polish-Canadian extraction was heard in this Legislature. Now I am adding my voice to the proceedings here and I think it is pleasant proof of the great strides we have made in this great democracy of ours.

There is in this land and in this province, an opportunity to compete for a place in any field of one's choosing, regardless of race, religion or colour; whether it be in the political, business, educational or any other field. We have reached a point of accomplishment in that regard which other nations with a much longer history than ours are having great difficulty in achieving. In passing, I would like to add that this government over the past 20 or more years through its human rights code and the many other actions it has taken along these lines, has played a considerable part in bringing this about.

Mr. Speaker, back in the days of C. D. Howe and the great pipeline debate in Ottawa, in June, 1956, the government there was run by a few on the front benches. The private Liberal members were referred to as a "bunch of trained seals." They usually accepted a passive role. The *Ottawa Journal*—

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): What do you think we call you?

Mr. Yakabuski: Mr. Speaker, would you ask the hon. gentleman if he wishes to be cut down now or later?

Mr. Whicher: Now, by all means.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Yakabuski: The *Ottawa Journal* printed an editorial about this very thing entitled:

NO PARLIAMENT FOR TRAINED SEALS

on January 4 last. I would like to quote from that editorial.

The Liberal backbenchers will help neither country nor party if they accept the passive role. In their constituencies, in caucus and in the House, they should analyze and discuss policies so that the best can be produced. If they think all wisdom is found in the Cabinet room, they invite disillusionment and defeat in the next election.

Strangely enough, a short time after the federal Parliament opened in Ottawa in

January of this year, George Bain, writing in the *Globe and Mail* said: "Parliament's backbenchers are not backward in coming forward."

It would appear, Mr. Speaker, that the backbenchers in Ottawa have got the message. In this Legislature, our private members in the government have not been backward about speaking their mind. This is the way it should be. Our hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) only just recently assured this House and all the members of all parties in it, that anyone and everyone would have every opportunity to speak freely on all matters that come before this House. This is a right and privilege that I intend to exercise freely.

There will be times, perhaps, when I can make a contribution to the debate in progress. There may be other times when some, or all of the hon. members, will feel that I am contributing nothing. When we feel that the government is following the proper course, we will vote and voice our approval. When our conscience tells us it is not, then we have no alternative but to voice our disapproval in caucus, or on the floor of this House. I say "the floor of this House," because the Legislature is the greatest forum in all of this province and it is here that issues large and small, should be settled.

I do not agree with those who subscribe to the thinking that more can be accomplished in the back rooms, or by smiling and bowing to the Minister in the corridor or in his office. It is their right and their duty to speak loudly and clearly in this Legislature on behalf of their constituents and in the interests of the province in general. It is with this in mind that I ask the private members and the Cabinet members from eastern Ontario to rise and speak with one clear voice regarding the needs and the solutions of those needs in that part of our province.

On January 25 last, when His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor opened this session and read the Speech from the Throne, one of the first sentences that he spoke was: "To your constituents you have obligations—"

His Excellency, who spent almost a lifetime in the public service, both here and in Ottawa, knows full well what is required when one endeavours to serve a constituency well. He must have full co-operation from all the Ministers of the Crown, their Deputy Ministers and the senior civil servants or, for that matter, the entire civil service.

So I say to the hon. Ministers who sit on our front benches, I say to their Deputy

Ministers and all those who take part in the operation of this government: We have obligations to our constituencies; do not, for one minute, forget it. I have boasted that we have here in Ontario, one of the finest civil services to be found anywhere in any jurisdiction but, as within us all, perfection does not reign supreme. They have some shortcomings; they have some failings; and so have we. I say these things because there are times when we private members have occasion to call or meet with department officials in one branch of the government or another, in the interests of our people. There have been times—and I am happy to say that they have been few—that we do not get the type of hearing that we are entitled to. Rarely do we request things that are unreasonable and if we feel that they are, we do not press our point. We only request that which is reasonable and fair for the people who have sent us here.

The hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) has introduced a bill calling for the establishment of an ombudsman. I am going to support his motion, because I feel there is a need for such an appointment in this and the other provinces. In Sweden, where such a position has been in existence for over 100 years, Joe, as he is commonly known there, has wide powers. He has the power, not only to call public attention to malfeasant officials, but to bring charges against them in the courts. In Sweden, even mere rudeness constitutes malfeasance.

Because of the foregoing remarks, I would not want to leave the impression that I was speaking generally. This is not the case. But I do say to the very few to whom those remarks are directed: If the cap fits you, wear it, at least until we get an ombudsman.

The purpose of my comments is to make a certain level of this government that is known far and wide for being the best in its field, even better. Let us remember, good government deserves our support and that is the kind of government that this is.

A newspaper writer recently said that a member should concentrate on one topic while making a speech in the Commons or the Legislature. I think he was referring to a speech made recently in the House of Commons in Ottawa by the Hon. Davie Fulton. I can assure that writer that it is most difficult for a member to concentrate on one subject. We, in eastern Ontario, have many matters that require attention. It is my intention to touch on certain of them today, and to enlarge on them when the estimates of those departments are introduced.

The Department of Economics and Development is making progress in the war on poverty in our region. But we are impatient and feel that the efforts of that department must be stepped up. The Pearson government in Ottawa has bypassed us. It has forgotten us and the province will have to increase its efforts, because of the total lack of effort by Ottawa. When Pearson was dishing out his goodies last fall, he left little or nothing in eastern Ontario. When he was giving a rink to Vancouver, when he was giving yachting harbours to the rich, a causeway to Prince Edward Island, aid to the Canadian national exhibition, aid to the tourist industry in the Georgian Bay area, and a promise of aid to construct a civic centre in Ottawa, he gave precious little to the poor and depressed people of eastern Ontario.

Our department is aware that the solution to our industrial problem in eastern Ontario can only come about by this and the central governments providing us with and allowing us to use incentives. If Ottawa continues to renege in its duty, then we must go it alone.

Mr. H. Worton (Welling South): They will look after you.

Mr. Yakabuski: Do you want to be cut down, too?

Mr. Worton: Mr. Speaker, I am not worried.

Mr. Yakabuski: In the education field, things are on the move. A tender has been let for a new composite high school to serve the Madawaska valley. This will be built in Barry's Bay, which was the site chosen by the Madawaska district high school board. I am hopeful that soon another composite school will be built to serve the Eganville-Cobden area. There is a further addition being added to the Renfrew collegiate institute.

On the elementary school level, much reorganization and building has taken place. We also hope and pray that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) will have his eye on our valley when his community college programme begins to take shape.

Although our farmers have suffered great losses due to winter kill and a severe drought during the early part of last season, they are looking forward to a bountiful year. The assistance provided by this government in the way of feed subsidies to the farmers of eastern Ontario is greatly appreciated. There are now such things as crop insurance and other legislation affecting farmers under consideration. I am hopeful that this new legislation will be drawn up, passed and

implemented at the earliest time. The Department of Agriculture and The Department of Lands and Forests are working with our people on a variety of ARDA projects, which I know will be of great benefit to our area. Work on the Mountain Chute hydro project at Black Donald on the Madawaska River is progressing well. This will be followed by additions to the Barrett Chute and Stewartville generating stations. These projects are filling a twofold need; they are providing employment for some 500 men in that area, and are also helping to fill the continuing demands for power in this province.

The Department of Lands and Forests, as I mentioned earlier, is co-operating in the development of eastern Ontario in many ways. The ARDA projects underway and being contemplated are a good example, as is the new bill introduced recently to make private plantations more productive and profitable.

As most of the hon. members are aware, a great part of our area is dependent to a large extent on the products of the forest. With the advent of the Ski-Doo and other snow machines, a whole new winter wonderland has been opened up. But our lakes and streams will be fished as they never have been fished before, and I think the department should undertake an accelerated fish restocking programme to meet the new demands that will be placed upon our waters.

I am happy that the hon. Minister (Mr. Roberts) of that department has taken a personal interest in our wolf control problem. I had long ago decided that the wolf must go, that in this era there is no longer room enough for both the wolf and the deer hunter. I was a little disturbed when I read in one of our valley papers last week that the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) had stolen some editorial space from me with regard to the wolf control programme. I must assure that editor that the only reason the hon. member for Sudbury brought before this House the wolf problem before I did is because we allowed him to speak first.

I am sure that many parts of our area could again become sheep-raising country if the wolf was destroyed or pushed back to the wilds where he belongs. I have been assured that steps are being taken to meet and solve the wolf problem. I feel that part of the solution lies in increased bounties. Other means will also be necessary if we are to be truly successful.

Although we are making progress with regard to main highways, secondary highways, county and municipal roads in our area, I feel that the overall effort is totally

inadequate. In the western part of the Ottawa division, and in the Bancroft division, the planners seem to have forgotten us. When we consider how all-important a good roads network is to our development, I say that the people responsible for this oversight must be made aware of our needs. That I intend to do, when the estimates of that department come before this House a little later on. I have been preparing our case and I plan to go into the problem in detail at that time.

The Department of Tourism and Information is being of wonderful assistance to our people. I look forward to that department playing an increasing role in our development.

The Department of Mines may not be aware of it, but we feel that that department, too, can play a part in our growth and progress. I will go into that matter at a later time; I am, more or less, serving notice that the call will go out in due course.

I now make an appeal to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to reconsider an application made by the city of Ottawa for a children's hospital. We are not badly off as far as general hospital needs go in eastern Ontario. True, we have our bed shortages, a problem which is common to all parts of the country. But eastern Ontario is dotted with many fine little general hospitals. There are two in Pembroke, one each in Barry's Bay, Renfrew, Arnprior, four in Ottawa, several in Kingston and numerous others serving the general needs of the area well. I would like to call to the attention of the hon. Minister and this House that the people of those communities made great sacrifices in providing the hospitals and their additions. They did not renege on their local responsibilities in providing care for the sick. They had drives and collected funds and with some assistance from the federal government they built them and put them into operation. I had the privilege and the experience of serving on the Barry's Bay St. Francis memorial hospital board during the planning, construction and operating stages. I know what took place in my community. The generosity of the people was overwhelming; the sacrifices they made were unbelievable. Now we have a hospital that has been in operation a little more than five years, on which the debt is negligible. The same applies to all the other communities I have mentioned in eastern Ontario. You cannot say that for Metro Toronto. If this government had not provided special loans, the hospital shortage here in Metro would

never have been solved. The children's hospital for which the city of Ottawa is asking is not really a hospital for Ottawa; it is a hospital to serve one million people in eastern Ontario. This hospital would serve an area from Whitney and Mattawa in the north and west, to Belleville in the south and Alexandria in the east, with the heart and centre in the city of Ottawa. The children's hospital here in Metro is a great institution; it is famous throughout the world. We are not asking for a hospital on the same scale as Sick Children's in Toronto, but we do need a children's hospital to provide special and adequate care for infants and children, present and future, of eastern Ontario. Someone in The Department of Health or the Ontario hospital services commission suggested that we send those children in need of special care to Sick Children's hospital here in Toronto. That suggestion is utterly ridiculous. Surely the hon. members would not have our ailing children and their parents or guardians travel anywhere from 200 to 400 miles to receive special care. With a children's hospital in Ottawa none of our people would have to travel more than 100 miles with their child to receive this special care. Our request is logical and reasonable and should receive favourable consideration from the powers that be.

Do hon. members realize the extra financial burden we would be imposing on the low income bracket families of eastern Ontario? Are they aware of the extra cost to parents, such as travel, hotel, meals and all the other expenses involved, without mentioning the inconvenience of travelling the same long distances to visit their children perhaps weekly and over long periods of time?

The people of western Ontario are not required to do this. They have a children's hospital in London to serve that section. We need the proposed valley children's hospital in Ottawa to serve all of eastern Ontario. We need the valley children's hospital because the population of Ottawa itself is over half a million and is expected to double in a few short years. We are hopeful, too, that the population of the whole area will increase substantially over the same period.

We need a children's hospital because Ottawa can provide teaching and research facilities for medical students, student nurses and ancillary medical personnel of eastern Ontario. We need the proposed hospital because present facilities are overcrowded and most of the space devoted to

children is badly in need of modernization. We need the children's hospital because the care of sick children requires a concentration of specialized pediatric facilities.

Someone in The Department of Health or the Ontario hospital services commission suggested that children's wings or sections be added to existing hospitals in Ottawa. This is not the answer because we want to attract to Ottawa personnel especially trained in the care of sick children. Unless we have a full-fledged children's hospital we will not be able to attract the people and consequently our children will not receive the care and treatment that is their birthright. Surely the children of eastern Ontario deserve as good if not better treatment than the children of the central and western parts of this province.

A children's hospital will provide for our young, new and expanded services for the treatment of children: Outpatient clinics, emergency facilities, a research programme so that patient care is continually improved and updated; an adolescent unit, psychiatric unit for the evaluation and treatment of children with emotional problems; adequate play space and trained play therapists; a visiting teacher, equipment especially built for children and infants and geared to their needs; liberal visiting privileges for parents, encouragement for specialists in child care to settle in Ottawa; high humidity rooms, microchemistry laboratory methods, integration of services needed to care for the crippled child, the cardiac child and other such long-term illnesses; a tonsil suite and an intensive care unit; physiotherapy and rehabilitation services, follow-up and social service department and a dental clinic. Our people and children require these facilities and are entitled to them.

The central government in Ottawa will soon be providing funds for increased hospital facilities in this and the other provinces. This is part of a huge health needs assistance programme announced last summer. I am sure that the federal government, as bad as it is, would want a part of those moneys spent on a children's hospital in the capital city to serve all eastern Ontario. We have the moneys to offer the city of Ottawa to assist them in building a civic centre; true recreational facilities play a part in our overall health programme, but a children's hospital I feel is much more important than a civic centre. The council of the city of Ottawa passed a resolution regarding this request and I am sure every council in eastern Ontario, whether it be city, town, village or

rural municipal, along with every citizen in eastern Ontario, would endorse it.

I say to the hon. Minister of Health he cannot disregard the needs and wishes of so many people. I understand that a delegation, headed by the mayor of Ottawa, Mr. Donald Reid, will journey to Queen's Park in March to present the request regarding a children's hospital for eastern Ontario to the hon. Minister and the Ontario hospital services commission. My only hope is that included in that delegation will be the former mayor of Ottawa, Miss Charlotte Whitton. I am sure that if she is part of that delegation she will lend much weight to it and will have the request planted firmly and fairly before the hon. Minister and the Ontario hospital services commission. Miss Whitton has accomplished much for the capital city of this nation and I am sure that her support in this need for a children's hospital in eastern Ontario is of such importance to the area that she will support it and battle for it wholeheartedly.

The need for a children's hospital in Ottawa has been before us for some time. It has been kicked about by the department and the Ontario hospital services commission for too long.

I must apologize for the mayor of Ottawa because it is only recently that he himself has seen the need for such an institution. It is not difficult to understand that the mayor of Ottawa has difficulty in absorbing presentations regarding many of the needs of the capital city. You see he owes his position to the former controller and MP, Lloyd Francis. Lloyd Francis allowed him to become mayor if he would turn his coat in the 1963 federal election. He did so and consequently Lloyd Francis became the member in the riding of Carleton. As a matter of fact, the first Liberal ever elected in that riding thought because of this the mayor of Ottawa owes his very existence and a great debt to the former member, Lloyd Francis.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): He did not turn his coat though.

Mr. Yakabuski: He might just as well have.

Mr. Racine: But he did not.

Mr. Yakabuski: We do not want him any more.

Lloyd Francis was so busy trying to retain the riding of Carleton and stave off the successful attacks of Dick Bell that he had no time to make the balls for the mayor of Ottawa to pitch. Consequently, little has

been done about this problem until recently, until Lloyd Francis was ousted by a very good friend, Dick Bell, and now has time to make the balls for the Ottawa mayor to pitch.

I only say these things to bring hon. members up to date in the situation, to explain why there has been no great effort previously by the mayor in the city of Ottawa to obtain the hospital that we are requesting. But Ottawa and eastern Ontario need the children's hospital that we have requested, and because they may have a dense mayor is no reason why the city and all eastern Ontario should suffer.

Therefore I say to the hon. Minister: Sit down with this delegation from Ottawa, discuss the problem and grant them the request that they and all eastern Ontario are asking.

In summarizing my remarks I would state we have made, or are making, some progress in eastern Ontario. That progress is not rapid enough. If the federal government in Ottawa reneges in its duties to that part of the province surely this government will not; and that is why I call for a co-ordinated effort by every department of this government to bring eastern Ontario up to a standard par with the other sections of our province.

I am not going to talk about the Metro monster today, but I will some time later in the proceedings of this House. We know what the needs of eastern Ontario are. We have known them for some time and this is the third session that I have brought some of these matters to the attention of this House and the province. I am getting a little tired of people in the federal department talking about our needs in eastern Ontario, the needs of the family farm in eastern Ontario and eastern Canada. We all know what the needs are. Many of us had suggestions regarding their solution. I think it is high time that these departments and their Ministers stopped talking about what the needs are, and started formulating plans to overcome the deficiencies that exist in that part of our province and country.

I want at this time to congratulate the Hon. J. J. Green, who last December was appointed to the position of federal Minister of Agriculture. I said the right thing that time, did I not? Joe Green happens to represent, at least for the time being, the same riding as I do. I want to wish him every success. I know he will work hard to improve the lot of the farmer in eastern Ontario and eastern Canada. I extend to him my offer of wholehearted co-operation in every effort that he may make to lift up the standards of the people whom he and I represent.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, may I add my congratulations to the many other tributes you have received concerning your office and the manner in which you carry out your duties of controlling the debates of this House.

I would like at this time to express again my thanks to the people of the district of Nipissing in electing me to represent them in this Legislature, and to thank the hon. members from both sides of the House for the most courteous reception they have given to me as well as the help they have offered me as a new member.

Because you have heard on many occasions and at some length from my predecessor about the beauty and the potential of the district of Nipissing, I will dispense with the custom of describing my riding. I would, however, like to read in part from an editorial which appeared in the *North Bay Nugget* at the time of Mr. Troy's death.

Suddenly this morning the entire North Bay district and all of northern Ontario for that matter was plunged into the deepest kind of grief by the death of a man among men. Educationist, soldier, athlete and coach, legislator, a man of great courage and stamina, a fighter at all times for his principles, a devoted churchman and in all things a gentleman to the core.

The editorial continues a little further on:

As a young man he was a star football player and boxer and though of slight stature he never backed away from opponents of much greater size. And he never backed away from anybody during the rest of his life.

Mr. Speaker, in the next few minutes I would like to bring to the attention of the Legislature some of the problems I believe to be of importance primarily to the people of my area which are applicable to other areas in the whole province.

Tourism is the major industry in the district of Nipissing as it is in many other areas of Ontario. It accounts for a gross figure of just less than \$12 million in our district. Over \$4.5 million in American funds were cleared through the local chartered banks in 1964. The industry has depended upon the forests and the lakes of the area as well as the fish and the wildlife available.

Tourism industry growth, however, has not been keeping pace with the rest of Ontario and Canada. According to the economic council, the province as a whole is enjoying a smaller percentage of the American tourist dollar each year. This standstill in the growth

of the industry in our area, I submit, Mr. Speaker, is the result of three main factors. First, the lack of tourist promotion by the provincial government and the lack of co-ordination of the different groups in the departments of government responsible for this promotion. Ontario, Canada's richest province, ranks seventh of our ten provinces in expended tourist promotion dollars as a percentage of total expenditures, and ranks eighth in expended travel promotion dollars per capita.

Regional tourist promotion should be initiated by the government in conjunction with local regional associations. Each region should be supported financially to produce its own promotional programme.

The second reason for the lack of growth is the scarcity of capital available to tourist operators, at a reasonable rate, to improve their present facilities or to build additional and more modern units. Interest charged to the operators has been in excess of 20 per cent in some cases and rates of 10 or 12 per cent are commonplace. It is to be hoped that the Ontario development association, which according to the Throne speech will be established during this session, will assist by including the tourist business within the category of small business to receive governmental financing at a reasonable rate.

The third reason, Mr. Speaker, is the lack of development of historical sites and other attractions to hold the interest of the tourists in the area for a few extra days or to attract them in the first place. Local groups in the Nipissing area are now making moves to establish a replica of Fort Laronde in its historical site and there is a move to establish the old Dionne home at Callander as a local museum. This type of project should receive provincial help in its setup and in its financial projects. Local museum grants for the conservation and reconstruction of historic structures should be increased as recommended by the economic council.

According to the valuation of the economic council each increase of \$2,100 in direct tourist expenditure per annum appears to create one new year-round job in the province. The direct tourist expenditure in the Nipissing tourist region is just over \$12 million. Therefore it should create 5,700 year-round jobs in Nipissing. Obviously, since the Nipissing area is underdeveloped industrially and has a high rate of imported goods, most of these jobs are not created in our area but rather in the more industrially developed parts of the province. This is an economic condition which exists throughout

the north and among many other parts of the province that are dependent upon the tourist industry for their economic stability.

In our province the first legislation embodying the right to education for all was The School Improvement Act of 1871. Now, some 95 years later, we have not yet achieved in practice, what has been recognized as the right of each citizen for nearly a century. Equal opportunity does not yet exist across our province. In the rural and remote areas, such as many in northeastern Ontario, because of distances and lack of finances, facilities are not as readily available as they are in the urban and metropolitan areas. Formal learning and education have become an economic necessity in all parts of the province. The educational achievements of the people in northeastern Ontario do not compare with the provincial average because the right to education has been denied them by these reasons of finance and distance.

The provincial average of population with less than five years elementary school education is 6.1 per cent, whereas eastern Ontario has 10.8 per cent of its people in this category. The provincial average of people with four or five years secondary school education is 17.5 per cent; 14.4 is the percentage in northeastern Ontario. Across the province, 6.2 per cent of the people have some university training or a degree; in northeastern Ontario only 3.9 per cent are in this group, just over one half the provincial average. If present conditions are to improve, it is imperative that this government assume a greater proportion of the educational costs at the three levels, or devise a better method of support to local boards which would more realistically take into consideration the conditions which exist in different areas and under different systems.

In northeastern Ontario, examples of cost which provide unequal opportunities are quickly apparent: lower per capita property assessment coupled with higher costs such as teachers' salary schedules, which are in some cases \$1,000 higher than the Toronto area schedules. Recently some northern boards were forced to pay large displacement allowances to attract teachers. Not enough cognizance of these facts is taken when the department sets its grant schedules and as a result taxpayers pay higher municipal rates in these areas.

Student transportation in our area is another concern which causes inequality of opportunity. One community in Nipissing supports an elementary school with over 80

pupils but no transportation is provided for graduates to attend secondary schools located 30 miles away. After grade 8 the drop-out is more common than the child who continues to secondary school. In another sizeable community which supports two elementary schools, those students who attend secondary school are forced to spend three hours per day in buses. These children do not have an equal opportunity. Only the exceptional student is able to obtain passing marks and these few quickly become discouraged.

The department last year made it permissive for boards to provide up to \$3 per day for room and board of students attending secondary schools in lieu of bus transportation. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this be made available on the request of parents and that full payment be made by the department either to the board or the parent at the time the expenditure is made. Many boards could not use the present opportunity because they are unable to finance the cost while awaiting the departmental grants.

At the post-secondary school level northeastern Ontario was void of opportunity up until a few years ago when Laurentian University was established. At that time the Nipissing area was denied a university charter even though it could have served a wider area from the standpoint of location. At the present time a submission is being prepared for the board of regents recently established to select locations for the new so-called community colleges. This type of education is sorely needed in northeastern Ontario if equality of opportunity is to be available and if our area is to have a pool of trained people to attract much needed secondary industry.

In the field of agriculture the Speech from the Throne has outlined some help for northern Ontario but it is more general than specific. The farmers of both east and west Nipissing have suffered two non-crop years in a row. The drought and rain subsidy made available this year has been a small help to a large problem.

The fact that no aid was given to cash crop farmers has created great hardships for many people. The attitude of this government in this matter has been one of entrenchment regardless of the need or the problem. The discontinuance of government-guaranteed bank loans this year has partially defeated the purpose of the drought and rain subsidies. The establishment of a marketing board for the sale of bush lot pulp products would be of assistance to the small farmer who depends

on his bush lot to carry him over the winter months. Supply and demand have not set pulp prices, but rather the buyer unilaterally sets the price and the vendor is forced to accept.

The health services provided in Ontario at the present time do not meet the needs of all the people. For many the debate we have witnessed in this House over the past two weeks on Medicare, Bill No. 6, is meaningless. Regardless of its coverage, doctors and related practitioners are not available to provide the services now required. Just as some areas of the province are presently benefiting from an economic boom and industrial expansion, other areas are stagnant. Medical services are available in the booming areas and unavailable in many of the stagnant areas.

One community, sir, in the district of Nipissing, serving a population of over 5,000 people, is provided with no dental service and only two medical practitioners, both of whom are unable to practise full time because of health reasons. A good, well-run hospital is available but operates far below capacity because there are no doctors to admit patients.

The hon. member for London South (Mr. White) has attempted to place the blame for the shortage of medical practitioners at the feet of the profession, but surely this government must accept some of the responsibility when in spite of the many warnings they did not push ahead with medical educational facilities.

I believe that a provincial medical and dental unit should be established to provide emergency services to areas suffering acute urgent needs. The Department of Health, in co-operation with the OMA and the provincial dental association, could establish such a unit to be available at the request of the area concerned provided conditions of need were established. The costs of administration to the province would be small and a parallel method of payment to that in general use could be set up if medical insurance carriers were billed directly by the doctor who would practise in the area for only a limited time. This could never replace the permanent settlement of practitioners, but it could provide emergency service to people who have a right to such service especially if they are to pay a premium to the government.

"We have never had it so good," has become a common expression. Yet in the past few years more and more people are becoming aware that our expanding economy has not brought improvements to living standards to all in equal measure. A growing section of the population in certain areas of this

province are getting a less proportionate share of the wealth. The people of north-eastern Ontario on the whole are a part of that segment which is falling behind at a rapid rate.

The industrial expansion of the Golden Horseshoe and other parts of southern Ontario is clamouring for people to accept employment. The North Bay area, however, in the past two years has suffered a drop in population of nearly 800 people. Opportunity for employment has not been made available and our skilled tradesmen have moved to the more fertile labour markets of the south where wages are sometimes double and industry is waiting with open arms.

The economic and industrial expansion of the province is contained mainly in one area at the expense of the rest of the province. This condition exists, Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of initiative on the part of this government to face the problem.

A regional economic development plan is non-existent in the province. There are nine associations such as the northeastern development association but these are proving ineffective, serving mainly for the purposes of public relations of this government.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) has said: "We must admit that it is not unanimously agreed that the regional development associations have been entirely effective."

Only 41 of the 131 municipalities in north-eastern Ontario belong to the association and these 41 municipalities account for only 40 per cent of the population. The association covers an area of 104,650 square miles with a population of over 500,000 people. The provincial government's aid amounts to a paltry \$15,000. The paid directors spend a good part of their time persuading municipalities to remain members and arranging regional meetings at which Ministers of this government are guest speakers. Some contributing municipalities are now assessing the value and are giving consideration to withdrawal from the association. It is necessary that this government take bold steps quickly. Areas of economic development must be redefined across the province and each department of government must set up its regional departments to coincide with the development areas.

The departments of government which directly or indirectly affect economic development should pool their efforts rather than each going off in its own direction, sometimes even in opposite directions.

I would remind the hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Roberts) of a statement he made on two occasions in our area:

—that a regional economic development programme for northeastern Ontario and other areas of the province would be presented to the Legislature during this session.

I hope that the hon. Prime Minister's recent announcement in Sudbury of planned tours in northern Ontario for Canadian and American industrialists and financiers is not the economic development he was referring to. The development of the north has been talked right into the ground; the people are tired of promises. Even strong supporters of this government are becoming vocal in their objections. The North Bay *Nugget* had this to say in a recent editorial:

Perhaps there has been too much lip service paid to the north and not enough practical application of programmes for its benefit.

The proposed programme of the hon. Prime Minister should first take into consideration the need for a complete economic analysis of the resources and potential of the area. Large amounts of federal assistance would be available through ARDA if the potential of that programme was taken advantage of by this government just as Quebec has done.

The economy of northern Ontario has been dependent upon the natural resources of minerals, forests and those attributes of nature which attract the tourist. These resources have poured millions of dollars into the provincial coffers. The mining tax and stumpage are special taxes of this government, over and above those that affect everyone. The large portion of the income from these taxes is from northern Ontario. But the moneys have not been returned to the north. The north has been an exploited colony for raw materials long enough. It is time that this government, as well as the federal authorities gave some aid to the establishment of secondary industry in the area.

Beside the economic studies I mentioned previously, a method of freight rate subsidies should be established for manufacturers in the north to reach the southern markets at a competitive price. This concept is not new. Freight rate subsidies have been used for years in the Maritime regions to help to develop their secondary industry. Could it not be applied on a smaller scale to regions in Ontario, with provincial government assistance?

In the past 15 minutes, Mr. Speaker, I

have tried to point out some of the problems that affect my district and the north. Many of these same problems exist in other regions of the province not adjacent to the large metropolitan areas of the Golden Horseshoe. I should hope that the other hon. members of this House from northern Ontario share my view and that they will help to bring this government to realize its obligations. Especially do I wish those hon. members of the Cabinet from my area to give consideration to the problems existing in their own backyards.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, in the 30 seconds that are left before the hour of five o'clock, may I congratulate the new hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) upon his maiden speech and then move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 7, by Mr. Worton,

Resolved,

That discussions be initiated with the federal government to institute changes in the laws of divorce for the province of Ontario to alleviate the hardships at present caused by such matters as the deserted wife, the difficulties caused on certain occasions by the law of domicile, long-term imprisonment, confinement to mental institutions, and related matters.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): I move, seconded by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), resolution No. 7 standing in my name which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, as I rise to speak in support of this resolution, I am hopeful that this day will be a historic one for the province of Ontario. I am hopeful that this House will be permitted to engage in full debate, a free vote on the issue of divorce reform and that machinery will be set in motion to correct an unjust and inhumane law.

My position and the position of my party on this important matter was placed before you in June last year, so I do not wish to take the time of this House in reviewing the historical evolution of divorce legislation in the United Kingdom and in Canada. However, I do wish to re-emphasize the distinction we make between a religious marriage and a legal marriage. When we speak in this House of dissolving a marriage, we refer only to legal marriage and to the civil rights arising

ing out of this kind of marriage. We have no right, nor has any court the right to interfere with the marriage in the religious sense. In fact, religious leaders themselves have urged the adoption of divorce reform and I point to a statement by Richard, Cardinal Cushing of Boston, in which he says:

Catholics do not need the support of civil law to be faithful to their own religious convictions and they do not seek to impose by law their moral values on other members of society.

It was suggested last year by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) that divorce is a federal responsibility, that reform must be originated in Ottawa. I wish to stress again, sir, that this is simply not so. The Divorce Act, Ontario, which was passed by the federal Parliament in 1930, will be amended only after consultation with the province of Ontario and I suggest that the weight of the voice of this Legislature is sufficient to cause that reform.

Tradition and practice have made the matter of divorce a provincial concern which in view of the variations of divorce legislation from province to province across Canada, must be changed only by the recommendation of the province affected.

We cannot permit by inaction in this House, federal legislators to take upon themselves the responsibility for initiating changes to a law which will affect only this province. So it is the members of this House who must determine the proper reform for effective legislation in this field. The present law recognizes only two grounds for divorce, adultery on the part of the husband, sodomy or bestiality, and it has resulted in subterfuge and perjury; it has bred contrived adultery making mockery of our laws and it has caused incalculable human misery and suffering. Thousands of young women are living alone with young children, unable to find a productive and useful role for themselves because they are unwilling to, or could not afford to, deliberately flout the law in order to dissolve a marriage which exists in name only.

Thousands of young men refusing to take this step have jeopardized their entire business career. Hundreds of thousands of men and women in Canada are living together as man and wife in violation of their own religious conscience because they face a legal bar to marriage. Thus, a law which was designed to strengthen and preserve the legal institution of marriage is, in fact, destroying the institution of marriage.

Since I and my party raised the issue in the Legislature last year, there has been much public and private discussion in support of our stand. I am certain that hon. members of this House are well acquainted with the editorial comments in newspapers throughout this province and the statements of public and religious leaders in favour of divorce reform. I do not wish to take the time of this House in repeating them here today. However, I would like to read into the record, the comments of people who have written to me to offer me their support. I have received, literally, hundreds of letters from men and women all across Canada, and I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is from a minister of a church in my own riding. He says:

Dear Mr. Worton:

There is a great need to free those who are bound to an impossible situation. I have felt, sir, that absolute desertion, chronic alcoholism and perpetual cruelty and neglect, should be grounds for divorce.

Now this appears, perhaps, too liberal from a minister. However, I have had so many years of experience in and out of courts I am convinced that legislation to help these people would be a wonderful thing.

Under the present law, a woman who is deserted by her husband cannot receive her allowance if she admits to knowing his whereabouts. If she does, she is immediately thrown back on direct relief and this setup is archaic and cruel.

A Scarborough woman who has written to me says:

From personal experience, I can tell you there are self-styled detectives who collect money for services from people desiring divorce when they, the detectives, never attempt to be on the job, and who is to know. It is a disaster that this can happen in such a rich and civilized province such as ours.

Today I feel that my son who is now 13, would have been that much better prepared for life had I the stamina and legal assistance to obtain a divorce when he was an infant. Because of propriety I tried to face a bad situation for eight years.

This letter, Mr. Speaker, is from Toronto:

I believe this is a matter that the church must face and look at more realistically along with our Legislatures whose responsibility it is to change the laws of our

land to awaken the conscience of the church, facts and figures will be required. If you can provide me with this pertinent information, I would be pleased to do what I can with my own congregation and denomination to obtain support for your efforts in Parliament.

It is signed by a minister of the church in Toronto.

I might add that a high percentage of the correspondence deplored the fact that this same resolution failed to come to a vote in this assembly last year. The government of Manitoba has permitted full debate and a free vote on divorce reform resolutions for several years. I regret that the hon. Prime Minister did not see fit to have this Legislature add its voice to the call for a change in our archaic laws. I am certain the responsibility for a year of misery and suffering among tens of thousands of Ontario residents does not rest lightly on his shoulders, and I plead with him to permit it without further delay.

In Ontario, we have not yet advanced to the point of reform reached in the United Kingdom half a century ago, when the Gorrell commission recommended grounds for divorce to be extended to include wilful desertion for three years and upwards, cruelty and incurable insanity after five years, habitual drunkenness after three years, and imprisonment under a commuted death sentence. To delay a vote on this resolution another year would leave this Legislature guilty not only of prolonging human misery, but of forcing thousands upon thousands of men and women, hopelessly trapped by bad law, to continue to lean on the state for their livelihood. Today, Mr. Speaker, we can provide at least some hope for these men and women and, what is more important, for their children, whose lives are put in serious jeopardy by the severe emotional upheaval caused by the separation of their parents.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Speaker, this is the second consecutive year that a resolution dealing with divorce has been placed on the order paper by the hon. member for Wellington South. Most of the speakers last year supported the principle of the resolution and I wish to do the same now.

It is safe to say that every member of the legal profession in Ontario would support this resolution. Therefore, it should naturally follow that every lawyer in this House should feel the same way. At a meeting of the Ontario Bar association held this month, the association suggested at least three new

grounds for divorce in this province. I think it is also safe to say, Mr. Speaker, that the overwhelming majority of people in this province favour changes in our divorce laws.

Having said this, why the delay? I hope we are not going to talk this resolution out again this year. Anyone whose profession or work involves marital and domestic problems is aware of the hardship and mental anguish created by archaic divorce laws. The present law is responsible for many social ills, such as unnecessary common law unions, with the stigma of illegitimacy for the children involved. Desertion and mental illness are other examples in this realm.

Further, men and women are forced to remain in a marital captivity where love and hope no longer exist and neither one is keeping the vows of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe in the premise that the introduction of a resolution by a private member of the Opposition is necessarily bad. Certainly no amendment to this resolution is required. This resolution is broad enough and, indeed, innocuous enough for everyone in this House to support. Everything that could be said on this subject has been said. By supporting this resolution we are not undermining the moral fibre of our society; Ontario will not become another Nevada or Mexico in divorce litigation. The resolution does not recommend broad or unacceptable grounds for divorce.

For example, Mr. Speaker, the word incompatibility is not mentioned anywhere at all. It would be interesting to interview some of the social and welfare workers in this province, and to hear their stories of families affected by desertion, long-term imprisonment or mental illness, particularly where there are young children. In many of these cases, reform of our divorce laws would help. Many of the groups and associations which we consider reflect our conscience, such as women's institutes, service clubs, labour unions, clergy, and judiciary have advocated the need for divorce reform. I envisage representatives from these groups taking an important—indeed, the main—role in recommending changes. We cannot depend on the federal government to initiate discussions to make changes in the law for Ontario. Federal governments, past and present, have successfully avoided all attempts up to now to deal properly with this matter. All the hon. members will remember the three-ring circus which used to take place each year in the Commons when dealing with divorces from Quebec and Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, by supporting this resolution

we are taking a step in eliminating dishonesty and hypocrisy, degrading setups involving co-respondents in order to obtain evidence that does not and should not have to exist. Above all, we are probably helping to stop the signing of false affidavits and declarations, sometimes completed by honest but desperate people. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution will be approved by the hon. members of this House before adjournment.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my voice and the support of this party in the Legislature to the arguments that have been made by hon. members of other parties. We concur in what has been said today, and, of course, concur in almost all of what was said on this precise subject last year. We cannot but agree with the arguments. I therefore, have five short observations to offer on this topic, and then, as the others, take my seat in the hope that this debate can be drawn to a vote.

First we have made, Mr. Speaker, all the valid distinctions there are to be made between the religious sacrament and the civil ceremony. We pointed out that adultery, as the primary grounds for divorce in this province, leads to acts of moral and self-destructive desperation. We have agreed that compromised and untenable common law relationships are forged as a result of the present law, and we respect the fact that it is a law for the rich—a class law, in nature—which discriminates against large numbers of underprivileged people.

Second, Mr. Speaker, we assert that this is a legitimate subject for discussion in a provincial Legislature, and so strongly support the resolution. Partly, of course, because there are varying components to the divorce laws in legislatures across this land, differing in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and PEI from Ontario. Partly because of the power of Dominion-provincial conferences to decide precisely if this kind of issue is accepted public policy. And finally, because we simply have to give power to the Attorney General, through this Legislature, to exercise his voice when this issue is discussed at such a conference of co-operative federalism.

Third, Mr. Speaker, what is really baffling to this group in the House, is what exactly we are waiting for, and in that I have to echo the words of the hon. member for Halton.

After all, the refusal of this Legislature to act consigns, I suggest, thousands of people to endless frustration and despair

for no discernible reason. Or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, there is one. I suspect that the reason is inherent in the subject-matter itself, for this resolution comes within that field of social and religious controversy which always tends to paralyze governmental action. It is an appreciation that action of any kind, however necessary or justifiable, is bound to offend some groups and this tends to produce in government—this Legislature—a high moment, I would almost say a poetic moment, of inertia.

Where religious minorities are concerned, Mr. Speaker, or where the subject has sexual associations, as some resolutions on the order paper have, this timidity, this inertia, is intensified. And that is what has happened to this government, and that is what has happened to this debate. I suggest that without being unnecessarily provocative we are collaborating in despair at the legislative level. The hon. member for Wellington South has put it all too effectively.

The fourth point, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to emphasize, once again, the social consequences. We discussed last year the legal niceties, the historical framework and the statistics of people involved. We estimated the dollar and cent factor.

But I suggest to you that the social consequences of this archaic law are potentially inflammable. All the interrelated disciplines interested in this field, all the leading child-care people, all those who have involved themselves in world health organization analysis of comparative legislation, agree that our kind of rigid and restrictive divorce laws results in the battered-baby syndrome, in increased admission to mental-health clinics and hospitals, in excessive degrees of disturbance and under-achievement in schools; and in higher levels of delinquency. Whatever studies have been made show a direct correlation between the effects of this law and that kind of deleterious social pattern.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I make the last point, and support the speakers who have come before. We object, and in a personal sense bitterly object, to the refusal on the part of the government to allow a vote to be taken.

I suggest to you, sir, that it is an act of political reprehensibility of the first order, because there is, in fact, a consensus in this Legislature. When there is such a consensus it should be measured and recorded in the *Hansard* of this House.

Let it be said that we are not even voting on these resolutions as to precise wording. Let us take the argument made by the hon.

Prime Minister when we had the hate literature resolution before us. He indicated that the precise words were not what we were voting for; we were voting for the sense of the resolution, and that is why we supported it unanimously in this House. If we are, in fact, voting for the sense of the resolution, then surely it is possible to effect a vote in this House and to see the members stand in the confidence that on this social issue there is a strong powerful majority consensus.

Instead, Mr. Speaker, we have sentiments expressed which are poetic in their nobility; the legislators all emerge as honourable men; there is a sort of public catharsis to make up for pinpointing this issue and another year lapses and the situation is allowed to continue.

There is no reason, Mr. Speaker. There is no justification. There is no logic. There is no excuse. I suggest that the majority of all parties would like to see a vote called at the end of this debate. Since most of us support this resolution, such a vote should be called and the initiative given to this province so that we can show the lead rather than merely follow in such an area of important social policy.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, some years ago, perhaps 30-odd, in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, there was a gentleman named A. P. Herbert who sat at that time as a member for one of the university seats—I believe it was the University of Oxford. In the Parliament of the United Kingdom at that time they had a system somewhat unique which is now abandoned, wherein graduates from their universities had an extra vote and could elect their own members to the House of Commons. Among those members sent to the House of Commons in England was Sir Alan P. Herbert.

He sat under no party banner, he sat as an independent member of the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. One of the tasks that he early set himself to was the task of divorce reform and he produced a series of books, amongst them the book "Holy Deadlock." There were several others, dealing in a humorous way, an educated way and a most convincing manner, with the whole problem of the divorce laws in England. Single-handedly this independent member of the House of Commons was able to bring about the divorce reform that the previous speakers who have spoken this afternoon—the hon. member for Wellington South, the hon. member for Halton, and the hon. mem-

ber for Scarborough West—have been talking about.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have no university seats in the Ontario Legislature, nor, it is obvious, do we need an independent member to put forward ideas that are going to meet with the acceptance of all of the members of the House. We have had the views expressed from members of the three parties represented here. These views are unique in that they are unanimous. The debate took place last year in the same tone and in the same manner. I say to you, sir, what more is needed? How much more urging must there be to bring about this reform that is at least 50 years out of date now in the province of Ontario?

Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague from Wellington South mentioned what happened in the province of Manitoba. I have a little more detail on that and I think it is of some salutary assistance just to read some of the information I have received from a gentleman named Thomas P. Hillhouse, who is the hon. member for Selkirk in the Manitoba Legislature. He advises me that on April 9, 1965, a resolution was put before the Manitoba Legislature. He advises me that this is the form of the resolution:

Resolved that this legislative assembly recommend to the government of Canada that the dissolution of marriage may be claimed by either husband or wife on the grounds that the respondent (1) since the celebration of the marriage committed adultery; or (2) has deserted the petitioner without cause for a period of at least three years; or (3) has, since the celebration of the marriage, treated the petitioner with cruelty; or (4) is incurably of unsound mind and has been continuously under care and treatment for a period of at least five years; or (5) has, where the wife is the petitioner, been guilty, since the celebration of the marriage, of rape, sodomy or bestiality; or (6) has been legally separated from the petitioner for at least three years by virtue of a judgment of the court of superior jurisdiction on the grounds of which an order of separation can be made under The Matrimonial Cause Act, 1857, Imperial, and amendments thereto; and (7) any married person who alleges that reasonable grounds exist for supposing that his or her spouse is dead may present a petition to the court to have it presumed that the said spouse is dead, and to have the marriage dissolved, and that for a period of such proceedings, the fact that for a period of

seven years or upwards the other party to the marriage has been continuously absent from the petitioner and the petitioner has no reason to believe that the other party has been living within that time, shall be admissible in evidence as *prima facie* proof that the other party is dead.

The interesting fact, sir, is that this vote was a free vote of the Manitoba Legislature. All the party whips were removed and each member was allowed by his own leader to vote as his conscience was his guide. The vote was carried by 43 to 9 and there were almost all the members of the House present on that occasion. Included among those members of the Manitoba Legislature who voted for this resolution was Mr. Roblin, the premier of that province.

Surely, sir, the same sort of pattern or precedence could and should be followed by this Legislature. Our divorce laws are governed by a federal statute Divorce Act, Ontario, of 1930. That statute is there with the knowledge, consent, acquiescence, and approval of this Legislature and it can be taken away with the knowledge, consent, acquiescence and direction of this Legislature. I am certain, sir, that no federal government would resist the earnest request, the unanimous resolution or near unanimous resolution of this Legislature to change that statute in a more suitable way.

There is no point, sir, in outlining or detailing the hardships that go with our present laws, the tragedy of the law of domicile where a wife must pursue her husband through many, many jurisdictions on occasion to get some satisfaction out of our laws. The hon. member for Scarborough West said the fact is that we have a law for the rich and a law for the poor in this—the great tragedies that are visited on families by reason of common law unions, and all the chaos, unhappiness, difficulty that exist in homes where this type of union is the only answer.

The difficulties in even getting before our courts, sir, something as elementary as this, is another barrier. In British Columbia they passed a statute transferring the responsibility for dealing with divorces from supreme court judges to county court judges. Such a step had not even occurred to this government until this moment.

It would seem to me, sir, that we would be taking a very advanced step in the social legislation of this province if there were to be a vote on this very important matter, and if the government not only allowed it but

asked for it and encouraged it. I say, sir, in common with the other members who have spoken before me, that this is one of the most serious subjects that this Legislature has ever dealt with. It is my urgent plea that this matter be allowed to go to a vote this afternoon. I have no doubt about what the result of the vote will be.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make my comments on this resolution. I would point out that there has been a great deal of comment recently concerning divorce reform in our province. As recently as last Saturday we had a comment from a spokesman for the United Church of Canada indicating that that body was in favour of divorce reform and a change in our present legislation. On October 26, 1965, the Toronto association of Baptist churches passed the following resolution and I quote:

Whereas we recognize that by law divorce in Ontario is granted only on grounds of adultery and that this has contributed to the increasing number of so-called common law marriages in the case of some and the use of perjury in the case of others;

And whereas we recognize that the church has no right to impose its views on divorce upon members of a free society,

Therefore be it resolved that the Toronto association of Baptist churches, in affirming its stand on religious liberty and the dignity and value of man, encourage our premier and legislators to initiate discussions with the federal government and to study a broader basis for divorce laws.

These two groups are obvious examples of the concern and the consideration that has been given to this topic by the general public.

It would appear that there is no consensus insofar as the Liberal Party across Canada is concerned. We have had a lot of criticism as to why our government did not bring this matter to a vote last year, and yet I see nothing in the records of the federal *Hansard* indicating that the Liberal Party federally has taken a stand on this topic.

I had the opportunity to speak for a few moments last year on this subject, and I say once again that the time is ripe and opportunity for steps to be taken in this House.

I say that divorce should be resorted to only in those situations where the marriage relationship has completely broken down. I

do not say, by any stretch of the imagination, that because we make our divorce laws in Canada any less stringent this will result in an increasingly serious number of divorces. On working from this premise that divorce should only be granted in extreme cases, we see that grounds such as cruelty and desertion, which *per se* destroy the marriage relationship itself, have been ignored in our country. Yet one act of adultery which may or may not break down the marriage completely has been leaned upon in our legislation as the only basis for divorce proceedings. Perhaps we should take a second look at that particular aspect and decide whether one isolated act of adultery should constitute sufficient grounds.

In the English Matrimonial Causes Act of 1937 the following was the preamble, and I quote:

Whereas it is expedient for the true support of marriage, the protection of children, the removal of hardship, the reduction of illicit unions and unseemly litigation, the relief of conscience among the clergy and the restoration of due respect for the law, that the Acts relating to law and divorce be amended.

These comments, dated in 1937 in the English House, certainly apply here in Canada and in Ontario today.

Canadian divorce laws are among the narrowest and most restrictive in the world. As a lawyer, I hate to say this, but they have brought the law into disrespect in our province. Many people come into my office, and I am sure lawyers throughout Ontario will echo these sentiments, who indicate that they would like to get a divorce; is it possible for me or someone I know to arrange a third party, to be co-respondent? Our law is in sad shape when the people of this province have to resort to that and come to a lawyer for that advice. We have seen this; that is not one remote example. Some five or six years ago we had obvious examples of this which resulted in a considerable amount of litigation, I might add, and a reflection on our own law society which, I feel, took the proper steps in the circumstances.

One of the most thought-provoking areas of divorce reform is that involving illegitimate children. I wonder how many people are aware that there are apparently 500,000 people living in Canada today in some illicit union. It is a striking number when you consider our small population. A major reason for this is the high cost of divorce

and the difficulty in taking divorce proceedings. The federal government, and we as provincial legislators by not acting, are responsible to the same illegitimate children. We are depriving them of the rights to which they are entitled as members of our community. When a common law marriage, to use the term that the newspapers seem to love, results in illegitimate children being born, we have examples of children who have no rights *per se* under the law. There are certain obligations; the father must bring these children up and he has obligations. The children's aid society will chase him for a while, but if the father of these children dies, leaving an estate, these children have no claims to it if the father dies intestate. This is a subject that we have got to consider.

As was pointed out by the hon. member for Scarborough West, the present legislation makes divorce much more easy to obtain for those who are in the wealthier groups. If a woman is deserted by her husband in the province of Ontario and the husband goes to another jurisdiction, the woman is confronted with a difficult problem. I think it is fair to say that the minimum in Ontario for a divorce, for legal fees and disbursements, is approximately \$500. If you have any circumstances beyond the ordinary in a divorce proceeding—if you have the husband outside the jurisdiction, in Mexico or anywhere other than in the province of Ontario—the cost becomes substantially higher. Then the woman is put in a difficult position and I suggest that we are putting her there. She has this thrown in her lap by the lawyer; he says: "Get me \$500, \$1,000 or \$2,500 and we will go along and process this action, and we will proceed in California or wherever it might be that the husband has taken as his domicile."

Mr. Singer: It is all illegal, anyway.

Mr. Eagleson: Not necessarily. If the husband has acquired a proper domicile—and I am surprised that such a lawyer would ask such a question—it is legal so long as he stays there.

In any event, we find ourselves in the position of directing this woman to the funds she must pay. Then she must say to herself: "Am I going to expend this amount of money, or have I a greater duty to my children or myself for my future to keep those funds for what might happen next?" The next thing, as an obvious example, is that she falls in love with some other chap and so we have more illegitimate children. It is a sorry state of

affairs. In case there is any doubt in anyone's mind as to whether the number of common law marriages, as they are called, is as predominant as they say, and the fact that our divorce laws have a bearing upon them, in a recent study by the school of social work at the University of Toronto, of 40 people studied determining the reasons for their common law relationship, 38 had a legal bar to another marriage, basically, I say, as a result of our legislation.

If I may digress and comment upon other jurisdictions and their approach to this problem of divorce, the states of Australia and the government of New Zealand permit divorce for cruelty, attempt to murder or grievous assault on a spouse, drunkenness, imprisonment, desertion and frequent convictions of crime. European laws are much more liberal than those in Canada. France, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland all permit divorce for conviction of criminal offences under varying circumstances, and basically allow divorces for adultery, cruelty and desertion. Attempt on a spouse's life is ground for divorce in 11 European countries. Mental cruelty and bodily injury are grounds for divorce by statute in five European countries. And I am sure there is some wonderment, as I said before, as to whether this would result in an increasing amount of divorces. I would mention Irvin Deroghi in his book of 1955 entitled "Grounds for divorce in European countries." He states at page 46: "To assume that the liberalization of the laws relating to divorce in Europe has led to a weakening or shattering of marriage or family life would be a fundamental confusion of cause and effect. Marriages have already been broken when spouses apply for divorce."

By the end of World War II the majority of the United States had permitted divorce for adultery, extreme cruelty, impotency, incapacity, desertion or abandonment. Insanity is the cause in approximately half of those states.

I notice in this afternoon's *Toronto Daily Star* that the one exception in the United States, the state of New York, presently has before the Legislature a bill discussing the matters of divorce reform. It goes through the whole series of things that have happened in New York. Their legislation, I think, dates from 1787, yet the only ground in New York is adultery. This, I suggest, from the comments I have read and the people from New York with whom I have spoken, indicates to me that there is going to be a change in New York. There was quite a furor last December, I think it was, when the Roman

Catholic clergy indicated to all members of the state Legislature that they should not consider this bill, that they ought to give it a great deal of thought and maybe move it along for a while. Yet the Senator who was proposing this bill in New York state took the bull by the horns and said: "We are running this state, and we as legislators are responsible to the people of this state, and we will leave the Roman Catholic church and other clergymen to look after the problems they have in conjunction with ours, but we are not going to be dictated to on this point." As a result, 10, 15 or 20 days ago there was a degree of retreat by this same Roman Catholic group. In fact, a lay clergy group from the same church indicated its support of the bill. In New York, as I say, they grant divorce only for adultery; a judge once commented that in states such as New York, where they have adultery as a ground, they in fact have two grounds—adultery and perjury. For those who do not want to commit adultery, or who do not want to commit perjury, there is no relief. This is the unfortunate situation that is apparent in our country today.

In uncontested divorce cases in New York, they have the same third-party problem, no different than we have here, and yet New York is supposed to be the most restricted state. They have a very small number of divorces, the reason for which is obvious. The legislation is so restrictive that they all go to other states and get divorces. Because of the full faith and credit doctrine, they are allowed to come back and live in New York. It is a faulty approach, and I hope they are going to remedy it in New York.

Many Central American and Southern American countries have had liberal divorce laws for years. Since 1888, Costa Rica has permitted divorce for several causes, including physical cruelty. In Costa Rica since that date, they have had a judicial separation which, after a period of two years, can be taken before a judge who determines whether divorce should be allowed on that ground alone.

As we look at those other countries—Ecuador, Peru, Nicaragua, Uruguay and Venezuela—all have liberal divorce laws. With this background, then, we come back to Ontario. It is with a little bit of shame that we all admit and recognize that the only legislation we have dealing with divorce dates from 1930. In that year, the federal Parliament passed *The Divorce Act (Ontario)*, 1930 which brought into Ontario law the law in force in England as of July 15, 1870. The

only reason I can determine for this particular date was the fact that the western provinces' legislation bore the same terminology; I suppose for that reason we were lumped together. As it stands today, the western provinces and Ontario are in the same boat, with the same grounds for divorce.

Nova Scotia has the additional ground of cruelty and consanguinity—too close a marriage, for those of you who are not aware of it; that is for the benefit of the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha). There is an additional problem we have in Ontario, that of the domicile and court jurisdiction. The Divorce Jurisdiction Act of 1930 provided that if a couple was domiciled in Ontario, and the husband deserted, and if the wife continued her domicile in Ontario for two years, she could then apply for a divorce in Ontario. But there are additional grounds granted in England that we did not get in 1930 and should get. They are as follows: If the wife was domiciled in Ontario before the marriage and she never lived in the husband's domicile, then the woman should be allowed a cause of action in Ontario. Similarly, if the wife is ordinarily a resident in Ontario for a period of three years the Ontario courts should have jurisdiction.

There is a further problem in the city of Toronto with regard to divorce. We have a backlog of 800 to 900 cases at the city hall now, and each day there are more. As the hon. member for Downsview pointed out, the British Columbia Legislature has taken the position that a county court judge, in his capacity as a local judge under The Judicature Act, can, in that capacity, carry on the processes of a judge for divorce. In that way they have managed to clean up many problems they had. A supreme court of Canada case recently indicated that this was completely constitutional, so this is another way we can help ourselves in Ontario.

In spite of that, whether we go that far or not—and I would suggest we do—the least we should do is always have some judge—not necessarily the same judge—sitting on divorces in Toronto. With a crash programme, one could clean up that backlog in four months, but unless you have someone sitting in the meantime you are going to have the same 800 or 900 cases waiting. If we put a judge in there permanently, the assistant registrar, Mr. Shaughnessy, will not be so upset when the lawyers give him trouble and want to know why there is no judge sitting. Sometimes the poor chap, and I suggest he has one of the toughest jobs in the city of Toronto, has to explain that he

does not know whether a judge is going to sit that day, that week or that month, but he can only hope. You do your best to get your case on the list. Even after the trial in Ontario there is a further delay, and it is the sole responsibility of the province.

Rule 799 of regulation 396 of the Revised Regulations of Ontario, being the rules of practice and procedure in the supreme court of Ontario, under The Judicature Act and The Matrimonial Causes Act of Ontario, provides that every judgment for the dissolution of marriage shall be a judgment nisi, not to be made absolute until after three months. I suggest there is no real reason for this three months delay. The Queen's Proctor has the opportunity to intervene if he so wishes, but on very few cases does he do so. In addition, some people say we should have this waiting period so that if anything has happened, if there is a possibility of reconciliation, then that time should be allotted to the parties.

I say fine; that a three months period is agreeable, but let the judge have the power to reduce it in certain circumstances. Many lawyers, I am sure, are aware that we have cases that would avoid ultimate adoption proceedings because a child is going to be born or has been born any minute, and we might as well legitimize the child right at that time. The judge can see from the facts that there is no hope of reconciliation in some cases; why not make the thing absolute right then and there? It is an uncontested action, the parties are agreed to it, and I say we should do that.

I agree that many persons hold different views, that their religious beliefs and otherwise do not allow them to seek divorce. Yet a majority of them, I suggest, are in favour of reform along these lines. I would suggest that we should have provision made for those who no longer wish to live together, but cannot avail themselves of a divorce because of those beliefs. Judicial separation is permitted in England and successive Royal commissions have not changed that law, so presumably it is filling quite a gap. This remedy was not brought into Ontario in the 1930 Act; it is now time to do so.

I had a letter from a constituent stating his reasons for judicial separation as a layman. He spelled it out more clearly than most of us could. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read therefrom:

Dear Mr. Eagleson:

There was quite a write-up recently in the *Star* concerning divorce regulations in New York state. Many people in these modern days are mixed up in the social

problem of divorce—if not actual divorce, then separation. As you are well aware, separation is really a non-legal situation. I guess I have got to state my own condition, which is simply this. On wishing to separate from my wife, she would not enter into an agreement and would not have her lawyer meet with mine to discuss separation. Since it was my very considered opinion, as well as the opinion of others who were aware of the situation, that for the sake of my two children and for the good health of the two principals we should be separated, I walked out of my home, leaving no financial arrangements behind. I was drawn into court for non-support and the family court brought down a ruling as to support. I would like to say that the hearing was cruel and rough and even dirty.

Aside from all the other causes for divorce, one I did not hear mentioned, and yet one which I feel is justified, would be that a divorce should be allowed without major evidence to any couple who have been separated under the normal meaning of the word "separation," or separated on the basis that has been my case, for a period of five years. There is very little likelihood that the two married people are likely to re-enjoin themselves in a happy home if they have been separated for that period of time. I would like to think that they should be able to enjoy the privileges which come from divorce.

Mr. Eagleson, I feel very strongly on this point. If I have not made it clear, I would appreciate your calling me and I certainly think, for the sake of many people involved, that this point as well as all other good points should be pressed very hard.

Here is the tragedy of the whole letter and why it is most important that we in this House take a stand.

In fact, I have no hope whatsoever that our divorce laws will be made more sensible in my lifetime, but I do hope that some progress will be made along more reasonable lines. I feel that divorces are very hard on many people and are something to be avoided, but there are cases when the health of all parties involved, particularly children, warrants the granting of a divorce. I can assure you that my family and my two children suffered for many years under the situation which existed in my home. Separation had a most gratifying effect on their health and education. I certainly feel blessed that my children have grown up into responsible adulthood, in spite of an unsatisfactory home situation.

The Canadian Bar association, Ontario branch, recently passed a resolution, suggesting that the grounds for divorce be expanded in Ontario to include the following: (a) adultery; (b) desertion without cause for at least three years; (c) cruelty as understood by Ontario law; (d) sodomy or bestiality; (e) wilful refusal to consummate the marriage.

In addition, it was resolved that the supreme court of Ontario should be allowed jurisdiction for judicial separation.

Now, as one looks at the whole situation of divorce reform, it is necessary to look with greater detail into the prevention of divorce and preservation of marriage. Because of our addiction to the romances of life, it is unlikely that we, as legislators, will propose the ultimate solution to fewer divorces—that is, to make marriage tougher. Even a month's wait, in most circumstances, would probably cut the divorce rate considerably, but education in what to expect of marriage seems a more likely solution.

Many experts are working to get courses in marriage into the schools. Most engaged Catholic couples now get premarital counselling at pre-CANA conferences. Protestant churches are increasingly offering some form of premarital advice. Both offer talks by doctors, clergymen and counsellors. In addition, the new art of family therapy has made impressive gains in analyzing the complex psychological equation that creates marriages. When frustration jars the equation, the parties to the marriage become so upset and so hostile, that they forget about the things that have brought them together and worry more about the things that have broken them apart.

Today, a skilled therapist can save many marriages, or at least keep an inevitable divorce from becoming too bitter. While insisting, then, that divorce be a more rational process, as suggested in the present resolution, I submit that many divorces that now take place, can in fact be prevented.

One of the most effective, yet not too widespread examples, is the conciliation court. In 18 states of the United States of America, they have 36 courts, and psychologists, social workers and marriage counsellors do their best to keep people together by resolving their problems with them. They try to get the couple to communicate with each other again. In Toronto, we have the example of the family court system, and although these people are doing their best under the conditions they have, I feel the family court system is woefully inadequate. We had a great deal of discussion in the past year and a half before

Metro council about cutting down the funds for the family court. I say this, that they can do a good job, but in the present situation and the way they are set up at the present time, I feel that they cannot do an adequate job.

It has come to the point now that some Toronto lawyers will advise clients to forget about the family court proceedings because it is going to be too long, and many a day has been spent with a lawyer and his client standing in the lobbies of that building of family and juvenile courts on Jarvis street. Hours and hours and hours on end—there seems to be no rhyme or reason to the time lag, and yet I know that these people are understaffed and overworked. But I do feel that more direction should be given to the matter of the family courts and that more psychologists and counsellors be available at specific times. At the present time, I often have the feeling that the family court takes the attitude that there is a war waging between the husband and the wife and the local judge sitting on the case has to act as arbitrator among the brickbats and stoning.

The time has come for a compassionate law that would prevent divorce where it honourably could be prevented; and when it could not, leave an unhappy couple with a maximum of dignity and a minimum of bitterness.

Mr. Speaker, in all conscience I must ask that this House vote on this resolution.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I am grateful to my hon. friend from Lakeshore for leaving me a couple of minutes. He speaks articulately and with such emphasis and sincerity, that I merely express the wish that we could hear him more frequently on the questions that exercise this House.

I am not going to add very much, save to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have been engaged in a good many divorce actions. I never kept track of the numbers, but they certainly reach a considerable quantity. I have never learned how to prosecute a divorce action from my principal of early years, when I was articled as a law student to Leo Landreville, that wise and kindly and intelligent man.

I read in one of the slick magazines recently that Mr. Landreville had one of the largest divorce and criminal practices, that magazine which looks upon itself as an opinion-former said, in northern Ontario. Well, the magazine was not very accurate when it said that, because not only did Mr. Justice Landreville, when he was at the Bar, not have a large divorce practice; he never

took a divorce case in his life, nor did any of the other members of the firm who practised law with him and were of the same religious persuasion. So it goes to show you, so to speak, that you cannot always believe everything you read in the papers.

In the practice of divorce there are many ludicrous and degrading things. I never tackle one without feeling a deep sense of personal shame of being involved in the part of the law that evinces so little respect from those involved in it. I have time only to cite one aspect which will underline precisely what I am trying to say, and that is the doctrine of condonation. At the end of the case, you ask the spouse who is the petitioner, or you ask the wife whether that spouse has forgiven the other spouse for his or her adultery. They do not always know what you mean by "forgiven," so you can put it another way that suits the law and the courts. You can say, "Have you told your spouse it is all right to commit adultery with the co-defendant?" And they say, "No, I have not." If they said "yes," their application or petition would meet a fatal end, in that it would be dismissed, but they always say "no." That doctrine of condonation is neither the Christian doctrine of forgiveness—in the words of St. Luke, "her sins which are many are forgiven," when Christ forgave the prostitute—nor is it the lay doctrine of forgiveness, summed up in the words, "To err is human, to forgive divine." It is just that, that mechanical question, "Have you told your spouse it is all right to commit adultery?" In the sense of, "everybody is doing it." It means just about that, I said, and I am not attributing it to any person.

Another Englishman, Mr. Justice McCurdy, at the same time as Sir Alan Herbert—a judge whom the academics granted as having been a very erudite and a very competent judge in the high court of justice, a bachelor, sir—railed so much against the divorce laws that his biographer says it drove him to such distraction that he could no longer perform his duties on the bench. He said about them one time, "Our divorce laws are unworthy of the civilization we claim to possess." And indeed they are. All the opinion of this country is congealed. My friend cites the United Church—my church—and how it expresses its principles. The opinion is congealed in this country. He would say only that if this government approached the federal government at Ottawa in a reasonable fashion and ask that government to draft a new Act for Ontario, the federal government would be only too glad to do so.

In view of the opinion that has been expressed in this House, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of this House, and specifically rule No. 45, I move that the question be now put.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I realize that this motion is not debatable but I think I should get up and say that while I find myself in sympathy with some of the ideas that have been expressed in this debate, and that I am very happy to hear the opinion expressed by various private members, when I read the resolution I read it to mean that a direction is being put to this government that we initiate discussions with the federal government to institute changes in the laws of divorce of the province of Ontario and so on. I would simply say that the government at this stage of the game is not prepared to accept this direction as covered in this resolution. As I say, I am pleased to have the expressions of opinion expressed here by private members but I would have to vote against the resolution because of its direction for a course of action to this government which the government has not considered and which the government could not accept at this time.

Mr. Speaker: There is a motion from Mr. Sopha that the question be now put. All those in favour of the motion, please say "aye." All those opposed, please say "nay."

In my opinion the "nays" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour that the question be now put will please rise.

As many as are opposed will please rise.

AYES

NAYS

Ben	Apps
Braithwaite	Auld
Bryden	Bales
Davison	Boyer
Farquhar	Carruthers
Freeman	Cecile
Gisborn	Connell
Lewis	Cowling
(Scarborough West)	Davis
MacDonald	Downer
Newman	Dunlop
Nixon	Dymond
Oliver	Eagleson
Paterson	Edwards
Racine	Evans

AYES

Reaume
Renwick
Singer
Smith
Sopha
Spence
Taylor
Thompson
Whicher
Worton
Young—25.

NAYS

Ewen
Gomme
Guindon
Harris
Haskett
Henderson
Hodgson
(Victoria)
Kerr
Knox
Lawrence
(Russell)
Letherby
Mackenzie
MacNaughton
Morningstar
McKeough
McNeil
Noden
Price
Pritchard
Randall
Reuter
Robarts
Rollins
Root
Rowe
Sandercock
Spoonier
Thrasher
Villeneuve
Walker
Wells
White
Whitney
Wishart
Yaremko—50.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Speaker, the "ayes" are 25, the "nays" 50.

Mr. Speaker: The "nays" have it.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): At eight o'clock we will deal with the estimates of The Department of the Prime Minister and then Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves adjournment of the House.

It being 6 o'clock p.m. the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Estimates, Department of the Prime Minister, Mr. Robarts	778
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	800

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before calling the order of business, I would like to make a comment about procedure. Early in the session, the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) said that he was going to raise a point of order when we first moved into House in committee of supply, which is order No. 24 on the order paper.

Subsequently, the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) mentioned this in his contribution to the debate on the Speech from the Throne and his comments interested me very much. He said:

I am thinking of the alert eye of the hon. member for Sudbury who noticed the new approach being taken by this government, and its erosion of your prestige.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, he is speaking about your prestige.

He also said:

Let me say that with the erosion of your prestige comes the erosion of all the rights of the people of this province. We notice that in the past—and I want to re-emphasize this—

these are his words:

—a previous premier would move that the Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply.

Then he goes on to say, Mr. Speaker:

Then on that dark day of December 7, 1961, very near an anniversary of another occasion when freedom was threatened, we saw a sly move in which you were dismissed by the intonations of the Clerk of this House, and I read for December 7, 1961: "Orders of the day. House moved into committee of supply, Mr. K. Brown in the chair."

Then he says:

Now, why do we place such stress on your importance and the recognition that you must be assured of your rights over procedure?

—and makes a great song and dance.

I can only say that this procedure, Mr. Speaker, was recommended by a select committee on procedure which reported on November 23, 1960, item No. 7 in that report, recommendation No. 6 is that:

When the order of the day for House and committee of supply is read, Mr. Speaker do leave the chair without motion or question and the House immediately resolve itself into committee of supply.

This is the procedure we are following, and that report is signed by the hon. leader of the Opposition—a unanimous report. Now he stands up in this House and tries to say that we are eroding the rights of the people and eroding the rights of the Speaker. Here is the procedure—this is the procedure we follow, recommended by a select committee which reported unanimously. On the bottom of the page is Mr. A. E. Thompson's signature.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, we protest that it is improper for you to leave the chair in the fashion that has now been indicated that you should leave it. We have indicated, in no uncertain terms, that we would raise this point of order and protest to you, sir, that we have the right to amend, from time to time, any motion that ought to be properly put, to have you leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply. It has been said many times during the course of these discussions that in the Parliament at Ottawa there are by agreement six supply motions per session in which the Opposition has the right to offer an amendment. Indeed, at Westminster, with which you, yourself, sir, have communicated sometimes in the past—and according to the rules of our House it says that when there is a gap in the procedure of this House the rules of the Parliament at Westminster shall apply at least for advice and guidance. At Westminster, sir, by agreement there are three supply motions. The Ontario legislative

assembly is unique in that apparently there is none. We would have your ruling, sir, that according to the ancient custom and usage of Parliament the only proper way for you to leave the chair is by motion properly put.

As recently as December 7, 1961, the Prime Minister at that time, who is the person who occupies the same office today, moved "that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into committee of supply." Strangely, sir, for a reason that we do not know, the hon. Prime Minister refers to a report of 1960. If that report was made in 1960 the custom and usage continued for a full year after that, and apparently no attention was paid to that report. Suddenly, for a reason that we are unable to comprehend, the practice was discontinued.

I know a little bit more about the reason for this continuance than I am saying, and I do not like to say any more unless someone wants to afford the proper stimulus to say how this came about; but there is something more to it than meets the eye.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour has the opportunity now to revert to the previous custom and usage of this House and to require, as we insist, that a motion be properly put. I can say on behalf of this group here, that we would be perfectly agreeable to a limited number of supply motions, whatever the number that might mutually be agreed upon—three, four or six a session. The important thing is, sir, as I have said to Your Honour before, that the Opposition has no opportunity to grieve on current and contemporary matters, those matters as fresh as the ink in this morning's newspaper. We just have no opportunity to raise them. We can do it through the device of moving the adjournment of the House to discuss a matter of urgent public importance but oftentimes that does not meet with Your Honour's pleasure and you do not allow the motion to be put.

The executive council over there have the opportunity to wander in here—and I do not think that is a bad word to use—and some do. The hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) wandered in here the other day and made a statement. The hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) wandered in here and made a statement about a Cabinet Minister in another jurisdiction. The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) does it.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Prime Minister did it at 6 o'clock.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Prime Minister did it, and we tolerated that, at 6 o'clock. We have no similar opportunity to do that. Some of our more determined colleagues attempt to do it in other ways but we should like to do it completely within the framework of the rules of the House. That is all we ask. We are ready to be perfectly reasonable about this.

Mr. Singer: Always, always, we always are.

Mr. Sopha: Sometimes people protest too much. But we merely ask you, sir, to give us a ruling that recognizes the ancient custom and usage of Parliament, the custom and usage which is practised at Ottawa, the custom and usage which is practised at Westminster; what is good enough for both those other Parliaments—indeed one of them is the mother of Parliaments—is oftentimes according to our own peculiar characteristics of being North Americans, good enough for us.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, as I gather we are talking really about the purpose of Parliament, of Parliament which is the—

Mr. Speaker: The point of order is on whether the House should continue going into committee of supply upon reading of the order, or whether we should have a specific motion for the Speaker to leave the chair when we go into committee of supply.

Mr. Thompson: May I say, sir, that this is fundamental to Parliament. You represent the rights of the people by guarding both the Opposition and the government. We have listened too long to a Prime Minister who says that government must always have priority—and I can quote that back at him several times. He was so insensitive to the rights of Parliament, Mr. Speaker, that he did not recognize that the Opposition must have a right to initiate.

May I say that this very thing is an opportunity for the Opposition to make a motion of supply and to bring a vote of censure. If we cannot give a vote of censure we are similar to the IODE or to other groups, however worthy they are. They may feel offended about the government but the essence of Parliament—and I think some of the hon. members should listen to this and grasp it—the essence and the greatness of this House is the fact that we permit an Opposition party to challenge a government and to raise the question of whether they should not be thrown out and that we take over. If we

are deprived of that, sir, then we make sterile the rights of this House and the rights of the people.

May I say at the outset that as we look at Ottawa, we see that there has been an accommodation as my hon. friend from Sudbury said. We realize that we do not want to be making a motion of censure all the time. There has been an agreement whether it would be for six, and I understand in Westminster I think it is three. I would say that both have a relativity to this Parliament. Recognizing that the Opposition has a responsibility to have the opportunity to move a vote of censure, you, sir, in your position would protect not only the rights of the government for debate, but also the rights of the Opposition to carry through their constitutional role.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, further to the point of order that has been raised by the hon. Prime Minister, I think there has been a steady erosion of certain rules or custom in this House over the years. This group here attempted a few years ago—I cannot now give you a precise reference—to move an amendment on what presumably was a motion to go into committee of supply. We were declared out of order at that time. This was a ruling of the Speaker that could hardly have been based on traditional procedure, nor on the written rules of this House, as I recall them without having looked them up recently. Strictly speaking, every time the House goes into committee of supply there is a specific motion for the purpose; it used to be considered in order to move an amendment relative to the business which the committee of supply was to take up. It used to be procedure that it would be announced what business the committee was to take up on that particular day. As I say, we tried to exercise that right and we were peremptorily ruled out of order, without any particular reason given.

It can be admitted that if an amendment is permitted every time the House goes into committee of supply, there could be a great deal of waste of the time of the House. As my hon. friends here have pointed out, this problem has been settled in other jurisdictions by agreement on all sides that there would be a specific number of occasions on which such amendments would be permitted. In this House, however, there are no occasions on which such amendments are permitted. Indeed, it is now claimed that the House resolves itself into committee of

supply without any motion at all. As soon as the hon. Prime Minister calls the order, we automatically go into committee of supply.

I have no doubt that the large number of gentlemen sitting across from me and to my left do not mind jumping through the hoops whenever they are told, as we saw earlier today. But over here, we do not necessarily agree as to the hoop we should jump through, nor as to the time we should jump through it. I think that we should, from time to time, have an opportunity to indicate our disinclination to jump through the hoop that the hon. Prime Minister has decreed for the particular time. However, our previous effort to assert ourselves in that way was, as I say, peremptorily dismissed. I do not really know what one could say the custom of this House now is.

All I would like to say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, is that I think it is high time that all of these matters were considered in a systematic way. The hon. Prime Minister read from a report from a committee that was presented to this House a few years ago. I would remind you, sir, and the hon. Prime Minister, that that committee never did submit a final report. I think the rug was pulled out from under it by the calling of an election, and after two interim reports it did not complete its business. So it embarked on the project of considering the rules of the House, but never completed the work. I think it is quite unreasonable to rely upon a report, which was intended only as an interim report, dealing with only one phase of the rules. Either we should complete the job and consider the rules in their totality and arrive at some sort of agreement, or I think we should revert to the original rules, which permitted amendment on every occasion when the House went into committee of supply. On every such occasion there is really an implied motion. How can we move into committee of supply without some sort of motion, unless there is a rule, a written rule, saying that we will do so? There is no written rule; there is an interim report of a committee that recommended this. The report was adopted only in the sense that it was placed on the table of the House. It was not adopted, surely, as a determination as to an amendment of the rules of this House.

As for the present moment, Mr. Speaker, you once again are placed in a difficult position by virtue of the fact that our rules now exist in a state of limbo. The last time they were written was about 30 years ago

and all sorts of those written rules have now been superseded, we are told, by custom. Well, if they have been superseded, I say it is time that we rewrote them, to take into account the current procedure, so that members will know where they stand. Before they are rewritten, I would suggest that a committee of this House should sit down and consider the whole matter with a view to determining the rules that in this day would, on the one hand, facilitate government business and, on the other hand, give a reasonable opportunity to the Opposition to put forward its point of view.

I do not think it is good enough for the hon. Prime Minister to come in with an interim report, adopted only for the purpose of putting it on the table; I think it is time that we faced the whole problem and tried to settle it in a way that would be satisfactory to all reasonable men. This is not the situation at the present time.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: May I just have one word on this point of order? I would like to make it very clear that this was not an interim report. I have a copy of it, it is available to the hon. member or anyone. I would just read one paragraph which says:

A study was made of the procedure in the Houses of Commons of the United Kingdom and Canada on going into committee of supply. As a result the committee concluded that the present practice in the Ontario Legislature of a motion being moved for the Speaker to leave the chair each time the committee goes into supply, is incorrect and recommendation No. 6 was agreed to.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It was agreed by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), who was chairman, by the hon. member for Essex North (Mr. Reaume) and by the hon. member for Hamilton East (Mr. Davison). Now, the point I make, Mr. Speaker, is very simply this. This procedure did not, I repeat, did not, grow up through any desire of this government to remove any of the rights of the Opposition, it grew up as the result of a recommendation of an all-party committee of this House.

Mr. Singer: Oh, nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Of course it is not nonsense. There is the report.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that if you go through the report you will find that this is not the only procedural matter set forth in this report which is now the procedure in this House.

I want to make one other point very clear—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, surely it is nonsense to say that every interim report that is received becomes part of the rules of the House. It is utter nonsense.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am saying simply this: I will not accept the allegation that this government is trying to destroy the rights of the Opposition. That is the only reason I brought this in. I will not accept that position.

This procedure has been current in this House since 1961. I could not care less if we change it back the way it was before. I am quite prepared to meet with the hon. leader of the Opposition and make an arrangement, but before I do that I must make my point clear; it was not this government; it was an all-party report that recommended this procedure, so he cannot sit over there and try to say that we are stifling the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, to line this up, there are other questions of procedure which we will have to straighten out, and which are presently being negotiated. I can assure the hon. member that I would be very happy to reach some arrangement whereby we can take two, three, four, or more, because I am not too concerned at this stage about the motion to censure. If he wishes to move that is all right. But we will have to do it in an orderly fashion.

I am prepared to discuss this, I will not however, sit here and permit the allegation to be made that we are trying to close him off, when all we are doing is following something he agreed to do.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Prime Minister spoke twice and he has made remarks—

Mr. Speaker: The Prime Minister offered the original remarks. I think perhaps we can wind this matter up—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, on a point of information, if I might say: The hon. Prime Minister is completely inaccurate in saying it was started in 1961; it was started by the Hon. George Drew. If he would look at this, he would find that started many years ago. I wish that he would take the interest which his predecessor did in the history of this Legislature. The Hon. George Drew started

that process of ways and means and supply to move it through.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Thompson: And we want to see it—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to say a few words. The report that the hon. Prime Minister has just read is not at odds with what we, on this side of the House, suggest could now be done to reconcile the differences of opinion between the Opposition and the government. All my hon. friend read from that report was that the committee members agreed that not every time need the House go into this motion for committee to go into supply. It does not say that it should not do it at all; it says "every time."

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I am afraid not. Mr. Speaker, just as a matter of information, I will read the recommendation. It is recommendation No. 6, that when the order of the day for House in committee of supply is read, Mr. Speaker do leave the chair without motion or question and the House immediately resolve itself into committee of supply. That is the sixth recommendation.

Mr. Oliver: Prior to that, my hon. friend said as he read to us just a few minutes ago, and prior to—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Would the hon. member like me to send it over?

Mr. Oliver: Well, the hon. Prime Minister can send it over. But my hearing is still good, and he said that the committee agreed that, not on every occasion, need this be done. He did not say—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is the sixth recommendation, right?

Mr. Oliver: Yes, that is right, sure it is right. But not on every occasion. That is all we are asking tonight.

I can remember in this House, Mr. Speaker, when it was customary, and when it was the right of the Opposition, to move a motion of censure going into supply and it was done many times. Now we have got to the place in the procedure in this House when we cannot move a motion at any time going into supply. Somewhere in between those two, surely, we can find a common ground that will help us to get out of this distasteful situation because my hon. friend will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the old days the sessions

used to last about 30 days. I remember one when we had an awful time to get it to last 30 days. But now it lasts six months, and in the six months as we are presently observing the rules we have only two official times that we can censure this government—on the Speech from the Throne and on the Budget. If it was important in the days when the House lasted only 30 days that the Opposition should have a chance to move, going into the committee of supply, a motion of censure against the government, surely it is much more important that they should have that opportunity now?

I agree with what the committee reported, that not every time did we have it. But for heaven's sake, do not let us have these squabbles every time we go into supply or into some other part of governmental activity. Let us sit down together and agree that four, five or six times during the session the Opposition will have the right to move, going into supply, a motion of censure against the government. The way it is now, you are completely tying our hands and it just cannot be done.

Mr. Speaker: In view of the fact—

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): I would say this, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Is the member going to speak to the point of order? Otherwise he is out of order.

Mr. Sargent: In regard to this, I do not think I owe the House an apology, but I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I have the greatest respect for you personally and your office, and for every hon. member of this House individually. I think that I owe it to my party and to the people I represent to say that I do have respect for the laws of this House. In the heat of debate, when I said I would not sit down, I should not have said that. I respect you and your office, Mr. Speaker. I am not apologizing for my stand, because no one should doubt my feelings about equal rights here. I wanted to say I am sorry I was out of order; I do respect your office. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker: On that happy note, I think perhaps we can resolve the situation at the present time. Although, as some members have pointed out, I am a great believer in the ancient customs and practices of Westminster as well as our own House, in view of the fact that it has been the custom and the practice for the past four or five years to go into committee of supply without a specific

motion, I think that perhaps we shall go into supply on this occasion without a formal specific motion. If an agreement is reached upon some other procedure, it shall then be used when the occasion arises.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE PRIME MINISTER

Mr. Chairman: Estimates of The Department of the Prime Minister, page 95.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Chairman, would it be in order for me to suggest that an appropriate branch of the office be opened with moderate funds, the purpose of which would be to keep the hon. member for Lakeshore (Mr. Eagleson) and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Kerr) informed of what the hon. Prime Minister is doing?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): If we had a few more that did not speak—

Mr. Sopha: Oh, he is back.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 1401.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on this vote—I think this is probably the only opportunity I have—one of the responsibilities which the hon. Prime Minister has is in his relations with Ottawa, and I am thinking particularly of the federal-provincial conferences. I would like, sir, on this occasion, to make some remarks which we in the Opposition feel about the Dominion-provincial conference and the role of the hon. Prime Minister. I am talking about the general principle of the role of the Prime Minister, and we are voting, I think, on his salary, so I hope that you would agree that I am in order on this, sir.

The first thing is that we believe that many of the Dominion-provincial conferences have far greater influence in many ways than this Legislature and its deliberation, and it is for this reason that we have a concern on two scores: one, on the secrecy which takes place, and the other, on the insufficient consultation which takes place.

We believe that there should be reform in these two areas. In the first place, on the secrecy, I would suggest, sir, that there should be open conferences. One of the great things about our country is we have faith in the people of the country, faith in the fair-mindedness and the reasonability of the people of this province if they are only trusted, if the issues are brought to them.

And surely today more and more, the issues on a Dominion-provincial basis are of crucial interest to the people of the province and we cannot see why these discussions should be held in private. The people have a right to know the whole of the deliberations.

I notice where the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) has stated that, regarding the Medicare bill and the deliberations that took place, when we asked him about the stands he made or the difficulties with the issues with the federal people, he said—and I am paraphrasing—“You do not tell secrets when you are talking with your friends. You do not talk outside about what you talked about inside.” This is on a far bigger scale than that, Mr. Speaker. This is something that is affecting the people of this province and we want to know what the deliberations are which take place in Ottawa between the province and Ottawa.

I believe that the participation of the Opposition party should be considered and I do not want to be unreasonable in this. I think that the Opposition party should be invited to go as observers to a number of these conferences. They would get far better debates, far more enlightened debate in this Legislature. The government would probably get far more sympathy and again we would be getting public dialogue on these issues, by bringing them before the people. I, sir, am the leader of the Ontario Liberal Party and, speaking for the people of Ontario, I think that one of the difficulties about the Fulton-Favreau formula was that there was not participation by Opposition parties in this.

May I come to my next point? I think there should be more consultation. I believe that there should be a central office, a Dominion-provincial secretariat—and I know we brought this up during the last estimates of the Prime Minister. I quote, sir, from *Hansard* of last year and the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister to a question of a secretariat of Dominion-provincial affairs in the province here. He answered: “To meet the needs of whatever the situation is we put together various groups from the departments concerned. Some of the co-ordination is done out of my office, but there is a great deal of co-ordination and consultation between the two governments at the departmental or ministerial level which I would not necessarily know about.”

Sir, I think that in all the relations between the federal government and the province there should be an essential philosophy which emanates from the Prime Minister.

I am not sure this is being done. The hon. Prime Minister does not know some of the consultations taking place, probably, at a civil service level or at a higher level, the Deputy Ministers' level. I think one of the problems today is that with the many inter-provincial and Dominion-provincial conferences taking place, they may be going off at odd ends, one going one way and the other the other, and yet they are all tied together with a common interest. There should be a common purpose, which means there should be leadership by the hon. Prime Minister in this area.

When I ask for a Minister—I call him a Minister of Dominion-Provincial Affairs in this House, sir—I really feel that the hon. Prime Minister himself—and I commend him on what he has been doing in this area—would probably want to be that Minister, to take that portfolio, in the sense that he is acting that part anyway, taking the full responsibility for the deliberations between Ottawa and this province. But I feel a Cabinet post should be created, sir, and a department that is responsible for the deliberations. I say this because there should be a period in the House when questions could be asked by the Opposition to the Minister—if it is the Prime Minister—about relations with Ottawa and the province.

It would be a good debate; it would be a very interesting debate, and the people of Ontario would be very excited about knowing some of the deliberations which have taken place. For that reason I say that first, let us do away with the secrecy that takes place with Dominion-provincial conferences, and, secondly, let us set up a secretariat so that there can be consultations taking place with Ottawa.

I come to my last point, sir, and that is this debate on Confederation. As I understand it, an advisory committee is being set up by the hon. Prime Minister to advise him on the questions of Confederation. I may say that I had advocated such a committee to be made up of the most knowledgeable people throughout the province on Confederation and the Constitution. I, frankly, was delighted when the hon. Prime Minister arranged that he would have such a committee and it was in the Speech from the Throne of last year, but I had hoped that this would be a committee which would be reporting to an all-party committee of the House. I had hoped that the hon. Prime Minister would be using the experts to again encourage public dialogue throughout this province, rather than it should be a committee which is cloistered

within the confines of the hon. Prime Minister's office, reporting only to him. I know this committee has been making reports to the hon. Prime Minister. I would like to see them making their reports to the Legislature. We all have a stake, we all have a stake in what the deliberations of the government will be towards the framing of our Confederation and we all want to share in it. I would hope that the hon. Prime Minister might today reconsider this group that he has. It is not of one particular political hue. They are being asked to join his committee because of their outstanding scholastic ability and I know that they represent many political hues, and I would hope that we could learn from the deliberations which they have been having.

May I say that in the Quebec Legislature they have tabled, with their similar committee, reports to an all-party group in the House, over 5,000 pages of technical data on Quebec.

I have been talking, sir, about what I think is one of the most important aspects of this Legislature, and that is our relations today, our Dominion-provincial relations, and I have been asking that the whole of the Legislature play a part in these deliberations. I have been asking that we should—the hon. Prime Minister when he goes to Ottawa—I suggest that there could be open conferences. I have been asking that the hon. Prime Minister might indicate that the Opposition parties could go up to these conferences as observers and I believe that in some cases they might be considered to go as participants with representatives of the government. I ask finally that there should be more consultation. There should be a department set up here which will co-ordinate the many Dominion-provincial committees that are activated now and that are working. There should be some co-ordination and central direction through a Minister who, I would presume, would be the hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, traditionally the estimates of this department, I think, have been dealt with in a relatively routine manner by the Opposition parties. In fact, the approach might best be described by that word which has become part of the folklore of this session, "nit-picking." The queries were usually with relation to what braintrusters had been added to The Department of the Prime Minister or what had been the expense account of his PR officer in the last year or so. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that items of this nature do not get down to the important policy and administrative problems that relate to the very centre of government, namely, the Prime

Minister's office and the Cabinet, which is the estimate that is before us here.

The hon. leader of the Opposition has dealt with some phases beyond that in his introductory remarks—federal-provincial conferences and the committee on Confederation. I want to take a look-in-depth rather than the routine look, Mr. Chairman, that has characterized the past. In fact, if I can go back to that idyllic picture that was given to us by the seconder of the motion in reply to the Speech from the Throne (Mr. Carton), that picture of the good ship Roberts sailing beneficently across the Ontario landscape, what we are dealing with today is the most important part of the ship, namely, the bridge where the captain operates. Frankly, Mr. Chairman, what I want to suggest and I hope I can prove it to some degree even to the doubting Thomases on the government side of the House, is that there is something seriously wrong on the bridge of the ship.

Mr. Chairman, in my Throne speech I recalled in some detail two crises which have rocked this government in the past two years—the police-state legislation in 1964 and the pension crisis in 1965, from which, in fact, we have not yet escaped. The hon. Prime Minister frankly admitted to a delegation of civic employees that came to see him a couple of weeks ago that he was in a bind on this issue, and exactly how he is going to get out of that bind we have yet to learn.

But the important point here, Mr. Chairman, is that these two crises provided a dramatic public revelation of contradictions in policy and of confusion in administration which are widespread throughout the whole of this government. And the root of the trouble, I submit—and I shall go forward to give you some evidence now—is to be found right in the Prime Minister's department.

If I may pursue the analogy of the good ship Roberts, too often there is chaos on the bridge. The hon. Prime Minister makes a policy statement, for example, on pensions, and two months later he publicly reveals that he has either forgotten what that statement was or he did not understand it in the first place. The hon. Prime Minister makes a statement, for example, on per capita costs on Medicare in January, and when a controversy breaks out with regard to those figures the hon. Minister of Health reveals that the figures the hon. Prime Minister used had been discarded by a federal-provincial conference four months earlier, in September.

Now, let us face it, Mr. Chairman: The communication system has broken down on the good ship Roberts. The skipper and his

senior officers in the Cabinet are often at cross-purposes. The trouble lies, partly, in an almost incredible incapacity to clarify policies even among themselves on some occasions, let alone the general public; and partly because the responsibilities of so many of the senior officers on the good ship are so ill-defined, so overlapping in many instances, so competitive when they should be co-ordinated, that service to the people of Ontario gets lost in the warring between the departmental empires.

Mr. Chairman, only the hon. Prime Minister can resolve this. I raised this last year when I was speaking in introduction to the estimates of the Minister of Economics and Development. Only the hon. Prime Minister can resolve this, but he has not done so. Somehow—and before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to make some suggestions tonight—the machinery at the centre of government, in the Cabinet and more particularly in the Prime Minister's office, must be developed in order to resolve these conflicts and make it possible for us to get on and get the job done.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I acknowledge that when we are talking about the centre of government, the Prime Minister's office, there are other factors which converge on this office and contribute to its problems, but they are not of immediate concern to us tonight.

Some people have said, for example, that the trouble lies in the fact that the hon. Prime Minister has too much deadwood in his Cabinet. Editorial friends have referred to it as "tired and old," and they have been publicly asking when the hon. Prime Minister is going to do something about it. Other commentators, Mr. Chairman, have argued that Ontario just has a dull, grey government, with no inspired leadership. They have pointed out that the only time there is any excitement associated with the government, is when the hon. Prime Minister, and I am quoting here: "has dumped in his lap a crisis created by some blundering Ministers such as Mr. Cass or Mr. Spooner."

But today, Mr. Chairman, our concern is with the Prime Minister's office and my basic contention is that our trouble stems directly from the failure of the hon. Prime Minister to give vigorous leadership in resolving the policy conflicts and the departmental confusion, and in creating the necessary machinery in his office for getting the job done.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, Professor Krueger from Waterloo University documented these conflicts and confusion in certain key areas

of the government in his address to the regional development conference which is sponsored by The Department of Economics and Development. The hon. Prime Minister considered this conference important enough that he took the unprecedented step of adjourning the Legislature for a day or so, in order that members could attend.

What Professor Krueger had to say was based on studies done by himself and two of his colleagues in the department of geography at the University of Waterloo, at the request of the Ontario economic council. In view of the vital importance of this whole problem, Mr. Chairman, we in the Opposition requested that the Krueger report should be tabled. Clearly we, as well as the government, were entitled to have the benefit of that study.

But the government refused to table it. It has not been tabled yet. Characteristically, it regarded this information as something that should be kept secret for the use of the government alone. And since the government, and more particularly the hon. Prime Minister, is doing nothing about it, all the more reason that this study and its recommendations, embarrassing though they may be, should become public knowledge.

On the principle that what the government will not reveal on public business is the Opposition's responsibility to dig out, I have taken the trouble to see whether I could not come across a copy of the Krueger report. I am glad to say my efforts were crowned with success. I have a copy of that report here.

I have read it very, very carefully from cover to cover. It has a great deal of revealing information in it; some most interesting recommendations, some of which relate directly to the centre of government and the Prime Minister's department. So I am speaking here tonight not exclusively in terms of my own ideas, but from the careful documentation of a study initiated by this government itself, through one of its departments and the Ontario economic council.

I should say, just by way of sorting out what is relevant here tonight, that that Krueger report was rather limited in its initial objective.

That was to conduct "an objective analysis of agencies and programmes concerned with the various phases of regional economic development in Ontario."

Furthermore, the authors specified quite frankly that they did not have the time or the resources to cover the whole range of government. Therefore, they concentrated in two or three of the relevant departments,

namely, economics and development, municipal affairs, and tourism and information, along with the role of the Cabinet and the Prime Minister.

What emerges is an indescribable maze of confusion and contradiction in policies and administration, overlapping responsibilities, duplicated effort, departments competing in the same field and a well developed propensity for studying problems with no effective machinery for implementing the recommendations of those studies. As I said last year, speaking only on the basis of the speech made by Professor Krueger at the regional development conference, the account he gives is worthy of Gilbert and Sullivan. It is highly amusing, if it were not so serious.

What he does, after detailing—and I will not go into it here, because it is not relevant in this department—so many cases in the other departments, municipal affairs, economics and development, and tourism and information—what he does is to detail the confusion and then draw two or three sober conclusions. These are what we should take a look at, when we come back to the importance of the Prime Minister's office and what might be done about it. On page 8 of the report, I am quoting:

The net result is an apparent maze of administrative regions and districts that often cut across basic statistical data gathering units such as counties and townships, thus making it impossible to analyze trends in resource use and economic development and difficult to formulate and implement planning and economic policy.

Now that is not very dramatic, Mr. Chairman. But read it, and what it adds up to is that you simply have not got the machinery to do the job. Your administrative machinery is totally inadequate. Page 9, quote:

After reviewing the provincial regional administrative organizations, one is led to the conclusion that when confronted with an outmoded municipal structure, the government of Ontario, in place of the needed basic reorganization of that structure, superimposed upon it a new and complicated set of administrative regions. This expedient has in turn created a fundamental impediment to rational planning or resource use and economic development.

Again not very dramatic, in terms of words. But in terms of frustration and a basic lack of machinery to be able to tackle the job, almost total in its devastating condemnation. Not only is there competition and lack of co-ordination between various departments of the government, which have responsibility in

one particular field—such as tourism in The Department of Economics and Development and in The Department of Tourism and Information—but on occasion branches of the same department are not aware of what another branch in the same department is doing. For example, and I quote:

In the process of our investigations—says Professor Krueger:

—we received a report concerning two sections of one branch—

and I am looking directly at the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall):

—that were carrying out the same type of field survey in the same region, with neither survey group knowing of the existence of the other until they met in the field.

That is to be found on page 11 of the report. Obviously, Mr. Chairman, this kind of overlapping of responsibilities can be resolved only at the top by the hon. Prime Minister. But there is no indication—you had this report a year ago; you have been sitting on this report now for at least 12 or 15 months. Something of its content was indicated to the public at the regional development conference.

I dealt with it at great length in the introduction to the estimates last year of The Department of Economics and Development, and the hon. Prime Minister has done nothing that is publicly visible for the purpose of resolving this chaos.

The Krueger report makes another basic point crystal clear. Both the regional development division of The Department of Economics and Development and the community development branch of The Department of Municipal Affairs have been given, on paper at least, the responsibility of co-ordinating government action from all departments in certain areas. But this is an impossibility, Mr. Chairman. On page 20 the Krueger report makes this statement:

One branch of one department cannot co-ordinate government policies. Co-ordination must take place at the Cabinet level.

So we are right back with the hon. Prime Minister, the Cabinet and the Prime Minister's office. Once again, nothing has happened. Again the leadership must come from the hon. Prime Minister, and there is no evidence that he has done anything in this connection. So the co-ordination is ineffective, while the departments pursue their

jurisdictional warfare. The report cites another basic point on page 23 and I quote:

We also recognize that it is virtually impossible to co-ordinate economic development policies and programmes when there is no overall official statement of economic goals. If the government believes in co-ordination of programmes affecting regional economic development, one of the most urgent and fundamental tasks is to formulate a master development plan which becomes the blueprint for policies of all departments.

But there is no master development plan. Once again, the leadership has not come from the hon. Prime Minister or the Cabinet—more accurately—in this instance. The result is that every department is working in the dark, with no guidelines for any contributions which they might be able to make.

However, the report is realistic. It points out that even if you had a master plan, even if some elimination of wasteful duplication of effort by competing departments operating in the same field took place, it is inevitable in our complex, modern society, that the resources of a number of departments will be needed in coping with problems such as the development and conservation of our natural resources, land use throughout Ontario, or regional economic development. This is true of a growing range of topics, whether it be the war on poverty, or helping our Indian population to rescue themselves from a shameful second-class citizenship.

Where a number of departments are involved, the traditional approach has been for the Prime Minister to set up an inter-departmental committee—this is a favourite resort, but experience suggests that they have not proven to be an effective instrument and the Krueger report details a classic example.

In 1961, the year our present hon. Prime Minister took over the reins of government, a Cabinet committee on conservation and land use was formed. To be quite frank, I do not know whether it was formed before he became leader or after—conceivably it was before he became leader because I believe the leadership convention was late in the fall—but it was during his first year in office. That committee brought together ten government departments and two agencies, namely, Ontario Hydro and the OWRC. To assist the committee an advisory sub-committee of senior civil servants was organized. Dr. E. G. Pleva, a geographer

from the University of Western Ontario, was retained as a consultant. The responsibilities of that Cabinet committee were spelled out:

1. To propose a basis for a comprehensive programme of development related to provincial policies and natural resources.

2. To study and make recommendations on departmental procedures and problems in the general conservation plan of the province.

3. To recommend the best methods of co-ordinating the activities of the different agencies in the field of conservation.

4. To provide a clearing house for departmental plans and programmes and an information exchange for the benefit of departments and agencies related to conservation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to lay the groundwork for future activities the committee asked each department and commission to prepare a brief outlining its organization and responsibilities as they related to resources conservation and land use. From this information a magnificent chart was prepared which showed the way that the ten different departments and commissions had either a direct or indirect effect on resources use.

I think you will agree, Mr. Chairman, that was a pretty impressive tackling of this whole problem—admittedly an important programme. Ten departments of the government, two agencies, an advisory committee made up of all the senior civil servants involved in the departments of the Deputy Ministers, and the consultant, Dr. Pleva. And what happened after all that big start? I quote from the Krueger report, Mr. Chairman:

The Cabinet committee on conservation and land use as well as the advisory committee of civil servants seems to have ceased to exist.

As so often happens with this government, a committee is set up and it just drifts off into limbo.

The Krueger report concludes:

There is little evidence that the committee was very effective at the ministerial level or that it resulted in any co-ordinating of major policies or programmes.

The reasons were not difficult to find. The Ministers were so involved in the pressing affairs of their own departmental activities that they could not find time to really give the committee a fair chance to succeed. Also, although a Minister was selected

as chairman and the chairmanship was rotated, no one Minister felt that he had the responsibility for seeing that integrated policies were carried out.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the responsibility for this kind of wasted time and effort comes right back once again to the hon. Prime Minister. When he sets up a Cabinet committee there must be effective machinery for arriving at co-ordinated policies, and even more important, for carrying them out.

In fact, the Krueger report has a specific recommendation that is obviously plain common sense. I quote:

In order for a Cabinet committee to succeed, it seems essential that the Prime Minister take the responsibility for ensuring that the committee policies are implemented, even though they may require major modifications of individual departmental programmes.

Furthermore, Mr. Chairman, this can be done only if the Cabinet committee is bolstered with a key person whose status is that of a Deputy Minister, answerable directly to the Prime Minister, and whose duties must be to bring about the co-ordination and co-operation of all departments and agencies relating to the particular field that comes under the jurisdiction of this committee.

The significant thing, Mr. Chairman, is that this is not a new proposal. As the Krueger report points out, it was recommended by the 1950 select committee on conservation. But 10 years later, when this government got around to setting up that Cabinet committee—there we have it in the “fullness of time,” the speed with which the Tories operate, 10 years after the recommendation is made they set up the Cabinet committee—they did not heed the suggestion for the appointment of a chief of conservation, with the status of a Deputy Minister answerable directly to the Prime Minister, so no co-ordination of major policies emerged and no programme was implemented. The whole effort was little more than an idle gesture for which responsibility falls squarely on the shoulders of the hon. Prime Minister.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that the technique of a co-ordinating committee responsible directly to the head of government is now being used effectively by the President of the United States on broad programmes and problems such as the war on poverty. As it is a presidential committee, there is the necessary prestige and power to establish co-ordination through the various government agencies.

In Ontario today there are a growing number of problems for which policies and administration involves a number of government departments. There is this important question of the development and conservation of our natural resources, with which this government has been toying for years. There is the question of land use. There is the obviously important area of regional economic development. There is the question of implementing the new policy with regard to Indians, which has been in the making for some time. There is the problem of salvaging some of our human resources through the formulating of a policy and a programme involving four or five departments for emotionally disturbed children. Obviously, these are among some of the most important issues in public life today.

I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that the time has come to recognize the ineffectiveness of the loosely knit Cabinet committees we have used in the past and replace them with Prime Minister's committees that will have the power to work out a co-ordinated policy and have that policy implemented through all the departments that need to be involved. To do this a person must be assigned specifically to the task; a top-flight person with a Deputy Minister status and answerable directly to the Prime Minister. Otherwise, we shall for the most part just go through the motions once again in the future, as we have in the past.

Those represent one aspect of my remarks that I would like to summarize before I move on to the next — this whole question of the Prime Minister's committees as an effective substitute for the interdepartmental committees and the need for public discussion and action on questions raised by Professor Krueger in his report.

Now, sir, let me turn to a second area of concern with regard to the inadequacies of the Prime Minister's office. I have been reading through the speeches which the hon. Prime Minister has made over the past year or so. As a matter of fact, I have about a whole fistful of them here.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Almost enough to write a good book.

Mr. MacDonald: It shows the attention we give to the words of the first citizen.

Mr. Sopha: He usually speaks well.

Mr. MacDonald: There is one central theme in these speeches: His reflections on relations with Quebec and the problems involved in reshaping Confederation to meet

the needs of our day. Obviously, the hon. Prime Minister has a battery of braintrusters researching and preparing speeches on this theme. No doubt he has access to the government's advisory committee on Confederation, chaired by the province's chief economist, Ian Macdonald. Once again, for some reason or other all of the effort of this advisory committee, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has pointed out, remains secret, available only to the government but denied to the Opposition, denied to the public.

Perhaps, Mr. Chairman, it is not accurate to say that it is completely denied to the public because the hon. Prime Minister has given us some revealing glimpses in his public speeches. His posture is usually that —and I am using his own words here—of “a Canadian from Ontario,” taking the broad view of the problems of Confederation at this critical period in our history, rather than a narrow, parochial, Ontario view.

It is all the more important, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we take a good look at what the hon. Prime Minister has been saying on this, his favourite theme, because in the absence of any opportunity provided by the government for solid and continuous debates on this issue in this Legislature, one of the most important facing this nation today, we have to go chiefly to the hon. Prime Minister's speeches given outside the House.

On the one hand, I would be the first to say—and I have said it before in this House—that the hon. Prime Minister has shown a commendable understanding of, and sympathy for, the aspirations of Quebec. He has been warmly applauded in French Canada for his public statements on the need for developing the bilingual nature of this country. In his general approach, the hon. Prime Minister's efforts have been all the more commendable because they are in striking contrast to the basic lack of understanding and sympathy displayed by his federal leader on the fundamental problems of Canadian nationhood.

But having started with a fundamentally sound and constructive attitude towards Quebec, it is all the more regrettable, in my view, that the hon. Prime Minister has not shown an equal understanding of the historic role of Ontario in Confederation and in reshaping it so that it can survive for the second century.

This, I suggest, is of vital concern to us as Canadians, and, more particularly, to us as members of this Legislature.

For years the impatient cry throughout English-speaking Canada has been: What does Quebec want? Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is increasingly clear what Quebec wants. And what is more important, while the rest of the nation tends to drift in various directions, Quebec is moving forward toward achieving its goals.

Quebec's educational system, for example, was hopelessly inadequate for the 20th century, but she has broken the bonds of the past and forged ahead with breathtaking speed. The objectives and the guidelines for action in the whole field of education are clearly set forward in the Parent report.

Quebec's economy was among the most underdeveloped in Canada. Once again, her economic development has matched that of any part of Canada in recent years. Moreover, she is evolving a programme of regional economic development in the Gaspé project, which is now going to be more broadly applied across the whole province and, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, makes our efforts in this connection look little more than feeble fumbling up to this point.

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Did the hon. member read Mr. Gerard Filion in the *Toronto Globe and Mail* this morning?

Mr. MacDonald: I did.

Hon. Mr. Randall: There is the answer.

Mr. MacDonald: That is not the answer. That is only one small aspect of the question.

Hon. Mr. Randall: It is very important.

Mr. MacDonald: It is an important part, but if you had gone down to the regional development conference, and if you had taken the Cabinet down so you might have built up some support for your issue, you would have found that there are limitations on the possibility of decentralizing industry out into every community.

Hon. Mr. Randall: We are decentralizing every day of the week.

Mr. MacDonald: But lots of people at the conference talked about the need for a study in developing new growth centres, and you are not even doing the studying to consider what might be the growth centres.

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member does not know whether we have or not.

Mr. MacDonald: What sort of a secret society are you running over on that side of the House? This is part of my whole complaint.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to have to ask the member for York South to continue. We do not want to have discussion across the floor, please.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you get your Irish up, I am sure even the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will subside into silence.

If I might cite another example that I trust does not arouse the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) as much as I aroused the hon. Minister of Economics and Development—

Hon. Mr. Randall: The hon. member has not aroused me, I am sure.

Mr. MacDonald: —Quebec was burdened with a 19th-century approach to categorical assistance in the health and welfare field. Now she is moving towards a more efficient and humane approach which raises problems in federal-provincial relations, but which bids fair to leaving us far behind in a more effective meeting of the needs of the people. In short, Mr. Chairman, politics in French Canada today are exciting, with a sense of direction and purpose. The important question is not what Quebec wants, but what do we want? What does English-speaking Canada want? When are we going to develop, either in our own province or collectively in English Canada, the same sense of direction and purpose to create our "quiet revolution" so that our needs can be met as fully and as effectively as they are in the province of Quebec? When can we escape the dull grey of our politics and capture some of the same excitement which characterizes political life in French Canada today?

The crisis today is not so much in French Canada, Mr. Chairman, as it is in English Canada, and the dangers are the greater because we do not even recognize that we have a problem. We do not seem to know that we have a problem. It is in this area that I submit to the hon. Prime Minister, in spite of repeated public pronouncements in this field, that he has not recognized the true nature of the crisis; nor, more important, has he recognized the historic role of Ontario in giving voice to the aspirations of English Canada within Confederation.

This point, Mr. Chairman, is so basic and so important that I want to take a moment to give the House what I think is the most

brilliantly succinct analysis of the crisis in Canadian Confederation. It is a brief quotation from an article by Professor Gad Horowitz of McGill University in an article in the magazine *Canadian Dimension*, entitled "The future of English Canada." I want to quote from that article.

The greatest threat to the existence of Canada is not the autonomist drive of Quebec. It is the weakness of the will to nationhood in English Canada.

The immediate danger is that the inevitable transfer of power to Quebec will be carried out as part of a general transfer of power from the federal to the provincial governments.

There is no way of avoiding an autonomous Quebec. Quebec demands and deserves autonomy. She will have autonomy within Confederation, or there will be no more Confederation. But there is no reason to strengthen the other provincial governments. On the contrary, there may be good economic and political reasons, and good English-Canadian nationalist reasons, for strengthening the federal government in its relationship with the English-speaking provinces. The obvious solution to Canada's difficulties would appear to be a federal government which is weak in relation to Quebec but strong in relation to the other provinces—in other words, a "special status" for Quebec within Confederation. Of course, this solution can now be stated only in general terms; working out the details will be a long, hard grind. But no one has really begun to work them out. Events are not moving in the direction of a special status for Quebec. They are moving in the direction of greater autonomy for all the provinces.

Why should this be so? Quebec is certainly not at fault. The French Canadians do not care how English Canada manages its own affairs, so long as Quebec is left alone. Why, then, this complacency in the face of the impending break-up of English Canada?

What most students of Canada's problems do not realize is that Canada is now going through not one crisis, but two. The first is the crisis of Quebec, which gets all the headlines and all the hard thought. The second is the crisis of identity in English Canada, which is losing the only unifying sets of attitudes and symbols it ever had, the sense of being British North America, and is replacing it with nothing. The Britishness of Canada was its ideological and emotional spine. It has been

broken. This is Canada's quiet crisis. No one worries about it. No one says anything about it.

Then, having analyzed the picture there, Mr. Chairman, in this fashion, Professor Horowitz points to a few ways out. I quote:

The survival of Canada depends on the resurrection of English-Canadian will to nationhood.

And later:

The French Canadians often say to us "We French Canadians know that we are a nation. Whether you English Canadians are a nation is for you to decide." It is time for us to take up the challenge.

says Professor Horowitz. He adds:

If we are willing to make use of it for our own purposes, French-Canadian nationalism can help to create a true English-Canadian nationalism. Group identities develop in conflict. We may not have been an English-Canadian nation in the past. We may have considered ourselves Britons in North America (the old Tory view), or "unhyphenated Canadians" (the Dafoe-Diefenbaker prairie view), but it is no longer realistic to think of ourselves in those terms. The French Canadians will not permit unhyphenated Canadianism, and to think of ourselves as British North Americans is not only unjust to the new Canadians, but unsatisfactory even to the scions of Loyalists. The fact that the French Canadians tend to think of us as an English-Canadian nation in a bi-national state and address their demands to us as if we were such a nation, may encourage us to think in their terms and to respond to their demands in their terms. French-Canadian nationalism can help to beget English-Canadian nationalism.

Professor Horowitz emphasizes:

This is not an appeal to English Canadians to respond to the reply of "Quebec d'abord" with the tit-for-tat "English Canada first." It is an appeal to give at least as much thought to the future of English Canada as we are giving to the future of Confederation. There is reason to believe that the two nations will be able to live together in the bosom of this single state only when both are fully developed nations, each controlling its own destiny.

Mr. Chairman, so much for Horowitz's views. In light of them, I want to get back to what I think are the inadequacies of the hon. Prime Minister's conception of the role of Ontario as revealed in his speeches over the past year or so.

If we concede that Quebec has a special status in Confederation, as indeed she has always had, and as she is likely to have in an even greater extent in the opting-out formula in the future, then should we claim the same privilege to opt out ourselves in Ontario, perhaps with no strings attached, as the hon. Prime Minister threatened in the Medicare debate? Should we seek the same decentralization of powers for Ontario and all other provinces as Quebec is demanding to establish her special status? Or do we recognize that Ontario and the rest of the provinces have a special need for a strong central government to meet the needs of our people, to achieve an identity for English Canada, to help create a will to nationhood among English Canadians?

The hon. Prime Minister has repeatedly said that he is in favour of a strong central government. This is another theme that runs through his speeches. But, Mr. Chairman, if you add up all the demands which this government has made on behalf of Ontario, while they may be put less stridently than those demands that come from Quebec, they represent just as great a weakening of the federal authority.

John Dafoe put his finger on the dilemma in an article in the Toronto *Globe and Mail* on the Saturday following the Budget this year, and I quote: "The twin foundations of the Ontario government's fiscal policy are in danger of destroying themselves," he said. On the one hand, he pointed out, Ontario has contended that the federal government must retain control of the fiscal levers that regulate the national economy. On the other hand, Ontario demands the financial capacity to fulfill the constitutional responsibilities of the province. But if those demands are made greater and greater, as the hon. Prime Minister is, in fact, making them, it will be impossible for the federal government to retain adequate fiscal power to regulate the economy.

In short, Mr. Chairman, there is some remarkable inconsistency emerging in the stance of the hon. Prime Minister as "a Canadian from Ontario." I cited some of them in the Medicare debate, as listed by Anthony Westall, with reference to Ontario's unco-operative role in working out a national programme for medical insurance.

Instead of giving leadership to English Canada, and thereby countering a tendency for its nine provinces to go off each in its own direction, instead of forcing the federal government to a firm Medicare commitment, which is now possible—a commitment which will meet not only the needs of the people

of Ontario, but all Canada—the hon. Prime Minister is engaged in a poker game with Ottawa. He did the same thing on pensions, so that until the very end nobody knew where Ontario stood. Because of this basically unco-operative approach, Ontario threw away its opportunity, as the largest Canadian province, to play a key role in shaping the pension plan. Instead, we tended to be critical of Quebec because it was not afraid to sit down and do some hard bargaining to achieve what it wanted.

Mr. Chairman, during the Medicare debate, the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) made a heated interjection which was most illuminating. The hon. Prime Minister had to draw him back into his seat and try to pacify him before he got too far out, because it was the clearest statement we have had from any senior Cabinet Minister of the attitude of this government. *Hansard* records the words of the hon. Minister of Labour as follows: "The whole thing has been predetermined and there is no opportunity to do any bargaining with Ottawa." Mr. Chairman, if this is the approach of the government, I think it is about time the hon. Prime Minister confirmed or denied it, because I suggest that that is a counsel of defeatism, if I ever heard one. It is idle for us to be critical of Quebec in making so-called back-door deals with Ottawa through hard bargaining if Ontario, as the historic spokesman for Canada within Confederation, insists on sulking at a distance, bargaining at arm's length, and finally having no alternative but to accept conclusions which we have had very little role in shaping. This is the antithesis of leadership; it is a tragic abrogation of leadership. Yet this is the role this government has taken on issue after issue.

Mr. Chairman, the future of this nation is going to be shaped by a more effective working relationship between the federal government and the provinces, particularly between the federal government and Ontario as the largest province of English Canada. This, in essence, is co-operative federalism. The needs of the people of Canada, and particularly of English Canada, can be adequately met in the coming century only if the two senior levels of government co-operate fully, instead of engaging in petty rivalries and politicking.

Pensions and Medicare—and to this can be added such things as manpower training and ARDA—are not just issues in themselves, but instruments through which we can reshape the structure of Confederation.

Just as the railways were the means by

which Confederation was knit more strongly in the 19th century, so these issues are the instruments by which we can establish a greater unity in all of Canada through common standards of service and opportunity.

There is the added important factor of the crisis in English-speaking Canada. If Ontario were to give leadership among the provinces of English Canada in co-operative effort with the federal government, particularly in areas that constitutionally lie wholly or significantly in the provincial field, and if we were to give that leadership instead of tagging along at the end of the pack, in company with PEI or with Manitoba, after the decision has been shaped by other provinces, then there would be some hope of creating the identity which English Canada lacks in contrast to French Canada.

Ontario's leadership could inspire the will to nationhood which English Canada has lost. We could create a sense of purpose and direction in English Canada which would produce our own quiet revolution. Without it, we shall not be able to meet adequately the needs of the 20th century.

Mr. Chairman, I have opened up this issue and for the moment I leave the matter there. I have a resolution on the order paper calling for the establishment of an all-party committee in the wake of the demise of the Fulton-Favreau formula, which would provide an opportunity for all parties in this province to play a role in clarifying what Ontario wants from Confederation; what our relationship with Quebec should be; what we feel are the limits of a special status for Quebec within Confederation, and—most important of all—what our future relationship with the federal government should be in order that jointly, with Ottawa, we can meet the needs of our people in Ontario and with our leadership, throughout the rest of Canada, too.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, 100 years ago the fathers of Confederation faced an infinitely more difficult task in welding a nation out of the British North American colonies, but they did it. They served future generations well. It would be tragic if the fathers of re-Confederation were to fail this nation today and its future generations. The hon. Prime Minister of this province is cast by history as potentially the leader among the fathers of re-Confederation. It is my firm belief, expressed more in sorrow than in anger, that he is not meeting the challenge. I suggest that now is the time, in the estimates of The Department of the Prime Minister, to consider this situation and

to discuss frankly what his role should be, what it has been and what it should be, and what more is needed by way of machinery in the department of his office and the Cabinet so that we can get the job done adequately.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, a very interesting and very provocative subject has been opened by the hon. member for York South. Unlike him, Mr. Chairman, I do not have a set piece prepared—not that I in any way detract from the research and the thought that went into the preparation of his remarks. However, I cannot let the opportunity pass without making some minor contribution to a discussion of this very important matter.

Let me say that I take issue with my friend, the hon. member for York South, when he faults the Prime Minister of the province. I, like him, am one of the members of the House, and I fear that we are very few who read each and every utterance of the hon. Prime Minister that comes in the mail to my desk, whether it be here or to my office in Sudbury.

Some day it may happen, but I have never yet heard a backbencher on the government side of this House ever make remarks of any nature from which one could infer that that member has either read some of the utterances of the hon. Prime Minister speaking on behalf of the people of this province, or that he is interested in what the first citizen has said. Never have I heard a conversation initiated which recognizes that the hon. Prime Minister can go down into the province of Quebec, as he did, and make a speech in which he said that the teaching of French in Ontario is not all that it should be and invoked a lead editorial the next day in each of the French-language newspapers praising him for his statesmanship, his sense of nationality and his broadmindedness.

I do not fault him. I do not criticize the things he says, like his predecessor—and I try to be a fairminded man. I see that the leader of the government has a sense of the nationhood of Canada. I have never seen in anything he ever said that he put forward as being his pre-eminent duty, the protection of the narrow interests of Ontario ahead of the rest of Canada. On the contrary! To use the vernacular, one gets the impression that he speaks with such a wide sense of nationality—as the other day when he took the opportunity to get up to say how much he liked Saskatchewan—that a good deal of the time he is preaching for a call to some other place.

"No, sir, I do not fault him! The people I fault are those he has selected to sit around him on the Treasury benches where sits the executive council.

Apart from the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) I have never heard one of those hon. Ministers of the Crown ever make a single utterance about the meaning of this nation; not one—neither in the written or spoken speeches. To hear them from one year's end to the next, you would never know that they knew that Canada existed; that Canada was fraught with problems and anxieties to the state that the Prime Minister of the country accuses all of his fellow citizens of being schizophrenic, which is a nice psychiatric word—whatever it means—but it has a real meaning. It is not a complimentary word. But what do we hear?

Let me deal first with the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld). We hear from him that an important agency under his department—the St. Lawrence parks commission, the large properties that they own—are going to spend public money to have a barn-raising bee to celebrate our centennial year. A barn-raising bee, and they are going to do it in stages, instead of using the opportunity in that historic park of Ontario—and there is no part of the country that is more historic than the lands that border Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River to the sea—to invite some eminent historians to come down during the summer to their park and give a series of lectures.

I suggested some topics to the public relations man of that commission who, I do not think, was very hep in history. I suggested he might have one of them tell the story of why the Prince of Wales in 1860 refused to get off the boat in Kingston—because the Orangemen were so militant and angry that they might have lynched him. That would be a subject for a good lecture, but they are going to have a barn-raising bee instead.

What do we hear from the hon. Minister of Economics and Development? I am sorry he has left the House because I wanted to speak to him personally. He comes in here full of ire and great irascibility one day and tells a fellow Cabinet Minister from another province that if he wants to make speeches, to make them down in his own province, not to make them under dateline Ontario.

My friend, the hon. member for York South talked about a Duncan MacPherson cartoon—the great cartoonist could have drawn one about that. It would have had Uncle Sam in the background and the hon. Minister of Economics and Development per-

haps nudging Mr. Kierans in the ribs and saying: "You silly fool, do not say anything to offend him."

No recognition of the problems of Mr. Kierans—the dilemma that he faces—a problem of such magnitude that the hon. Minister does not have to face here. There are no pressures on our Minister from a nationalist origin. Mr. Kierans has the problem on the one hand of raising the standard of living of the people of the province of Quebec, raising them up to the level of Ontario of which they are properly jealous and envious. That is one part of his problem.

The other part is to so control the influx of foreign capital and the economic domination that it brings, that it will not detract from the French-Canadian identity. Underhill has well pointed out that of two centuries of the French residence on this continent, one was spent in fear of the British conqueror. And the British conqueror very nearly obliterated them, or tried to by the Act of Union in 1841, whereby—

Mr. Chairman: I am wondering how this fits into the Prime Minister's department?

Mr. Sopha: I notice this, sir, I am not going to be very long, but the theme of it is the love the hon. Prime Minister represents us when he speaks outside the House.

To continue what I was saying—the second century of the French residence has seen, of course, an attempt by them to preserve their identity—precisely what they are doing now, not losing sight of the fact that what is happening in Quebec is of an economic origin. When they want French Canadians to be vice-presidents and to be on the board of directors of corporations, those things are economic stimuli that motivate them to action.

Mr. Kierans might well have said to this hon. Minister of the Crown here—he should have said it the next day, had he thought of it—"Come down to Quebec. Make any speech you want in Quebec. We will give you a hall, we will fill it with people to listen to you. Talk about what you want, as long as you do not swear, because we are God-fearing people in Quebec. Because there is free speech in Quebec." Free speech. A man does not need to fear that a person of the prestige of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will get up in the most important place in Ontario and tell a fellow Canadian, let alone a Cabinet Minister, not to talk that way in this province or in this city.

I say, my God! The hon. Minister of Economics and Development does not even understand the problems. He does not even understand the problems we face in this year. To repeat that graphically, I tell you with Underhill—the little book I sent for when my hon. friend was speaking—Underhill says that if we properly recognized the place in our history of the American ogre, then to be consistent, one of our chief centennial projects in 1967 would be to erect a big statue in Ottawa to the American ogre.

Not only did the American ogre start us on the road to nationhood in 1867, because we feared those large armies that had completed the civil war, but ever since then there has been in the background the gnawing fear among us that economic domination is going to lead to loss of our political sovereignty. That is what Mr. Kierans was talking about. That is what he made the speech about. That is what Walter Gordon was working against. That is what his Budget of 1963 was about. That is why the Parliament of Canada passed legislation to prevent the control of our banks falling into the hands of Americans. Those are the things that bother us and concern us.

The hon. Minister of Economics and Development apparently does not comprehend that, nor the rest of them; a sorry state of their concern about the role of Ontario in the future of this nation, as a viable nation. When, if ever, are any of them going to make an utterance to show that concern?

One final thing. In that contentious and provocative statement made by my hon. friend from York South, he speaks of Ontario being the historic spokesman of this nation. That is what the hon. Prime Minister tries to be.

He actually works at it, and all credit to him. He works at it responsibly, and the things he says usually are responsible utterances. As a fairminded man I must admit that, because I study those things very carefully. Sometimes I disagree with him in detail, but I recognize that he has a highly developed historical sense of this nation.

I used to think that Ontario was the fulcrum, the point at which this nation balanced, and that Ontario perhaps had a very idealistic aura about it concerning the preservation of this nation. Ontario, after all, miniatures within its boundaries everything that is Canadian, with the possible exception of the fishing industry. But anything else that is Canadian, and typically Canadian, is found within Ontario. We are a miniature of the whole.

But I have had some second thoughts about the idealism, and the sense of charity that we exhibit towards the rest of the country. I think, on the contrary, on mature reflection, that Ontario today is what it has been historically—a place populated by very good businessmen. It was in the interests of Ontario, well recognized by George Brown, Macdonald, Galt, McGee. McGee, after all, was the first one that initiated the proposal of union. They well recognized it was in the interests of Ontario to found the Confederation. They worked for it.

Mr. Chairman: I hate to interrupt the member, but I would remind him—

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I am coming to the end. This is the way the hon. Prime Minister speaks. These are the things he speaks of, and I ask for equal time. But it is not only idealism or a desire—what is it my hon. friend says; a will to nationhood. Is that the phrase? A will to nationhood? It is in the interests of Ontario to keep this nation viable, strong and united. The heavy industrial complexes here, and manifold, multiple natural resources, are within this province; their development is by the industry of our people, by the accumulation of capital we have in this province. It is good business for us in Ontario to keep the country viable and strong, because we can sell our goods and services to the rest of the country.

So it is not so much idealism as it is good practical, hard-headed business sense. That does not in any way mitigate our role of responsibility. There is little else that I can quarrel about. I do not regret this utterance I have made, but I am waiting for the day that one of these people that occupy these seats will come up to me in the hallway, and say to me: "Did you read what the Prime Minister said last week in Quebec city?" and we get into a discussion about it.

Seldom two days go by that a historically minded person—my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Nixon)—does not raise it with me. He keeps an eye open. He, of Loyalist stock, has roots well founded in the history of this country. His father, who sat in this Legislature 40 years before him, was concerned about it. Where is the concern that I see in these other benches? The back benches do not really count; we saw that this afternoon. They can be sacrificed, there is enough without them. We sacrificed two of them this afternoon.

I have never seem him quite as cruel as he was this afternoon. That is all right. I am worried about those 22 others over there,

apart, perhaps, from the hon. Attorney General, who, after all, represented us at the constitutional, Fulton-Favreau, conference.

Mr. Chairman: I know the member wants to get back to the vote—

Mr. Sopha: I am worried about the rest of them. And I finally say this. The hon. Prime Minister—that is who we are talking about—assumed the mantle of office in November of 1961. As I look at the faces of the occupants over there—and I do not like to point like the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman)—the personnel that I see are inherited, with one or two or three exceptions, from the Hon. Leslie Frost. They are his team. I ask how many years does he have to sit there until he cleans house, that he gets his own team around him? Who is it that came with him? The hon. Attorney General, the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information, the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). Who else are his? That is why there is no co-ordination, perhaps why there is no elan.

Hon. Prime Minister of this province, let it be known that your seats are not secure, you are not going to sit around that lovely table in the Cabinet room interminably. You have got to work for your jobs, you have got to show some elan, some energy, some *force majeure*. He had a little sense of competition and he looked around. As one picks out the very few backbenchers there are here, there are very few who could adequately displace those that have grown old and fat and lethargic over there. So better perhaps than getting into philosophic discussions and talk about better co-ordination between Cabinet committees and all that, perhaps if we had a new look at the faces in the Treasury benches the affairs of the people of this province might receive a thrust upward.

Vote 1401 agreed to.

On vote 1402:

Mr. Thompson: I think that my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury has pointed out certain characteristics of the Cabinet, but I would like to point out another characteristic about this government, and that is that there is an extraordinary number of Cabinet Ministers. May I point to Ottawa? In Ottawa, in comparison with the members of the party in power, the proportion that makes up the Cabinet has been 6.8 per cent. In the United Kingdom it has been 3.6

per cent of the members of the party who make up the Cabinet. But in this Cabinet you get something like 70 per cent of the members of your party making up the Cabinet. It is quite obvious that the machinery to make the Cabinet work effectively has a complete lack of co-ordination. I look towards the hon. Minister of Health. I felt sorry for him as I read in the paper two years ago, I think it was, when the hon. Prime Minister was down in Quebec. I read where the hon. Minister of Health had gone down to a Dominion-provincial conference and he was asked what he was doing there. As I understand it, he said, "Well, we are going to be discussing health," and further down I read where the hon. Prime Minister had said also in this thing, "Well, that is the first that I have heard of it." And of course that accentuates either that you are left out in the cold constantly or else that there is a lack of co-ordination amongst the group of you.

We have argued for an economic council with the hon. Prime Minister acting as the leader of it, to get co-ordination. Krueger—and before that there have been others to show the overlapping that takes place within the Cabinet.

Now, I want to turn to another point which is the lack of control by the Cabinet, of delegated authority, and this hits again at the actions of this Parliament. One of the things that we should be doing in the Parliament of Ontario is to be examining bills and regulations. After all, that is part of our main duty, sir. One of the dangers in the history of Ontario has been that there were people who thought that the Legislature was unnecessary—I think that even the much revered Sir John A. Macdonald referred to this Legislature at one time and said that it should really just be a municipality. To show that I am not being biased and narrow and partisan when I refer to Sir John A. Macdonald, I should say that George Brown felt that the provincial Legislature should report to the Lieutenant-Governor and not have an assembly but there should be departments reporting directly to the Lieutenant-Governor.

The first Lieutenant-Governor of this province felt that he did not need a legislature, as you know. Out in the west in Manitoba for five years they had a struggle with the Lieutenant-Governor who felt there was no need for an assembly. Now, why am I pointing this out, sir, in connection with Cabinet? Because historically this fight still continues. The Cabinet is the executive, the representatives of the Lieutenant-Governor, and in my opinion we are still fighting

the power of a lieutenant-governor who wants to push aside the Legislature and the Cabinet in its obligation to bring bills and regulations and orders-in-council before this Legislature to have the scrutiny of the whole of the Legislature. They are disavowing that obligation and taking us away back when there was a lieutenant-governor arrogant of the people's representatives.

I say this to you, sir, because I would like to know how many regulations, how many orders-in-council do not even come before the Lieutenant-Governor in council. Do you realize, Mr. Chairman, that these Cabinet Ministers sitting over here, can pass on their own regulations or orders-in-council if they are not of a legislative nature? Now, I am not a lawyer, but I would suspect that if I were to ask every one of the Cabinet Ministers to define what is of a legislative nature I would get such a variety of opinions that it would fill a book; the simple point is that that has never been qualified. Consequently this is what happens. Because Cabinet Ministers decide that something is not of a legislative nature, they go ahead with orders-in-council and with regulations that are put into effect without coming to the register of regulations and this goes through without even a law officer in many cases having a look at them. You know this. You know the abuse that has taken place between Cabinet Ministers making regulations and orders-in-council. I will give you one example.

The Minister of Agriculture about four years ago tried to pass an order-in-council by which he would give loans to anyone that he wanted to, and of any size that he wanted to. We were very fortunate that there was a legal officer who told him he was stepping over the mark in doing that, that it was beyond the discretion that he had and that he had better bring that in as a bill. That is one example, and there may be many more that the people have never seen. Why have they not seen it? They have not seen it for these reasons: First of all, there is this disqualifying clause about "of a legislative nature." The other thing is that the register never tables regulations so that they can be before the scrutiny of this House.

The Cabinet are a power in themselves. The Cabinet can go ahead, by-pass the register, by-pass the Lieutenant-Governor in council for examination and pass regulations—and you can laugh over there at this, you can laugh at us—but there are regulations and orders-in-council which are hurting the people around this province and they are getting fed up with you in the way that you are

taxing them. And I want to suggest to you again, as I have before, that bringing your boards and commissions which you have delegated power to, you in the Cabinet have delegated powers to boards and commissions which should rest right in this Legislature and should be examined in the Legislature. To bring it back again, to bring back the regulations that they are making, give some system to it, I am going to make several points to you. In the first place you should have a legal officer of the assembly. You should have a registrar who tables in the Legislature a report on regulations so that they can be examined by all of the Legislature.

Once again I urge on the hon. Prime Minister that he set up a scrutiny committee to examine orders-in-council, to have a definition concerning what order-in-council should be brought before the Legislature, and then that the members of the Legislature themselves should have the power, by moving a prayer about any regulation, be able to annul it.

The way it is now, these are printed in the *Gazette* and they are a *fait accompli*. We have heard too much about a *fait accompli*. I was thinking of the discussion and a very worthwhile discussion by the hon. leader of the new party (Mr. MacDonald), and I was thinking of the Fulton-Favreau report again and how the hon. Attorney General came back and used the words "it was a *fait accompli*." Then I think you were defining it in some other way but to me it was still an accomplished fact.

Too many orders-in-council and regulations are being made because you are not moving into the 20th century. You had this kind of approach for many years and you have not looked at other jurisdictions, you have not looked at Westminster. Mr. Speaker talks of Westminster. You have not looked at Ottawa, you have not looked at any of the parliamentary systems of the world. And you sit there and I suppose the hon. Minister of Health symbolizes all the arrogance there is; he symbolizes it all when he goes like this about the need to have regulations and orders-in-council and boards and commissions and all the power which you are given by the people, the need to have that examined and scrutinized on the floor of this Legislature.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. Prime Minister not going to deign to refer to anything that has been said on this side of the House?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get into a debate on federal-provincial affairs tonight. I enjoyed the comments of the hon. member. I will read them and study them and we will have other opportunities. I did not come here tonight on these estimates prepared to debate federal-provincial relations; the hon. member obviously did. And I enjoyed his remarks very much.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the Cabinet committee?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Well, of course I know Professor Krueger's report and he obviously does not think much of this government. This is open night on Cabinet Ministers. I just do not agree with Professor Krueger, that is the point, I just simply do not agree with what he said, and all the hon. member is doing is reading his report, which is highly critical of one or two Cabinet committees that he happened to see. I just do not agree with him. We have Cabinet committees which in my opinion function very well, and if they did not I would not have them. I would change the arrangements if I felt they were not satisfactory.

The hon. member makes our government appear very inefficient. He paints a sad picture of our province, but all I can say is that our unemployment rate in this province is less than 2.5 per cent at the moment. We have the highest per capita income in Canada. We met all conditions and guidelines set down by the economic council of Canada in 1965. We had the highest export figures from this province, and that is one of our major contributions to Canada in 1965.

Our quiet revolution—the hon. member refers to Quebec—as I have said on many occasions, our quiet revolution in this province started when the Conservative government came to power in 1943. And it has been one long story of progress ever since. And with the hon. member's complete and absolute fetish for planning, we just do not agree with him philosophically either. He might get up and say we should do a great deal more planning than we do—but we like the results we are getting in this province with this government. And we are getting results.

There are many, many comments I could make, and perhaps I should mention one or two things that the hon. leader of the Opposition raised, particularly if we go way back to the beginning, and it seems like about two hours ago. But he mentioned the

question of secrecy in federal-provincial conferences. All I can say is that I am in full agreement with him, but I do not set the ground rules for the federal-provincial conferences.

I have announced at the conferences that I had no intention of abiding by the secrecy rules that are honoured more in the breach than in the observance anyway. I think the way the conferences are run is pretty silly. It is neither fair to those who are participating in the conference, nor to the representatives of news media who are attempting to cover the conference, to tell the people of the country what is going on.

My own habit at these conferences has been to hold a press conference of my own as soon as the day's work is over, and I say to the press, "Now, what do you want to know?" and answer the questions.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask the hon. Prime Minister, does that mean that he would encourage the Opposition representation to go as observers to these conferences?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was dealing with the secrecy in the conferences themselves. We do not really make any particular secret of the stand that we take in these conferences. On the other hand, I must admit to you that it would be difficult to have as a standing rule that everything that went on at a conference was made public. There has to be some area where we have some private discussions, but I think we could establish much better rules than we have at these conferences, and I am not alone in thinking this.

I would say this about the federal-provincial conferences—and I have said this on many occasions before, too. It is an evolving instrument in our society and it is very far from perfect and it is in the process of being developed. As I look ahead, it seems to me that probably between now and October we are going to spend—I do not know how many weeks will have to be spent in federal-provincial conferences if we are to arrive at the national solutions to the problems we face and those that lie ahead of us which must be decided. If we are, for instance, to translate our decisions into legislation to provide for a tax-sharing arrangement to commence on April 1, 1967.

I would think the form and function of the conference is something to which we should be paying some attention, and I can assure you as a government we are looking at it in order to make suggestions as to how this might better function.

The next point that was made was consultation. I suppose, really, we make our position public when we go to a conference. And there is nothing secret about the position that we take; these statements are published. They do not get much publicity because some of them are long and perhaps not the most readable documents in the world, but there is nothing secret about any position we have taken at any conference. You can see the papers we have submitted there. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we might have debate on these matters in the House.

I would like to hear the hon. member for Sudbury produce his ideas on the so-called French facts. He seems to understand it very well. But I do not know that my estimates are exactly the place for this debate. I will be very happy to enter into it later on during the session, because there are many areas on which we should have some exchange.

For instance, the point raised by the hon. member for York South, in which he quotes Mr. Dafoe. Mr. Dafoe puts his finger on a very difficult point and this comes about through the growth of the provinces. Somehow or other we have to devise some means of reconciling the growth of the provinces in the last 20 years with the need of the federal government to maintain fiscal control. And, of course, these are obviously two separate issues; you cannot put them together. You cannot deny the fact that they exist, because the provinces have grown so rapidly in 20 years.

For instance, you must realize that for the federal government to draw back on capital spending as a means of control of inflation is absolutely meaningless unless it is done in concert with all the provinces so that they draw back, too; because we are spending together as provinces and municipalities. Over 85—I think it is about 82 per cent—of the capital government spending in Canada is controlled by the provincial government and the municipalities.

Now, this is not Ontario being big, or Ontario waving a big stick, or Ontario not co-operating. This is a simple fact of life with which we have to deal in this country. And Canada in 1966 is not Canada in 1936, and we have to adjust many of these positions. We have anomalies facing us which are going to have to be recognized. I give you this as one and I say Mr. Dafoe's point is very well taken.

As far as co-operation is concerned, I would say again that we have every intention of co-operating to the utmost with the federal

government. But we have our own opinions as to how things should be done and these we will express. Everybody in this House has a dual responsibility. In the first place, we are all here, elected by the people of Ontario, and in the second place, we are all citizens of Canada. Sometimes these two positions may come into conflict, one with the other. And this, too, is a fact of life that you must face. You just cannot be completely perfect.

We have a responsibility to the province, and in a broader sense we have a responsibility to Canada. I do not accept the proposition that we are necessarily doing the right thing for Ontario, or the right thing for Canada, if we just simply go along with everything the federal government says. It has never been like this in the history of our province, or our country.

So we will hammer it out over a period of time if we approach it as men of goodwill and if we can get our minds around the fact that we should not be competing with the federal government. We should be co-operating with them. But we now have political parties competing and levels of government competing at the same time. This is another matter which in my view has to be straightened out in our country, so that we have some cohesive position as we move forward across the country. This is my eternal plea for co-operation. No *fait accompli*, either from us to them or from them to us. I remember the conferences when it was simply a question of going to Ottawa, making a nice little speech and the federal government simply walked in and said, "Boys, this what you are going to do," and we all said "Thank you" and went home. Now, I think those days are gone. They simply do not exist any more and we are evolving a new method of dealing with the problems that we have today.

I really did not intend to get into this, but these are just some of the ideas that we can, I would hope, debate in some of the general debates in this House. There are resolutions here and we can arrange, as far as that is concerned, to debate anything we like here at any time, and we have time to debate some of these issues.

As far as the committee on Confederation is concerned, it is doing certain work for the government. It is not our intent necessarily that all their findings be secret. On the other hand, they have a great deal of difficulty reaching any consensus themselves, and sometimes maybe they are not as anxious as you might think to put their names on some of

the material they may produce, but there is no doubt in my mind and I have said—

Mr. Thompson: We do not want to hear the consensus, we would like to hear the different points of view.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would be happy to—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Prime Minister a question in this connection? I understand that a number of studies are being done by the committee on Confederation.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I will get you a list of them. I would be happy to bring in a list of the various areas—

Mr. MacDonald: Not only the studies, but the results. Can we have them or not?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: There have not been many results to date. That is the fact of the matter. The studies are continuing.

Mr. MacDonald: But when they are finished, can they be made available?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I would say that the committee is set up as an advisory committee to the government, which means everything it does is not necessarily public, however, that does not mean that everything it does is necessarily private. Let me put it that way.

Mr. MacDonald: But the government includes the Opposition as well as the administration.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is right. You are quite right, and I would have no hesitation in putting these things into the public domain so that we may have the benefit of these men's work and efforts. Undoubtedly we will not agree with everything they say, but it is the basis for debate and thought and consideration. So that is the question of the committee on Confederation, and I would hope that we can debate these questions of federal-provincial relationships.

One other point. The hon. leader of the Opposition suggests a Minister of federal-provincial relations. On the other hand, he turns around and says we have too many Ministers—you know, somewhere or other—

Mr. Thompson: Actually, I am thinking of you.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Thanks very much. We have developed a secretariat within the office of the chief economist to deal with various problems of federal-provincial relationships

and Confederation, and I think this is a better place for it. It did not happen this way by chance; it was planned, because at the moment the major field of federal-provincial communication stems from the need for new fiscal arrangements to be entered into approximately a year-and-a-half from now. We have co-ordinated the work that is being done by the tax structure committee and our contribution. You know that committee is served by elements of government from coast-to-coast and the federal government. Our contribution to the work of that committee, as a government, comes within, of course, the ambit of The Department of Economics and Development, and when we get to the estimates of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, you will then have an opportunity to see just how far we are going into this, when you see the amount of money you will be asked to vote for the number of people who will be working with the chief economist in the area of federal-provincial relationships. I will not, however, pursue this point in these estimates, because it will be all there for you to see when we reach that point in the estimates.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Before this vote—

Mr. Chairman: No, we have completed the vote. This concludes the estimates.

Mr. Thompson: No, we are on 1402.

Mr. Chairman: That is what we finished.

Mr. Thompson: We had not finished. We had not passed it.

Mr. Sargent: The point that I think is pertinent to the House is the fact that this is the first portfolio we have discussed in the estimates for 1966. I think it is important—you will agree with this, Mr. Chairman—that the hon. Prime Minister has said that he was not a party to ground rules at provincial-federal conferences. I agree with that, but he is in charge of the ground rules in this House, I think. At least we hope he is, and this may not be the portfolio to start with, but I do think it is fair to look at the public accounts here.

Mr. Chairman: Where does this come under 1402?

Mr. Sargent: 1402. Well, on page N-3 of your public accounts book you will see—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is N-3 of the public accounts.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is important, Mr. Chairman, that we have here, grouped in this department, a total expenditure of \$214,000 in the Prime Minister's department. I apologize that we should pick this department to start with, but—

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Would the hon. member give us that page number again?

Mr. Sargent: It is N-3, Mr. Minister, in the public accounts.

Mr. Sopha: "N" is for "nuts."

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not let them say that about you.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is important that we have here, starting to talk, Mr. W. Kinmond. Now, we are not quarrelling with any individuals mentioned, but we do—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, last year I tabled, at the request of a member in the Opposition, the name and salary of every person in the department, so do not feel badly about saying it; it has been done before.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that we have grouped in this first vote here, other salaries \$49,000. Down further we have maintenance, main office, \$113,000. I think somewhere along the line we should have the right to know the breakdown. The thing is—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): You asked for it last year—

Mr. Chairman: Has the member for Grey North any information he wants in connection with the main office? It can be given to him.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to get a ruling from you, Mr. Chairman. We are talking about ground rules.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I ask the members to listen, please, to the member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: I have no quarrel with any of the amounts here. We have a 25 per cent increase in the budget in this department, and probably there are good reasons for it, but I think we should establish throughout the next four or five months that where you have large amounts, there should be breakdowns,

because there is no way of knowing the details involved. May we have a ruling in that regard?

Mr. Chairman: The member has a ruling right now. Any information the member for Grey North wants, all he has to do is ask for it. Any information he wants, he may ask for now.

Mr. Sargent: I think it is a fair request, yes.

Mr. Chairman: The answer to the question is that if there is some information that the member requires, would he ask for it now, please?

An hon. member: Ask for that information.

Mr. Sargent: I am asking for that.

Mr. Chairman: Asking for what? What specifically is the member asking for?

Mr. Sargent: All right, in the main office vote—

Mr. Chairman: We are on 1402 now.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Cabinet office breakdown. But the principle throughout the whole budget is that where we have other salaries, we have grouping across the whole board and we should have breakdowns presented to the House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, I would tell the hon. member that the staff in the Cabinet office consists of nine persons and their salaries as of March 31, 1966 are \$74,000. There is one vacancy and we estimate for 1966-1967 \$68,000, but there is one vacancy in the staff, so that is the difference between those two figures. I do not know whether that is the information that the hon. member requires. You see, in the public accounts themselves, if you turn to page 81, you will see that it says the expenditure statement by departments for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1965, are shown in detail, with the exception of the following items which have been summarized. In other words, instead of filling up far more pages, they are summarized—salary payments of less than \$8,000 per individual, where the salary is less than \$8,000; then the salaries of a group of people will be put together. Everything over \$8,000 is shown as a separate item. Accounts for merchandise and services, which are under \$5,000, are put together. That is where you get those lump sum figures. Travelling expense payments under \$1,800 are put to-

gether. That is why you get those large amounts. The alternative would be pages and pages of individual items.

Mr. Sargent: Throughout this Budget of probably \$2 billion we are talking about—

Mr. Chairman: Right now I would remind the member that we are talking about what constitutes the vote for 1402.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, you are pinpointing this vote. I think we should set a ground rule for the whole—

Mr. Chairman: This is the only way we can operate. I am sorry. We have no alternative.

Mr. Sargent: Each time there is a grouping of moneys, do we have to ask for it to be broken down, or what?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, under each individual vote.

Mr. Sargent: I might ask the hon. Prime Minister to give us some ground rules on why we should not have this information made available to the public of Ontario? I do not agree with the principle.

Mr. Thompson: I think the hon. member for Grey North has a very valid point. We are completely aware that when these estimates come before the Treasury board we know that you have an analyst in the department who demands a clear breakdown, who wants to know what the new projects are in comparison with the old. We want a breakdown that could be understood by the people of Ontario and we know, Mr. Chairman, that this is a screening process, a fogging process. After the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) has asked for a complete breakdown in order that he can understand the estimates, then it is put together like this in order that things can be hidden. And it is to this that we object.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, to supplement this point, the committee on public accounts spent a great deal of time in discussion just a year ago and the chairman at that time was the hon. member for St. George (Mr. A. F. Lawrence). It was the unanimous opinion of the committee on public accounts that these accounts when they came before us should be substantially supplemented, so that we would have comparisons, breakdowns and so on.

But all the recommendations—the same as the interim report that the hon. Prime Minister

was referring to earlier—the recommendations, the interim report of the committee on public accounts—and the hon. Prime Minister sets great store by interim reports—was completely ignored, completely passed over. The hon. Provincial Treasurer just pretended it did not exist and the accounts are in exactly the same form. That is what the hon. member for Grey North is complaining about.

I would think, when you have this committee and they submit this unanimous public report—and I am sorry the hon. member for St. George is not here now, because he would certainly agree with me, and my colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury was on the committee, and there are several other hon. members of the House who were there. We all agreed this was the way the estimates should be presented, and we have not got them that way tonight. Small wonder my hon. colleague cannot understand these things; hardly anybody can understand them because we have not the details.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: He is talking about the public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I cannot do it tonight, but I am quite certain that there have been changes made in these presentations as a result of the recommendations made by the committee on public accounts and we will check those through. I might say once again, I really do quite resent this not inference, but bald statement that this government does it this way to hide something.

You know that we do not wish to hide anything. There is no information that is ever asked for here—but you must realize that we have to have some sense. For instance, I pointed out to the hon. member why they are lumped together. He is talking about the public accounts, and if you want pages and pages and pages, all right. But there must be some practical position one can take. If there is any amount in here that anybody wants broken down—last year, I do not know if you paid any attention to it, I was asked to and did file a complete statement of everybody in the department and what they were paid. But to list all that in the public accounts is just simply impractical.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to read the study which the hon. Prime Minister—

Mr. Chairman: Just one moment, please. I recognize the member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the answer that the hon. Prime Minister has given on this question is, I think, quite unsatisfactory. It is quite true, as he says, that the government in committee of supply produces almost any information requested. I do not remember an occasion when it refused information.

The problem is that the estimates themselves are presented in such a sketchy way, and with no comparison at all, that it is very difficult for the members to apprehend exactly what is involved without a most detailed cross-examination. It is not good enough for the hon. Prime Minister to say that great detail is given in the public accounts of the province. That is a year or more after the money has been spent. The public accounts we now have before us are for the fiscal year 1964-65. We are now dealing with the fiscal year 1966-67 as far as estimates are concerned.

The hon. member for Downsview said that last year the committee on public accounts made a recommendation on this point. I would point out that the committee on public accounts made that recommendation not only last year but the year before and we have never had—

Mr. Chairman: As far as the committee's recommendations are concerned, the member for Downsview did mention these. At that time I was going to rule him out of order. I would like—

Mr. Bryden: I am dealing with this vote because their recommendation applied to this vote and every vote in this book. I had intended to raise this matter at a different time, Mr. Chairman, but now it has been raised we might as well proceed with it. It applies specifically to this vote, to vote 1401 and every other vote in the book. The government has never given a reason that is worth anything as to why it cannot give the sort of breakdown that is given for the benefit of the Parliament of Canada and, as far as I know, for every other provincial jurisdiction in this country.

I would venture to suggest that these are the sketchiest estimates presented anywhere in this country. It is particularly difficult for the members to have no comparative figure, except those that are in the public accounts, which do not provide a direct comparison. I would say at the very minimum what we require here would be not only the figures that we now have in the estimates for the coming year, but also the estimates for the year now drawing to a close.

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) signals to me that we can get the other book and put them together. So we have last year's book of the public accounts strewn on our desks—the maximum of inconvenience—but there is one other thing I think should be here that is not available in any book. That is the statement of eight months experience and four months estimates for the current year, so that we will have some idea of what the recent spending pattern has been.

All these things are provided in other jurisdictions and I see no valid reason why they cannot be provided here. As has been said, the committee on public accounts has recommended that at least that much should be done. It has recommended it on two different occasions.

Last year the hon. Provincial Treasurer appeared before the committee and said that it would involve a lot of work on the government side. Well it may, but if it is work that is necessary in order to provide the House with information that it requires—and, I submit, it requires it—then it should be done. Beyond that we have never had an explanation from the government as to why this, alone of all the jurisdictions in Canada I am familiar with, can only give a very sketchy account of its spending.

Here is a book that represents spending of almost \$2 billion and it is encompassed in a book that is about $\frac{1}{4}$ in. thick. I submit that that really does not give the members the information they require. It puts an unnecessary burden on them in trying to interpret the information properly and, indeed, it withholds from them certain information that is quite relevant, namely the experience for the current year, so far as that is available.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on this I would simply like to say again that I challenge the hon. Prime Minister. The hon. Provincial Treasurer demands a far greater breakdown before he will assent to financial appropriations for any department; he has an analyst in his department who has a far greater breakdown demanded by each Minister concerning what are new projects and so on, far greater than is presented to the people of Ontario through this Legislature.

I say that is secrecy. I do not care what you call it when you combine it again to make it an ineligible and unintelligent approach when it is presented to the Legislature.

To back me up on this, I would like to refer to the study which you helped to finance. I hope that you have been able to get Professor Schindler's book; I have one copy. But let me quote from it at page 470. He had done, as you know, Mr. Chairman, an objective and impartial study of this Legislature. He says:

The Ontario Legislature has so far failed to adopt many of the most basic procedures that other parliaments have developed to assist them in controlling public expenditure. The estimates themselves do not include enough information to make intelligent assessment possible, and invariably they call for larger amounts than are actually required.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, I want to challenge the hon. Prime Minister on a statement he made. He said that they have no desire to hide anything. Last year I asked a perfectly proper question, which was: "How much did it cost to entertain the Shah of Iran?" I am still wanting for an answer to that. Public moneys were used to entertain His Royal Highness and his lady. It was a great clambake for the Conservative Party; the landscape was replete with defeated candidates of that party. We have been waiting over here—and I say this in all seriousness—to invite Haile Selassie to one for the Liberal Party and we would like to know—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury—

Mr. Sopha: But he is of equal prestige with the Shah, as far as I know. Both of them are constantly in danger of being assassinated.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I just challenge him. We do not know how much public money was paid for all this curtsying and bowing.

Mr. Chairman: Does the member think that this comes under the vote?

Mr. Sopha: He raised it. He said we—you know that expansive gesture that he learned from Leslie Frost—

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Chairman, we did file an answer to his question; I am quite certain we did.

Mr. Sopha: But you did not tell me anything. Look at the answer. It says nothing; it said: "It is none of your business." That is what it said.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: I will crystallize this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North is going to crystallize!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the fact is—

Mr. Chairman: Will the member start crystallizing?

Mr. Sargent: The fact is that we do have the information available in the files of the government. That is established. They must have it, or they would be able to pay these people. As hon. members have pointed out, this book, that we will use as our bible from now on, is now two years away from actual fact. We are dealing with a book that was conceived in 1964—the big public accounts book—and so we are two years off the pace.

Any township or city council has the actual to deal with when they are setting their budget, and you are asking us to work back and forth from something that happened two years ago, and something that you are planning to do in 1966 and 1967. I think it behooves this government and the hon. Prime Minister to lay down some intelligent ground rules for 108 supposedly intelligent people. What is the hon. Prime Minister's answer to this? How do we go about this deal?

Mr. Chairman: Any information that the member wants on vote 1402, ask for it and we will provide it.

Mr. Sargent: All right, Mr. Chairman. We cannot conceivably go through the whole Budget asking inane things like this, so we conceivably can come to you and ask you—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister that he make this available to us in programme form.

Mr. Chairman: Is there any information that the member wants now?

Vote 1402 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of the Prime Minister.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: That is a great relief, Mr. Chairman. I will now be able to carry on.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.40 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Wednesday, February 23, 1966

Summary Convictions Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	803
Coroners Act, bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, first reading	803
Statement re the annual review of The Department of Mines, Mr. Wardrope	804
Statement re water control projects on the South Nation River watershed, Mr. Stewart	804
Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman	809
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	831

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from St. Joseph's college school, Toronto and also ten new Canadian students from Parkdale public school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches) moves, seconded by **Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin)**, that **Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview)** be substituted for **Mr. A. J. Reaume (Essex North)** on the standing committee on legal bills and labour.

Motion agreed to.

Introduction of bills.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the amendments would permit a person who posts bail in the absence of a justice and does not wish to return for the hearing—possibly because of distance—and is content to plead guilty, and who does not in fact return for the hearing, to appoint the court clerk to be his agent for the purpose of pleading guilty. Surplus bail money after deduction of any fine would be refunded to the accused.

THE CORONERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Attorney General a question about The Summary Convictions Act. Is this the only amendment to bail procedures that the hon. Attorney General contemplates introducing this session?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is the only amendment, Mr. Speaker, that I have under contemplation at this time.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the amendment to The Coroners Act, the several amendments provide a number of small changes in the procedures under the Act. There is a retirement age provided for; automatic removal or suspension in the event of a coroner being deprived of his right to practise by the college of physicians and surgeons; provision regarding the shipping of bodies outside Ontario. There is an increase in the fines for certain offences; an amendment authorizing and empowering the coroner or Crown attorney to obtain expert assistance in an investigation; provision for reporting deaths in a number of public institutions, which I will not recite at this time; provisions compelling attendance of witnesses and providing fines if they ignore the subpoena, and then provision for payment of experts; coroners' fees are revised.

Generally, the rest has to do with small fees.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Attorney General if he intends to amend any of the procedures of coroners' courts.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This matter, Mr. Speaker, was referred to the law reform commission a year ago or thereabouts, and I have had some discussions with Mr. McRuer, the chairman of that commission. One of those discussions, in brief, was very recent. That whole matter is being studied, I take it, under law reform, possibly under the human rights side, but he is not ready to report to us yet.

Mr. Singer: A wonderful cubbyhole.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, that is not a cubbyhole. The law reform commission does very

thorough and excellent work and I should like the House to know that there are a good number of things there, not by way of cubby-hole, but as a hard-working commission. Anyone who knows Mr. McRuer knows the calibre of his work and of the men he has working with him. If they wish to inquire into the amount of work that is going on in that commission and the studies being made, I think that they would be very satisfied that this is not something to hide things in, but a commission in which work is going forward and very great progress is being made.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I should like to draw the attention of hon. members to the annual review of The Department of Mines, a copy of which, through your courtesy, has been placed on each hon. member's desk.

As you are well aware, Mr. Speaker, the publication of an annual review has become traditional in The Department of Mines. Frankly, it is a tradition of which we are all justly proud. Since this comprehensive report is written, assembled and printed all within just a few weeks from the close of the year under review—a unique achievement believed to be unmatched in Canadian government circles—it goes without saying that throughout the entire operation absolute co-operation is the byword.

Scores of people work in harmony and in haste to make this yearly summary of activities possible. Geologists, engineers, photographers, writers, printers—these and many others contribute their talent to this highly professional piece of work. Speaking quite candidly, I must say that this year we are particularly proud of our review, and with good reason I might add. More than ever it is chockful of helpful data for the information of this House and the general public.

As a point of interest I would like to direct the attention of the hon. members to the book's attractive front cover illustration which so colourfully depicts the role Ontario minerals play in our world today. It is designed to show the close integration of the mining industry with life and progress in cities far removed from the original source of the minerals. You will immediately recognize, sir, the upper part of the picture, the artist's conception of the new government complex as it will appear upon completion. A more detailed description of the cover theme can be found on the opening page. Right now I would like to take this opportunity to express my personal thanks

to all those on my staff who had a hand in the preparation of this excellent report. Also I would like to thank the mining industry for its generous assistance in providing facts, figures and photographs.

Finally, I would like to express, through the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), who is here now, my gratitude to the members of his staff who kindly provided the section dealing with oil and natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I commend this report to the hon. members for serious study. I honestly believe they will find it both interesting and informative.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, may I take a few moments of the time of the House in order that the hon. members may be kept informed of the recent development under the provisions of The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act? Knowing the interest there is in this federal-provincial programme, I am sure that the House will be pleased to hear that initial steps toward the development of major water control projects on the South Nation River watershed have been approved by both the Ontario government and Ottawa, in co-operation with Mr. Sauve, the federal Minister charged with the administration of ARDA.

Following a preliminary engineering study completed last year by federal-provincial ARDA, it was concluded that seven major storage reservoirs and two river channel improvements would be required to provide adequate agricultural drainage outlets, flood control and summer flow.

At a meeting sponsored by the eastern Ontario soil and crop improvement associations, county ARDA boards and the South Nation River conservation authority, it was unanimously recommended to the ARDA directorate of Ontario that the highest priority be given to the following projects: 1. Spencerville dam and reservoir; 2. A river channel improvement above Chesterville; 3. The river channel improvement above Plantagenet; 4. The Bear Brook dam and reservoir.

In order that firm estimates can be obtained on the cost of these projects, design and field engineering will be carried out at a cost of \$105,000 which will be financed on a 50/50 basis by the federal and provincial governments under ARDA.

Mr. Speaker, this engineering will be completed by December of 1966 and will form

part of the comprehensive watershed development programme in the South Nation River for submission for federal ARDA for cost sharing under the federal-provincial rural development agreement.

The counties affected are Dundas, Stormont, Prescott and Russell and parts of Grenville and Carleton.

Agricultural land capability studies recently completed indicate that 85 per cent of the poorly drained agricultural lands, amounting to 285,000 acres, can be improved for production by outlet ditches and tile drainage systems. Another 50,000 acres of farm land are subject to annual spring flooding and occasional flooding in the fall. In addition to these hazards, summer and winter stream flows in the Nation River and its tributaries drop to very low levels in most years and parts are completely dry at times. With the alleviation of these major hazards agricultural productivity can be increased to provide better levels of income for rural people.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the House will agree that this programme will have far-reaching beneficial effects on agriculture in eastern Ontario.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, are conservation authorities interested in this project? Are they a part of it; or has it been carried on between yourselves and the federal department?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I referred to the fact that there had been a meeting sponsored by the eastern Ontario soil and crop improvement association that was comprised of the county ARDA boards, the South Nation River conservation authority—they have been in the picture right through the whole development and they are part of this.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to labour this, but what I am trying to find out is if it is The Department of Agriculture, the hon. Minister's department, that is going to be the predominant voice in the building up of this programme?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Well, only insofar, Mr. Speaker, as this is an ARDA project and The Department of Agriculture is charged with the administration of the Act. That is The Agricultural Rehabilitation and Development Act.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, on February 3 the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben)

directed a question to me which required a great deal of research and tabulation, and in order to ensure accuracy, I took the question as notice and promised to provide him with the information at the earliest possible moment.

His questions were: What is the average educational level of the custodial staff at Millbrook and Guelph reformatory? What is the mean educational level of the custodial staff at Millbrook and Guelph reformatory?

I am advised, Mr. Speaker, that when most people use the term "average" they are usually referring to the mean. The mean is calculated by adding all the grades and dividing by the number of correctional officers. Another type of average is the median. To calculate the median is a rather complicated procedure, but roughly it is the mid-point in the range of grades. Using this terminology the Millbrook—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, I found it a little more difficult in discussing with the experts and my staff, to come to the quick conclusion the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) did. However, I am not quite as brilliant and I appreciate his better education.

Using this terminology, Millbrook and Guelph educational level averages are as follows:

The mean average for Millbrook is 9.7; the mean average for Guelph is 9.5. The median average for Millbrook is 9.7; the median average for Guelph is 9.4. From these figures it can be seen that the mean and median are practically the same. It would be safe to say that the average formal educational level of the correctional officers of these two institutions is nine and a half grades approximately.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I have a question I would like to direct to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). Perhaps I can put it on the record and it is possible that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Robarts) will be in a position to answer it.

My question to the hon. Prime Minister was whether he could report on a meeting which the government had scheduled this morning with a delegation of the Algoma Central Railway in regard to Bill No. 2?

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, I would say that there was a meeting and certain discussions took place and there will be further discussions. I can assure the hon. member he has nothing to worry about.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, I did not get the last sentence. The hon. Minister can assure me of what?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: There is nothing to worry about.

Mr. MacDonald: Nothing to worry about! The hon. Minister is going to hold fast, is he?

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, notice of which has been given.

The question is in two parts: First, when will the Ontario Northland Railway finally eliminate the discharge of inadequately treated or raw industrial waste into Lake Nipissing? Second, when the North Bay water pollution control plant is operated at over-capacity does the effluent cause a deterioration in quality of the Lake Nipissing water?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, on December 20 of last year certain industrial waste discharges from the ONR were rerouted into the municipal sanitary sewer system. This relieved the load on the capacity of the existing ONR treatment facilities and resulted in improved efficiency of industrial treatment. These modifications are being evaluated by OWRC and ONR with a commitment from ONR that expanded industrial waste treatment facilities will be provided if necessary.

The answer to the second question: The plant can operate for short periods of time at over-capacity without adverse effects on the quality of Lake Nipissing water.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister allow a supplementary question?

Would the hon. Minister comment on the report of the Ontario water resources commission, dated February 22, 1966, to the effect that it is still recommended that the Ontario Northland eliminate the discharge?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Speaker, I might say that I looked at that report yesterday and I am sorry I was unable to talk to any personnel from OWRC this morning as I was busy. I would like to discuss it further with them, and if the hon. member would care to get in touch with me I perhaps can give him a better answer.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question—

Mr. Speaker: The chair has recognized the member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I had a question on the order paper for the hon. Prime Minister which I assume I should delay until tomorrow, and one for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) who wishes me to hold over until tomorrow in asking questions.

I then have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile), Mr. Speaker: What does the hon. Minister intend to do about the situation which has developed between the Toronto children's aid society and the Metro Toronto executive council?

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to say that the introduction of The Child Welfare Act has been very well accepted by the municipalities and societies throughout Ontario. This new Act assures greater services to children and as in the case of Metropolitan Toronto, the majority of municipalities will contribute less than in the previous year in the operation of the societies. In contrast, the province is assuming much greater financial responsibility.

As I pointed out before, according to estimates, Metropolitan Toronto will provide 33 per cent of the cost in comparison with its contribution of at least 60 per cent of the cost last year. I would just add, as I have already stated, that the province has advanced its share of assistance to the societies for the first two months of the present year and a similar advance payment will be forwarded within the next week or ten days, to cover the estimated provincial share of child welfare services for the month of March. I believe it has been the practice throughout the province for the responsible municipalities to advance their share to the societies.

I will, of course, be meeting with Chairman William Allen of Metropolitan Toronto to exchange views on services to children in the care of the local societies.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, might the hon. Minister read the first sentence of his reply, which I missed, over again?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: The introduction of The Child Welfare Act has been very well accepted by the municipalities and societies throughout Ontario.

Mr. S. Lewis: Could I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? What does the hon. Minister intend to do about the disregard for the procedures laid down by this Legislature under The Child Welfare Act, where the municipalities are to go to the review board? They refuse to; they are circumventing the

legislation and going to the hon. Minister. Now, will the Act actually obtain, or will they be allowed to use other routes to solve the question?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my hon. friend has any particular case in mind, but as far as I know none of them has circumvented the Act. We have had some problems that have been brought to us by some societies throughout the province. They have been looked at by the municipalities and the people concerned and they have been resolved in most cases. If there is no resolution of the discussions between themselves, then they will be coming before the review board, but so far, we have none that has come before us.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have a short additional supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is not the hon. Minister aware of the report that the Metro executive has agreed not to go to the review board but intends to treat with the Minister instead? I am asking, what then happens to the legislative procedures on which this House voted unanimously?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, I cannot answer that, Mr. Speaker, except to say that I do not refuse anyone with a matter of interest to discuss with me, but nothing will be settled by myself. It will go before the review board if they cannot agree between themselves. There might be some guidelines we can give them, but as far as settling it with the Minister, that will not be done. It will be done before the review board.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I have a question, almost in the same vein though there is a difference, for the hon. Minister of Public Welfare.

In light of the obvious problem existing in the budgeting of the children's aid societies and Metro Chairman Allen's statement that municipalities are forced to raise taxes and pay for services over which they have no control, would the hon. Minister consider assuming his financial responsibility direct to the children's aid societies?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Mr. Speaker, I think I have answered that in the response I have given to my hon. friend from Scarborough West. I might point to the part in my remarks in which I stated that we have already advanced our share and we will be advancing the share for March. We are not dealing with the municipality as such now. We are paying our share directly to the societies. I am sure that is what my hon. friend had in mind.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is: Assuming that they were not contravening the Act, but that the municipalities were to keep to the Act and that they respected the regulations set forth under section 9 subsection 2 of The Child Welfare Act 1965—and I am saying they are not contravening the Act, they are respecting it—will the hon. Minister advise what course of action will be taken if the budget of the children's aid society is not approved by respective councils before February 25? There is nothing in the Act to say they have to do this. The hon. Minister must have assumed that everyone would not be in agreement with him; what are the steps that he would take?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I am quite satisfied to tell my hon. friend that this matter will be taken under consideration and every flexibility that we have at our command will be used in this particular respect. Nobody will be forced to act to the detriment of themselves or the societies. We already have allowed one or two extensions of time to particular societies and that is why we are providing our financial assistance to them.

The municipalities have had a preview so that they can arrange to fix their tax structure on the tax rate—if that is what the hon. leader of the Opposition had in mind. I anticipate no difficulty.

Mr. Thompson: I do not think the hon. Minister quite understood my question: that he had regulations by which a municipality was told it had to approve the budget first of all by February 25 and submit it to the Minister.

Realizing the hon. Minister says that he has looked at every flexibility and given every consideration, what are the steps that he considers would be carried out if a municipality did not submit to him the children's aid society's budget and approve it by February 25; what steps would he take? He says he has considered every angle. What are the considerations he has made for that particular angle?

Hon. Mr. Cecile: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if my mind is not very quick today, but it seems to me that I have answered that, in the sense that the regulations are there. But if the parties do not arrive at an agreement, they would necessarily go before the review board. But it is anticipated that they will come to an agreement. We have no objection to letting them have a few days to do that, over and above what the regulations would require.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have two questions of the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests, notice of which has been given. The first one is as follows:

In light of a report from the annual meeting of the Ontario federation of anglers and hunters, could the hon. Minister inform this House what action is being taken to protect the 3,000 square miles in Algonquin park from chain saws and bulldozers?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of my hon. friend from Algoma-Manitoulin, the department policy of multiple use in Algonquin park recognizes on the one hand the long-standing position of the forest-based industries in that part of the province and, on the other hand, the more recent development of intensive recreational use of the park area. This whole question of multiple use has been under discussion on many occasions. I distributed to hon. members an article on multiple use very recently and I would commend to the hon. member and others interested the definition of "multiple use" because that is really the crux of the problem—a proper definition and then working around it.

I may say that the Minister of Forestry assembled a number of us earlier this week, and the conference is still going on. One of the subjects was this very subject of multiple use. It should be pointed out that the department is obligated to sustain certain cutting operators in the Algonquin and Pembroke districts for mills in such towns as Whitney, Mattawa, Pembroke, and so on, and while we recognize this need, there is at the same time the desirability of meeting the need with the minimum of conflict with other users of the parks. Our staff in the park are in constant surveillance of the logging operations within the park and no roads are permitted to be constructed without our permission.

The gentleman who got headlines at Kitchener over the weekend is probably a very sincere man, but he does have the habit of resorting to extreme language in describing his own opinion which is very frequently a minority opinion, sometimes even an opinion of one only, on many questions relating to the great Crown land resources and their use.

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Minister and I have a second question for him.

In light of a report from the annual meeting of the Ontario federation of anglers and hunters, what action does the hon. Minister contemplate on a resolution passed, calling

for more conservation officers in the province?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, in reply I would say that the resolution to which I think he has reference here—or the report—is really a series of resolutions which were passed some time ago by this association, who were meeting in annual meeting at Kitchener last weekend and in this House we have taken under advisement their views and other views in this connection over a period of the last several months. This House will be asked for funds, in the presentation of the estimates of The Department of Lands and Forests, to permit the department to employ a substantial number of new conservation officers.

At the present time we have some 238 conservation officers on full-time staff, and I am not just glad to say—I have been impatient to be able to say this—that salary revisions are presently under consideration by the civil service commission.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question for the hon. Prime Minister, but in his absence I will withhold it until tomorrow.

My final question is to the hon. Minister of Labour: Is the manufacturing firm of Empire Pants and Boys' Wear Company, 575 Adelaide street west, Toronto, a member of the advisory committee of the men's and boys' clothing industry under The Industrial Standards Act; and, if not, why not?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I am informed that since last September the product line turned out by Empire Pants and Boys' Wear has not fallen within the definition of the men's and boys' clothing industry schedule. Hence the firm is not eligible to be represented on the advisory committee.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that very recently this firm got a contract from The Department of Health and was able to seriously underbid other companies which have to conform to The Industrial Standards Act, I wonder if the hon. Minister would review the situation and see whether or not this company, because of its production today, does not fall within the jurisdiction of this Act.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to look into it personally and get the story of the company and its operation for the hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I have the temporary order in the matter of Tilco

Plastics Limited, certain defendants, and also the permanent order of injunction, as requested for tabling yesterday by the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick). I am glad now to table them pursuant to my undertaking.

Mr. Singer: Are there extra copies of that, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I have two carbons, Mr. Speaker. I might be able to have them photographed for the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member for Scarborough West have a further question?

Mr. S. Lewis: My other questions, Mr. Speaker, were to the hon. Minister of Labour and to the hon. Prime Minister and I shall wait until tomorrow to present them.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 22nd order. House in committee of supply. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, first, I would like to apologize to the hon. members for not having been able to place before each and every hon. member a copy of the annual report. As hon. members know, it has been my practice in the past to make certain that they have these reports well in advance of presentation of the estimates of my department. However, due to an undue amount of illness and deaths amongst the employees of the printer, the printer was not able to meet the deadline. However, I was able to prevail upon him to provide me late yesterday with sufficient proofs of the annual report so as to be able to place them in the hands of the hon. leaders of the three parties, I believe early this morning. I was also able to prevail upon him to provide me with the classification charts. I expect that the completed annual reports will be delivered at any time.

Mr. Chairman, in presenting for the approval of the House, the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions, it is my pleasure to report a year of solid progress and to inform hon. members of our very positive plans to continue that progress in the coming year.

I reported to the Legislature last year that my department was embarked on a plan of

reorganization and progress which was to keep it in the forefront of the correctional world. This year I report a number of achievements attained in this plan and extensions and consolidations we are now able to make in it.

Before I detail our present and future programmes, Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize some of the basic fundamentals and implications of this work which, I think, too often are overlooked.

It is so much easier to be glib than constructive when dealing with human lives. It is so easy to base decisions entirely on emotion rather than on scientific findings. And the difficulties are even further developed when one considers that we are dealing not only with the lives of men and women, boys and girls, with anti-social behaviour patterns, but also dealing with the social byproducts. By our actions, we can affect the lives of the dependants of offenders and the immediate family. We recognize an obligation to society—a most definite and direct obligation—to ensure that we do our utmost to reduce the terrible ravages of crime.

We must be very objective about this. So many, in their dealings with this field, find it difficult to be objective. The offender obviously finds it difficult to accept his behaviour on the same terms as society regards it. After sentence, particularly, his main interest is how soon he can return to a free life—which is understandable.

Equally, society's interest is in the reduction of violence and other ravages of crime as much as possible. Society wants security and protection. Often, this involves incarceration of the offender to diminish the number of criminals at large, the deterrence of other offenders and the hope that as many offenders as possible can be given such training and treatment as will return them to society as useful members with reasonably acceptable behaviour patterns.

Some members of society are subjective in that their hearts rule their heads so that they cannot look at the totality of the problem. They must take a subjective viewpoint of individual actions. Their vision is often so narrow that their contribution becomes valueless, occasionally a source of irritation to the rest of the population, possibly doing more harm than good. There are in addition the publicity-seekers, who may even be well-intentioned, but whose actions are directed more particularly to the publication of their actions rather than ensuring that resulting good comes from such action.

As a department which has the responsibility of carrying out a programme on behalf of the public, we can in no way act on the subjective approach. In arriving at our total programme we must of course take into account all points of view so as to ensure protection of the rights and needs of the individual as well as of society as a whole. However, our overall programme must be based on the objective evaluation of the whole subject.

To assist the whole department and our staff at all levels, to evaluate their work in this way, and to make a restatement of the views and policies so well exemplified in 1946 by "The Ontario Plan," I tried during the course of the year to have our thinking on this subject crystallized and clearly defined. This became a declaration of the philosophy on which our work must be based and by which we must judge all our actions. It was circulated to all members of staff and is printed in full on pages four and five of the annual report. Even so, I think it can stand the emphasis of being read in this House so far as the opening statement is concerned.

It states:

The main purposes of The Department of Reform Institutions are:

(1) To hold in custody, for prescribed periods, those persons sentenced by the courts to its jurisdiction; and

(2) To attempt to modify attitudes of those in its care, whether children or adults, to such an extent that their actions upon release will be essentially law-abiding rather than law-breaking, and to provide them with the kind of training and treatment that will afford them better opportunities for successful personal and social adjustment.

Any programme within the department must be designed with prime emphasis on these two purposes and carried out in such a way that they are in consonance with each other.

Mr. Chairman, it is in accordance with this policy that we base all our actions. However, a philosophy only has value when there are staff, programmes and facilities to implement it.

Although the department has over the course of the years added many specialists to its staff, the basic organization and the areas of responsibility have remained fairly constant. Services, facilities and programmes have increased tremendously and there was a need for a thorough reorganization of staff

administration in accordance with this increase. The basic plan of reorganization was reported to this House last year. In a short time I expect to announce the appointment of a director of social work. We will then have a complete staff team, capable of carrying out a most effective, positive and progressive programme in keeping with our statement of purpose.

In the recent book on corrections in Canada, Professor John V. Fornataro, who is an assistant professor at the school of social work, University of British Columbia, states, and I quote:

The presence of personnel trained in such professional disciplines as education, social work, psychiatry and psychology reflects the stated intention of governments to operate their prison system for the remedy or "correction" of the offender. In a few institutions, officials with such qualifications occupy key administrative positions. In most, however, they do not hold positions in the direct line of authority, and frequently exert no real influence upon the institution's regime. This is the group commonly called "treatment staff," as distinct from "custodial staff."

This is a basic problem throughout the world. If hon. members would care to check in our annual report on pages ten and eleven they will see that our major administrative posts are indeed held by clinically trained people—educationists as recommended in this quotation. I think we have managed to solve this problem, I think it is because these people are attracted to a department where they know forward-looking policies exist and are put into practice. That is why we are able to do what so few other authorities of this nature throughout the world are able to do: attract and appoint professional, trained staff to positions of authority.

Even with sufficient staff, it is necessary to have the programmes designed to meet not only the common factors in the behaviour problems of individuals, but also to take into account the individual differences which exist. In other words, one needs a detailed classification programme. This is one of the strongest points made by the Canadian corrections association in its recently published criteria. It is, with this department, one of our strongest points.

It is so difficult to appreciate the extent, detail and refinement of our classification system, that we felt it was necessary to draw up a chart so that the system and its implications can be more readily understood. This chart

received tremendous acclaim when it was displayed at the international congress of corrections, with requests for printed copies from interested individuals and groups in this country and abroad. In view of the interest displayed in the subject in this House on many previous occasions, we decided to publish such a chart.

I would draw the attention of the hon. members to the chart which is now before them. In essence, the chart shows the classification committees, procedures and categories which are used to transfer adults, not only to the institution most beneficial for them, but to the programme within that institution most suited to their needs. I think this chart shows better than words the advanced level of classification reached by this department. This chart is, of course, dealing only with adult institutions.

Changes taking place in our training schools are also so extensive that the whole of the classification system is presently undergoing revision. A similar chart referring to training schools will then be prepared. Changes are taking place, as I have said, at all levels in the training school field and this year has seen some most exciting developments.

Obviously the most important was The Training Schools Act, which was passed by this Legislature during the last session and which was proclaimed on November 1, 1965. There is no need, I am sure, for me to repeat its provisions here. Outside this House, and indeed outside this country, it has created considerable interest. We have had a number of meetings with many people working in this field, including magistrates and family court judges, children's aid society people, and we have discussed effective usage of our facilities in accordance with this new Act. There has been worldwide interest in the Act.

After one session discussed it at the United Nations congress in Sweden last year, we were asked to place ourselves at the disposal of delegates for further discussion. It was accepted as a leading piece of legislation in the juvenile field. There was equal interest shown at the international congress of corrections held in Montreal, and we have had inquiries regarding it from the United Nations secretariat.

Those who have followed published reports of the federal committee on juvenile delinquency will realize how many of its recommendations are in fact already incorporated in our Training Schools Act. I hope hon. members will indulge me when I

suggest that once more Ontario has every reason to be proud of showing leadership in this area.

I reported to the Legislature last year our acquisition of the property of the RCAF station at Hagersville. We have carried out reconstruction to convert it into two training schools. One is for boys under the age of 12, the other is to provide a vocational training school for boys in the 14 to 16 age group.

The junior school is now occupied. It is a school without precedent in this country. Set apart from the main buildings of the camp are about 30 houses, some single- and some two-storeyed. These were formerly used to house staff members of the air force. Some of them will be used to house members of our staff and their families. Some of them will be used as the cottage homes of the junior school.

Living in these cottage homes will be small groups of eight to ten boys, with teams of five workers to each group. An innovation here will be the fact that women will work on these teams. Staff of each group attend a daily case conference to discuss not only the progress of treatment but also their own development. Out of this we evolve methods of working with each boy on the basis of his own personality problems in a much more intense and individualized manner than is possible in the larger schools.

As an example, there is no unusual restriction on the boys' movements. They play with children of the staff, are invited to the houses of the other children and in return may invite them to their houses. Each boy has his own clothes which he chooses in a downtown store. They do not refer to the institution as "the school" but as "home."

Everything is being done in this school to reflect normal community living. We have selected staff and given them further training so that they may be more capable of dealing with the individual problems of these youngsters.

We have clinical staff to back up the house parents and supervisors. With our high staff-to-boy ratio, there are greater opportunities to develop strong and positive relationships between adults and children.

The senior school at Hagersville will add a vocational training school to our facilities which will enable us to fortify our classification programme for this group of boys. A further benefit to be obtained, of course, is an all-round reduction in the population of our other training schools.

For girls, we have had adequate accommodation since the opening of Lindsay and do not visualize that it will be overtaxed in the near future. We have, in reviewing our programmes, concentrated on the reorganization of facilities to enable us to make the best use of them.

Extensive renovations are presently underway to use one of the buildings of the Galt training school as a completely separate, self-contained treatment centre for girls.

When this is completed the treatment section, which is now part of the reception and diagnostic centre, will be moved over to the new location permitting an expansion of our treatment services and relieving the other schools of those girls who require more extensive treatment than can be provided in the normal school programme. This unit will be a therapeutic community containing facilities for extensive testing, counselling and group therapy.

A further advance in the programme at Galt will be the provision of a pre-placement programme in the building formerly used as the superintendent's residence. This unit will provide guidance and assist the girls to develop responsibility to take their place in the community.

With the introduction of this unit to the school, four levels of training and treatment will therefore be available under the control of a single superintendent:

1. The reception and diagnostic centre—for the initial diagnosis and classification, and for those girls needing a somewhat restrictive setting;
2. A treatment centre—for those girls requiring intensive therapy;
3. The training school itself—which will have a programme of training for girls in the academic-vocational group; and
4. A pre-placement house—which will provide a setting where girls will accept almost full responsibility for their conduct and activity with the support of our staff in the background.

This latter development at Galt is, of course, a sort of halfway house or group foster home on the property of the school itself. We are at the moment studying the use of group foster homes for youngsters who are unable to return to their own homes. Presently we have a small number of these homes where three or four children are placed. Preliminary studies seem to indicate that there are a number of children who, when they leave our training schools for the first time, could do better in a group living

situation before their eventual placement in an individual foster home.

Under our director of education, vocational training programmes at a number of our schools have been expanded.

At the Galt training school we have added a course of instruction in the operation of business machines and a course of study in practical nursing.

At Bowmanville the vocational training programme for the boys has been completely revised in order to provide training courses in keeping with the diversified occupational training for students at the grades 9 and 10 level as prescribed by The Department of Education. This has been possible as a result of the developments at Hagersville where we will now provide vocational training on a higher level for those boys enrolled in the science, technology and trades course for secondary school students.

At the moment plans are being made for the reorganization of the vocational training programme at St. John's, Uxbridge. It is anticipated that this programme will include additional vocational classes and the appointment of additional teachers both in the academic and vocational programme.

During the past years, the private training schools have been faced with an increasing problem of providing satisfactory after-care supervision to the large number of children living in the community as wards of the schools.

Last year, this government undertook the complete financing of the private training schools, and as a result the department is now prepared to offer after-care assistance of community programmes to the private training schools.

Community activities within each of the schools has been intensified during the year. Students have participated in community recreational and social programmes provided by service clubs, professional groups, young people's organizations, which equally have been involved in some measure in the educational and social programme within the schools.

The support of these organizations and groups to the training school in their community and the interest which they have displayed in the welfare of the students in our schools is most appreciated by our staff. It is of tremendous value in our total programme and of great assistance in the rehabilitation of the youngsters under our care.

In concluding this section of the report, I should emphasize to all hon. members that

when the youngsters originally arrive in our training schools they are usually immature, hostile, insecure or badly frightened boys and girls. They believe that the world is essentially hostile since this is what their experience has taught them.

It is our first task and the task of our training schools to show the child that the reason he was sent to the school was not for punishment, but rather as a means of helping him. I am proud of the way this is being accomplished by devoted and hard-working staff who are constantly mindful of the tremendous responsibility which is theirs in the moulding of the young lives entrusted to their care.

Their aim is to provide a climate in which the children may have their needs fulfilled and their concepts and attitudes towards other people and towards themselves modified; modified in such a way that their behaviour which has previously been found to be socially unacceptable, can be given expression in a more positive, purposeful life.

With the appointment of an administrator of adult female institutions and a superintendent of the Mercer complex who are psychiatric social workers, we have been able to intensify our programme of bringing about changes of attitudes and behaviour in the women who are sentenced to our reformatories.

All responsible bodies are agreed that the demand for psychiatrists will be far greater than the supply, certainly within the foreseeable future.

We feel that the method of consultation developed in therapeutic communities seems to afford the most practical solution. We propose to use our psychiatrists primarily as consultants with the aim of enriching the total interaction between staff and inmates rather than using their services directly with a small proportion of the total inmate population.

Apart from considerations of necessity, this deployment of professional staff is more particularly suited to the type of inmate in our institutions. On the whole, we find more of the impulse-ridden, character-disorder than we do the neurotic or psychotic person. With these people it is found that a combination of environmental and psychological treatment offers a promising approach.

This type of programme makes increasing demands on the correctional officer who is with the inmates all day and shares their daily activities. We believe that to be effective our staff must relate to these inmates in the middle of their crises and that the skilled

handling of a crisis—an actual living situation in which a woman needs firm, consistent and considerate treatment—provides a real basis of learning which is most necessary for the non-verbal person. In other words, the daily living situation must be treatment aimed at a certain level of maturity before psychological treatment can be effective. It is against this background that the programmes of academic upgrading, commercial classes, training in sewing, household skills and a varied recreation programme including art, drama and physical education classes, are planned.

Progress in the planning of the new Vanier institution for women is well advanced and it is hoped that tenders for the construction will be called in the forthcoming months.

Our programme in adult male institutions has concentrated on the expansion of overall training facilities in all institutions. It is our intention before the end of this fiscal year to have academic training available in each and every adult institution. Where appropriate vocational training, which proves very valuable with the younger offender, will be extended on a geographical basis.

In the past year training centres have been opened at our northern institutions of Fort William and Monteith and during the coming year another training centre will be opened at the Rideau industrial farm. We can now provide academic education and trades training to selected youthful offenders in a setting much closer to home. This has great advantages in maintaining family ties by means of more frequent visiting. Community ties are retained and consequently employment opportunities will be greater.

We know the tremendous potential these centres add to our rehabilitation programme. Physically they are of the minimum security type with no bars or fences. The staff-to-student ratio is high to ensure close personal contact of a nature conducive to attitude change and personality development as well as the acquisition of knowledge and the development of skills. Many of these students are school dropouts, and in these centres they are given a second chance in life to lay the foundation for skills and knowledge upon which they can build when they return to the community.

Another significant development this year is the extension of psychiatric treatment services into the field of sexual deviation, in particular the pedophile or child molester. The expansion of services was co-ordinated with the programme of treatment of the alcoholic and the drug addict at the Mimico clinic.

Our staff work very closely with colleagues in The Department of Health, drawing upon the resources of the Lakeshore Ontario hospital in this undertaking. In the light of our experience with this programme, which is under constant evaluation, we shall expand it as appropriate in the coming year.

During the year we opened an additional forestry camp at Wendigo Lake and we are presently working on the construction of another at Portage Lake. This latter is partially occupied and will be completed during the coming months.

The value of the forestry camp as a rehabilitative tool is unquestioned. It has worked extremely well in our adult institutions, and indeed we have one for 15 and 16-year-old boys in our training school system which is equally successful. We are able to make effective use of these camps because of a highly sophisticated and efficient classification programme.

During the year, besides taking a long, hard look at county jails, we have subjected our own district jails in the north to the same scrutiny. We have realized that our experiments carried out in the forestry camps made them particularly appropriate as minimum security work units for district jails. We have McCreight's camp as the minimum security work camp taking prisoners from Sault Ste. Marie and Sudbury jails. Available for the use of inmates from the North Bay district jail we have the forestry camp at Wendigo Lake, and as I have stated Portage Lake will also be available for some prisoners from the Sudbury district jail.

Our reorganization of areas of authority between the Haileybury district jail and the industrial farm at Monteith, which now has a district jail annex, will enable us to have minimum security farm work programmes for inmates in this area.

During the year nothing has pleased us more than the progress we have made in our discussions with county councils concerning the establishment of regional detention and classification centres. And I am sure that all hon. members have felt equal satisfaction in the progress that has been made so far.

I do not think that I need to repeat in detail our programme for replacing the out-moded, ineffective, inefficient county jails with modern, efficient and economic facilities built with the co-operation of a number of municipalities and receiving a 50 per cent capital grant from this government.

The present county jails are nothing but a stumbling block on the road to modern correctional practice. The new facilities must

and will be a positive force in the rehabilitation programme, as well as being a sound economic proposition. A planning committee has been appointed to assist and advise on the most effective facilities and programmes which should be provided in these regional detention centres in keeping with modern correctional knowledge. This committee is also listed in the annual report, with the exception of Mr. David Archibald whose appointment I reported to this House just recently and was not made in sufficient time to include in the annual report. I am sure that hon. members will appreciate that the composition of this committee is such as to make available the best knowledge on this subject from all points of view.

So far we have been able to announce three agreements, two of which have already been signed. The Hamilton and the county of Wentworth agreement will be signed in the near future. Further to this, we have held discussions with a number of other authorities and the developments are most encouraging.

Mr. Chairman, I have only touched on the highlights of the many developments that have taken place in the department. During the past year each day has brought developments in one area or the other, so that it would be impossible to tabulate absolutely everything that has been done.

The annual report of the department lists many more of the changes we have made and even there, in our day-to-day workings, in our changes of emphasis. It is not possible to report such things as the extension of inter-departmental committees and the meetings we have held on subjects of mutual interest, of the meetings we have held with juvenile and family court judges; of the university liaison we have developed with members of our staff in many cases acting as lecturers and field instructors to students; of the many hundreds, yes, it is actually hundreds, of university students who have visited our institutions quietly and without any fuss; of talks and discussions we have had with magistrates.

There is also the trades and industries advisory committee which was announced in the Throne speech and which will shortly be appointed. This committee will review our total vocational training, academic and industries programme to assure that it is in line with modern-day requirements.

There is not one area of work, Mr. Chairman, which has not been appraised, in which we have not sought the best information; the most effective programmes and put them into effect.

In conclusion, I want to put credit for this great progress where it is due. We have appreciated the help received from outside agencies in the after-care field. I have been grateful for the advice and assistance received from public-spirited men and women who voluntarily serve on committees such as my advisory council on the treatment of the offender, the planning board for the regional detention centres, and the training schools advisory board.

And finally, I am proud and sincerely grateful for the magnificent job being done by a very dedicated staff. To them especially I express my thanks for a year of solid progress which has enabled Ontario to maintain her lead in the correctional field.

Mr. Chairman, in the light of this forward-looking programme of positive progress I ask the support of all hon. members in the authorization of the estimates of this department.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, I have several remarks to address to you with regard to The Department of Reform Institutions in extension of some of the general statements I made about that department in my first speech before this House.

In that speech I dealt with some home truths about The Department of Reform Institutions and the performance of its present Minister. The hon. Minister—and who can blame him—found this unpalatable and he responded last Thursday evening with a curiously interesting and revealing speech. The speech was interesting and revealing because it was one in which the hon. Minister clearly felt obliged to defend the record of his department—and I use his own words: “its very active programme” from “a direct personal attack,” full of “loud, noisy nonsense,” “with little, or any basis in fact.”

To this extent, Mr. Chairman, the first speech I made to this House served a very useful purpose. At least the hon. Minister was bestirred.

We must all have felt the interest of the moment when he rose before this House. What would he say? What sort of a defence would he muster for an attack on his own performance and the performance of his department? Far more important—so much more important, that any considerations of a personal nature are altogether eclipsed—would he persuade any fairminded person, that is to say I am sure all the members of this House, that the penal institutions of this province are operated as intelligently, humanely and progressively as any reasonable

man could hope? Would he, in fact, prove that some general criticisms voiced by an official critic of his department were just another example of what he was pleased to call—and I am happy to remind him—“bluster, invective” and “irrational wild statements”? Would he? Did he?

I, of course, have an opinion—I can say a judgment—about the hon. Minister's success at a moment that presented him at the same time with a great challenge and with what some may have considered a marvellous opportunity. I have, moreover, the conviction that it is an opinion shared, however regretfully and uneasily, by many of the hon. members opposite—there are not very many right now.

But we must concern ourselves here—it is not a clash of personalities which may at times have its entertainment value, but is absurdly trivial when serious subjects are being considered—what we must deal with here is the record of a department of this government in some of the most vital work of our time, the work of reclaiming and making useful citizens of the dross of our society, the common criminal.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister's speech last Thursday was of such a nature that it tended to confirm, rather than react against some strongly held views that I, and others, have about the hon. Minister's department. I will return to this later. Permit me to say now that it was a speech which, nevertheless, had its moments. Who among us did not enjoy the hon. Minister's reference to sportswriter Bob Pennington's column containing some ironical jibing and, possibly, some well-deserved references to me—although from a purely rhetorical standpoint, the hon. Minister may have gone on just a little too long with that.

Who did not value the eloquence of the hon. Minister's repeated use of the words, “Was that lack of initiative?” in citing what he would have us believe were the countless achievements of his department? “I do not want to be immodest,” the hon. Minister said with a blush, as he began, and then when he ended, did you catch the pathos of that opening remark—because when he ended, as hon. members will remember, the hon. Minister's record was very bleak indeed. But—and I offer this in all sincerity—who did not respect him for the forthright manner in which he replied to what he obviously believed was the point of my attack? The way in which he did so only confirmed in my view that the Minister is an honest, likeable and honourable man. I believed this before I made my

speech, I believed it when I made my speech, and I believe it with even greater force now, but—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Here comes the sting!

An hon. member: And away we go!

Mr. Ben: But! The hon. Minister had a clearly demonstrated incapacity for his job. I believed this before I made my speech, I believed it when I made my speech and I believe it with even greater force now that he has read the introduction to his estimates.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has described me as a "two-to-three-week expert" on the affairs of his department. Believe me, it has taken longer than that for me to qualify myself for the duties I have to this House, to the hon. Minister's department, to the people of this province and, if our constitutional system is properly understood, to the hon. Minister himself. Fortunately, I have had, as many hon. members in my position must have had, the assistance of many people of goodwill and much experience in penology, as well as my own experience as a lawyer in the courts and at the scene, familiarizing myself with the conditions of the penal system of this province.

One astonishing—one almost staggering—fact, Mr. Chairman, is that many of those whom the hon. Minister so proudly paraded by name as deservedly esteemed advisors of his department, are among the very people who are most extremely critical of some of the work that is done, or rather not done, by that department. The hon. Minister, one would think, must be aware of this, but we heard nothing from him in his speech about the flaws in the present system; nothing to indicate that the hon. Minister has been guided by some of the excellent advice he must have received. Nothing about his concept—if he has one—of the purpose of a wisely administered penal system. Nothing about plans for correcting the great defects of the present system. Nothing to indicate that the hon. Minister has conducted his own intensive, on-the-spot study of the institutions and staffs under his control—or, if he has conducted them, learned anything from them. Nothing to indicate that he has read or understood even a part of the great wealth of invaluable literature that is available in this field. In fact, nothing of importance about the future, the present or the past. Indeed—and I am happy to provide you with a summary of his speech—the hon. Minister provided us with extracts from his fanmail. What! no criticism!

A long, long list of his advisors, a short, short list of what he has so winsomely called the achievements of his department during the past two years; numerous threatening promises that he was about to give an exemplary, verbal thrashing to an upstart, impudent enough to question his competence and his wise, far-seeing benevolence—a memorably grisly lesson in how this is not achieved.

It is interesting also that the hon. Minister should ask, "Was that lack of initiative?" And so blithely citing all of 16 items as the signal achievement of his department during his term in office. I am happy to recall them to you. I quote from *Hansard* at page 675 of February 17, 1966:

Number one: We built two new training centres for young men, one in Fort William and one in Monteith. Is that lack of initiative?

We have organized the most extensive and advanced system for the replacement of outmoded county jails, with modern regional detention and classification centres offering a 50 per cent grant towards the cost of their construction. And everyone knows by now this is proceeding at a very satisfactory rate. Is that lack of initiative?

We have obtained the property of the RCAF station, Hagersville, and opened one of the two training schools already established there. Is that lack of initiative?

We have established a research department with an outstanding director, as I mentioned earlier.

We have rewritten our Training Schools Act to produce one of the leading pieces of legislation—

We are building a new training school in northern Ontario—

We have undertaken the full financing of the private training schools—

We have supported the establishment of the centre of criminology—

We have completely reorganized administrative positions—

We have reviewed and reorganized our statistical methods—

We have started the use of plastic surgery—

and so on. I could read them all but let us find out which ones of those are initiative.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I am going to get back to those, because it is quite interesting which part of it

is initiative. Now can we criticize the hon. Minister for managing to do this much in two years? Certainly not. Inexorable pressure of **the time that would have moved** any department, even this one, can be credited for at least the majority of these achievements and normal revision with the rest. We may consider that with regard to the research department and regional jail system the hon. Minister, after two years, is at least making a beginning and I rush to congratulate him for that. But it is evident to me that the hon. Minister must have failed to go through the files of his department, or else he would have found under date March 20, 1961, a report addressed to his predecessor in office, the Hon. George C. Wardrobe from the John Howard society, captioned, "Consolidation of county jails in Ontario," pointing out why they should be consolidated and the benefits that would flow from such consolidation.

An hon. member: What date was that?

Mr. Ben: March 20, 1961. This is the programme initiated by the hon. Minister.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): It goes back to the 1920's.

Mr. Ben: I could go back to 1946, you are quite right.

Mr. Thompson: 1926.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It probably goes back to 1866.

Mr. Ben: That is initiative! But of course, when I spoke of lack of initiative, my reference was to the hon. Minister himself. I am sure the hon. Minister would be most interested in hearing what of his very mixed bag of achievements the hon. Minister has himself initiated, by what he must consider his vigour, his relentless drive, his awakened concern with the multifarious problems of his department. Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister was good enough to invite me, in his speech, to get down to cases and get down to facts. As the hon. Minister so delicately put it, I should, quote, "put up or shut up."

Mr. Chairman, I am going to put up, if strength and opportunity are allowed me, I am going to put up so much, to such an extent during my term in this House, that the hon. Minister and some other hon. Ministers, are going to have to work for a change, to try to understand their roles or stand indicted before the people of this province for failing to respond to legitimate inquiries and failing to do their jobs.

Facts are difficult things, Mr. Chairman, as this government, which has on occasion employed every device and pretext to spare itself the embarrassment of them, well knows. But in order to give you some idea of the true state of the penal system of this province, I plan to make, if time is allowed me, a number of points in commencing to substantiate grave charges with which I was able to deal only in a most general way in my first speech.

Sometimes to me, the list of things I am obliged to say about the deficiencies of The Department of Reform Institutions seems endless, and sometimes, I admit to you, I find that the prospect of attempting to move this department as presently administered, is simply appalling. It is obvious to me that I cannot hope to deal adequately with any one of the innumerable important points in the limited time I have this afternoon, but I will use this time today to introduce you, at least, those of you who are not familiar with them, to at least a few enlightened standards of penal reform, and show you how this department, The Department of Reform Institutions of the province of Ontario is grossly failing to meet them. There is room for a nice little pun here, but I do not think it would be fair.

It is perfectly clear to me that a great deal of information given in a short interval is not readily assimilated by most people, to say nothing of some hon. Ministers. Nevertheless, the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions can read it at his leisure and I hope he finds it instructive. I will return to each one of these points and others when I can deal with them at more adequate length after we start on the individual items.

Each of them deserves at the very least, a day's debate. They are presented on the whole in no particular order of emphasis. However, as I mentioned in my first speech, I hope to deal with this extensive and vital subject in a logical and progressive way. So I am going to begin with a few principles and a few observations by acknowledged experts—although time does not permit an adequate survey here of contemporary thought in this field—and then relate these principles to cases and facts.

This at least will be a beginning. I hope to deal shortly with the individual items in the Budget, tomorrow if not today, and will interrupt the schedule I have for other subjects to do so. If my time with regard to these runs out, Mr. Chairman, I will break at some point and come into this House and resume at another time.

Among the advisors cited with such proper pride by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions in his recent speech, there was one, and only one, whom he mentioned twice. The man the hon. Minister chose to single out in this way, the man he described as "the outstanding director of The Department of Reform Institutions research department," the man to whom we would expect the hon. Minister to give his closest attention, was Dr. T. Grygier, a most respected and knowledgeable man in the field of penal reform. Listen for a moment to at least a few of Dr. Grygier's views as he expressed them in a scholarly essay on crime and society, in a book published last year, by the Macmillan Company of Canada, on crime and its treatment in Canada. In his essay, Dr. Grygier, who in some respects as is illustrated by his stimulating book, is not entirely orthodox in his approach, sets forth a thesis that, as I understand him, our present approach to penology frustrates the prime aim of sentencing, which is to secure the rehabilitation of the criminal. And it is my view that this criticism is directly applicable to the penal system of Ontario and it may not be mere happenstance that Dr. Grygier expresses them here. Although, like any good civil servant, he is restrained by the nature of his role, as well as by the nature of his article from going into cases, I believe you should hear certain excerpts. I will give them to you for the moment, with the minimum of comment, leaving those of you who are familiar with Ontario's penal system to judge for yourselves whether his remarks are applicable here. I quote:

The sentence should fit the offender and not the offence.

I quote:

Mr. Justice Kelly said law is retributive, punitive, exemplary and corrective. This view—

writes Grygier:

—though inspired by positive aims is still harsh and negative when it comes to means. Even the word corrective is nearer in emotional undertones to a surgeon's scalpel than to the rehabilitative approach.

I quote:

It is true as stated in the first chapter of this book that punitive and rehabilitative aims are incompatible. In one case it would seem to be a pound of retribution, a ton of deterrent and an ounce of reformation mixed together and put over a slow fire in a vat of segregation. What is the best mixture we are never told. This is to be judged individually from case to case

but it is impossible to evaluate such judging if no criteria are stated and no general principle is involved.

I quote:

A crime is an act for which criminal legislation prescribes sanctions aimed at the protection of society which includes the offender.

The emphasis is mine. I will return to the treatment particularly provided for offenders in this province later. I quote again:

Some modern correctional methods such as probation, conditional and unconditional discharge and even medical treatment are also the consequences of criminal acts and are part of a wide range of modern sanctions.

I quote:

The Shah of Persia was alleged to have said at Ascot, while explaining to King Edward why he preferred to look at the women rather than at the horses, "In Persia everybody knows that one horse can run faster than the other. Who cares which one?" In our present system many criminals are like the losing horses at Ascot.

In a recent investigation of chronic petty offenders the author, Grygier, said that none of the 109 subjects was able to compete successfully in a technologically advanced society. They were all losing the battle with life. They were treated as if they were outside the social system, although in fact they were its inevitable product. As Professor Seeley says in his paper, if 12 virgins are to be sacrificed annually to the dragon, it is more helpful to find out why we have dragons and why they need sacrifice, than to devise a selection system that determines the choice of the virgin.

Scientific does not mean "approved by scientists." It can mean "supported by scientific evidence." How many of our treatments have been supported by scientific evidence based on proper experimental design?

How many indeed!

Juvenile delinquency legislation is particularly prone to enforce morality regardless of the social consequences of such enforcement. But it differs from ordinary criminal legislation in that it confuses the enforcement of morals with the enforcement of welfare.

A brief submitted by the Canadian corrections association to the committee on juvenile de-

linquency appointed by the Minister of Justice of Canada on January 18, 1962, says:

We believe no child should be categorized as a delinquent in general terms. Also we believe the power the courts may exercise over the convicted child should bear some relationship to his offence.

The author, Grygier, also favours deterrence but not in the sense that we inflict punishment solely to deter others.

Punishment not for the offence but as a warning to others is equivalent for no offence at all.

We already suffer from too many laws and too much judging, too much punishment and too much treatment. In fact, too much state interference and too little evidence that its declared objectives are achieved.

At times we fail to protect the offenders. On the contrary, we exploit them. We exploit them in prison labour which sacrifices constructive work and rehabilitation for the sake of peace on the labour front. Instead of productive work which, of course, would compete with trade union labour in the open market and for which prisoners could be paid proper wages, we impose on them endless cleaning and maintenance tasks for which there is no pay.

I quote from one of Dr. Grygier's sub-chapters entitled "Moral exhortations and hypocrisy as the backbone of our juvenile laws":

The hypocrisy of our law and of our system of administering justice to our children can hardly go further.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask you, has the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions really been listening to this man?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that a rhetorical question?

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister may accept it if he so wishes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member want it now or does he want to wait for it?

Mr. Ben: Please yourself, sir.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Bracondale says so. I agree with everything he has said, in quoting from Dr. Grygier. The hon. member must be—I do not know where he has been, but it was precisely because of this philosophy outlined by Dr. Grygier about juveniles that we brought in the new Training Schools Act embodying everything he has

outlined in that as a philosophy. And he had the major portion in the designing of that new Training Schools Act. So the hon. member can hardly say I have not been taking advice. I have not only been taking advice from him, we enacted legislation as a direct result of this philosophy which the hon. member has just expounded.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, those of you who have had occasion to read the Old Testament may remember that when Israel was attacked and Solomon was then king, the forces against him were overwhelming—

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): I do not think the hon. member will ever take his place.

Mr. Ben: Does the hon. member not want to hear the Scriptures, Mr. Chairman? So Solomon had his forces burnish their steel shields, if you will recall, and he then reflected the morning sun from the shields into the eyes of the Egyptians to blind them. Now the hon. Minister is looking sort of openmouthed; what am I driving at? I am going to give the hon. Minister a little credit.

I want to go on record, Mr. Chairman, that in my mind at least there is a very great distinction between penal institutions—that is reform institutions—and child training centres. In my mind, these child training centres have no darn business being in the department of the hon. Minister. They should be in The Department of Education. And I want to go on record also, Mr. Chairman, that at the present time the hon. Minister is doing a fairly good job in the question of retraining these youths, these children.

But I have continually stressed that they should consist of and be treated simply as vocational schools; and what they are becoming is almost government-run private schools—and I admire the hon. Minister for that. But he is not going to blind me by trying to reflect whatever radiance may come from the training section of his department and blind me from seeing what goes on in the reformatory section. And neither am I going to permit him to try to blind the other hon. members of the House with regards to that.

It is fine for the hon. Minister to say, "I agree with everything that Professor Grygier said," but I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that all the remarks that I quoted did not deal exclusively with juvenile delinquency or juveniles or child training centres. They dealt with penology and to me child training does not come under the term "penology." If the hon. Minister thinks it does, then I say to him quite unashamedly that he should be ashamed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member included that.

Mr. Ben: I did not, the hon. Minister did. He tried to blind this House to what goes on in the reformatories by holding up to them what he is now presently doing in the child training centres. To me there is a complete distinction.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Crystallize it for him.

Mr. Ben: I have someone else on this side to do the crystallizing.

Mr. McKeough: Okay.

Mr. Ben: From comments by A. M. Kirkpatrick, another of the hon. Minister's advisers in the same volume, I quote:

It is now generally accepted that the social services of all major communities should make provision to help the returning prisoner.

Prisons are places that men leave; a few die, a few are executed and a few become insane. But it is an important fact that they do not remain in prison. When prisoners are held in custody instead of being killed or transported as in the past centuries they must eventually be returned to the community. It is then that their second punishment often begins.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to quote too long from any particular author but the text of an address given by Mr. Kirkpatrick to the John Howard society in 1957—it was reprinted in 1962, and I understand why it was reprinted because it is a most excellent article—I think is worthy of the attention of this House, because it shows some of the problems, I should say many of the problems, facing the prisoners on their discharge. I regret to say it runs to about five pages but I am afraid I do owe it to this House, Mr. Chairman, to read a good portion of it. It is captioned: Emotional problems on release.

On return to the community—

You find this exceedingly amusing, do you, sir? I am referring to the hon. gentleman over there.

Mr. Chairman: Please address your remarks to the chair.

Mr. Ben: All right. I see that the hon. member for Muskoka finds it extremely amusing.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): What did I do; why mention me?

Mr. Ben: To continue:

On return to the community there was a notable need for the ex-inmate to develop emotional roots to achieve a reduction in hostility to the heightened frustration of prison life, to secure acceptance by others and to achieve a tolerance making possible the acceptance of others. The latter is particularly true in regard to his wife and family if those ties are present. In his absence the family may have changed greatly due to disgrace, hardship and loneliness. There are many wives who achieve for themselves independence and a measure of security which they are afraid to relinquish and which threatens the male providing role of the returned husband or father of the family.

No smile now from the hon. member for Muskoka.

The reorientation to freedom calls for a return to self-maintenance and for exercise of choice not only about major decisions but about the minor activities of organizing one's daily life. How to purchase personal articles, to order a meal, to move freely through open doors and to open them without fear of reprimand, are sometimes difficult re-learnings. Getting rid of prison-made clothes which link emotions to the past is frequently a step to emancipation. In the first flush of freedom it is little wonder that on occasion light is made first of accompanying liberty. Sorely needed financial resources are frequently squandered in the resolution of conflicting emotions, stored up desires, liberty and freedom of choice. There is an essential humanness about this conflict that, though not condoned, places it beyond moralizing and comparable acceptance and understanding by the worker. It is noted there is often an ambivalence of vacillation as to the type of identification to be made on return to the community. Should the man maintain his present formed attitudes or become a square jaw and seek acceptance by the broader community? The former requires him to relinquish the more recent type of emotional attachment and security he has known while the latter involves him in a co-operative approach to authority which has frequently seemed to him to be rigid and punitive. He knows that his former associates are not likely to be helpful influences to him and the joints he used to frequent

will return him to the marginal fringe of criminal activity. But poor friends are better than no friends. The attempt to move into socially acceptable groups has many obstacles. Some groups are reluctant to offer acceptance to known ex-convicts. Even though he is maintaining an anonymity about his past he never knows when this may be pierced. From within, he feels the stigma and fears the hurt of further rejection. Doing time, he is losing time and many men feel a driving need to make up for the wasted years. So much of living has gone by. So much loss of earnings. So much enjoyment. So much opportunity that the tolerance for frustration can become very slight. There is an urge to acquire the visible symbols of success, such as expensive watches or rings. Another manifestation is the desire for good fun, seen in stylish and expensive clothes. Unless things break right and quickly, the temptation is ever-present to revert to known habit patterns and do it the easy way. Linked with this is often a chip-on-the-shoulder defensiveness which expects discrimination and projects it even on the most sincere helping effort if they do not immediately produce the desired results.

I will try to skip some here. There is another smiling one there.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): I am not smiling.

Mr. Ben: To continue:

Ex-inmates present themselves in a variety of ways. Sometimes the hostility is barely held in check and the initial demanding attitude has to be worked through before the real issue can be reached and help rendered. Again they may evidence confusion and inability to mobilize energy into action even in the matter of securing shelter or looking for work. In such instances there is need for a somewhat directive approach until the personality begins to reintegrate. The immediate problem of most ex-inmates is survival. Gate money for provincial institutions or prisons, earnings for the penitentiary are so small that ex-inmates are to all intents and purposes insolvent when they leave prison. A rough estimate used to be that a penitentiary inmate would have on release an average of about \$7.50 a year for time served, plus a dressout of clothing seasonally appropriate. Recently, prison earnings have been increased and more money will be available to the men

as they leave, though estimates are still difficult to suggest. The security of food, shelter and workclothes is an immediate necessity. The urge to be rid of prison-made clothes may create a ready acceptance of secondhand clothing which may be actually inferior to prison-made articles both in quality and appearance.

Mr. Kirkpatrick goes on to show the difficulty these people have in obtaining employment because of their past record. Because of the blanket bonding of employees which is becoming very frequent, the areas of employment open to ex-inmates are gradually shrinking. Today, many delivery men, truckers and warehouse employees are bonded and the companies make rare exceptions, if any. Then, when they refuse to bond an employee, explanations are in order and it is highly probable that the ex-inmate will be seeking new employment.

He goes on to say that when a man has demonstrated over a period of years that he is living a responsible life, free from criminal activity or association, it becomes discrimination of the worst sort if he is denied opportunities to advance himself or pursue a chosen avenue of employment.

In regard to employment, ex-inmates are truthfully in the position of second-class citizens and are forced in most cases into the ranks of unskilled labour, even though they may have excellent intelligence aptitude and reasonably good training. This is particularly true of men who have had vocational training in a prison and who seek to have this training recognized for an apprenticeship.

Mr. Kirkpatrick goes on:

The institutional classification statute coordinates the efforts of the after-care agencies and prerelease. But as much as possible, the after-care agencies should maintain their own prerelease representatives and relationships in the institution. It may be said that after-care agencies are extensions of the institution in the local communities.

I have omitted reading a good part of this article. I should point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that yesterday I phoned the John Howard society to find out exactly how many representatives in the prisons their agency had and I found they had two representatives who travel.

What has the government of this province done to solve this appalling situation? What good is it having these prisons when this is

the situation that exists on the outside? Now, I quote:

The earnings of prisoners in the penitentiary system were increased in 1964 but are still quite low, and the effect of the change has not been fully realized, though now it is estimated that a man may have about \$17 per year of sentence. The discharge gratuities paid by the various provincial institutions vary, but are also quite small. For example, in Ontario the gratuity is \$2 per month up to a maximum of \$20 on discharge.

Now that is a fine start on a new life. I quote:

It has long been one of the clichés of the prisoners' aid societies that you cannot counsel a man on a hungry stomach.

And again:

Because they have been in prison a long time, many inmates find it difficult to establish that they are eligible for welfare assistance.

Lou Zicton, of the John Howard society of Ottawa, continues:

Ideally, the prison dischargee should be eligible for public welfare assistance, with the function of the private agency founded upon the giving of case work service to help with psychological and environmental problems, but providing material assistance where necessary, for specific reason, as part of the process.

Again, I quote:

It is essential that the service given an ex-inmate be related to the experience he has had in prison, and that the probable effect of his imprisonment, his chance of re-establishment in the community, be taken into account.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a single example before I proceed. Does the hon. Minister really believe that the so-called "trades training" work given at Guelph reformatory is part of, and I quote, "a sound, rehabilitative programme"?

Does the hon. Minister really believe that the work is adequate to prepare these men and boys for parole in society after they are released? We must presume that the Minister does, or else the Minister is quick to agree that he is responsible for, and I quote:

—revolutionizing the reform institutions department would have to introduce at least some measure of reform.

In passing, I would like to suggest, in all deference to the hon. Minister, that he not get too euphoric or self-congratulatory about

laudatory letters. We all receive them at some time or another. While it is nice to receive them, we are merely throwing sand in our own eyes if we begin to believe that they fairly reflect the total situation or the measure of our involvement in it.

Let me point out, for the benefit of those who do not know that the misnamed Guelph reformatory is not even a creditable attempt at a trades training school. The inmates there merely pass their time in a limited amount of woodworking, tailoring, painting, repairing of automobiles—and it is a convenient arrangement; the automobiles belong to the staff—they also makes clothes, raise beef, pork and vegetables for other institutions. All this activity is accounted for on the credit side of the department's books by the figure of almost \$3.5 million which you find both in the public accounts and in the statement given by the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) and in the estimates.

What has the inmate learned that will help him to re-establish himself in the community? Virtually nothing. How then, do his qualifications upon discharge relate in A. M. Kirkpatrick's words, "to the experience he has had in prison"? Virtually not at all. He has had no formal, progressive training that leaves him immeasurably more skilled than when he entered prison. He can produce no document of value stating that he has completed successfully a formal period of instruction in a certain specialty. He is probably no better with his hands or his head than when he entered prison, unless, of course, he learned from his peers some useful arts of criminality that can be deployed against society—and I will return to that later.

In the words of the Rubaiyat, Mr. Chairman, he "leaves by the same door he came in." Re-establishment, God knows, is difficult enough for a prisoner, without compounding his difficulties by actually wasting an opportunity to equip him for later life. The reformatories of this province, Mr. Chairman—and I say it with all solemnity—are not reformatories in any sense. They are compounds for indentured labour. The figure of \$3.5 million looks impressive on The Department of Reform Institutions books, but I would ask you to consider what that figure really represents. It represents to a very substantial extent, a waste of human material; it represents human energy and human initiative poured down the drain; it represents failure, Mr. Chairman, the failure of the reform institutions of Ontario to carry out their public duty to reform.

What is the rehabilitative effect of the current programme on what is so loosely

styled "trades training" in reform institutions? Let us consider an expert view, that of Professor J. Ciale of the department of criminology of the University of Montreal, in a paper entitled, "Prison design and rehabilitation programmes" delivered at the annual meeting of the John Howard society, held at the city of Kingston on February 16, 1965, Professor Ciale had this to say:

Trades training had no influence on the rate of recidivism. A study carried out by the FTC—

that is the federal training centre:

—staff supports this finding. Less than nine per cent of ex-inmates who had received trades training practised the trade they had been taught upon release. This is not surprising, for an ex-inmate will be credited with six months' or one year's apprenticeship, as the case may be, by the certifying trade board. His pay will be commensurate with his level of proficiency. Usually he does not relish work at the wage scales offered until he obtains his master's card, when he can immediately earn much more money by driving a truck or getting some analogous work. This also demonstrates the importance of co-ordinating an inmate's treatment plan within the institution with his prerelease and post-release activities.

How much effort and how much money are spent on trade training activities with such a limited payoff?

One is obliged to ask at this point, Mr. Chairman, what does The Ontario Department of Reform Institutions do to further equip the dischargee from Ontario institutions? That question is rhetorical. The answer, Mr. Chairman, is that The Ontario Department of Reform Institutions does virtually nothing.

Now to continue with Professor Ciale:

The recidivist has usually started his criminal career before 21 years of age. Most of them before 18. He is likely to have been in a juvenile institution. He has a low educational level.

What does The Department of Reform Institutions do effectively to raise the standard of education to abort that criminal career? Once again, Mr. Chairman, the answer is virtually nothing.

To continue from Professor Ciale:

Medium security institutions which house approximately 350 inmates—and select the cream, as it were, from among the large unsegregated groups of maximum security institutions—have not successfully bridged the gap to the inmate's

society. They have not reached those inmates who cluster and group themselves according to the "right guys" and the "suckers."

The reason why, I suggest that—

writes Ciale:

—is because their working hypothesis is based on a regimented system of living with trades training as a predominant activity for those who are suitable, and maintenance and regular work for unsuitable, inmates. It does not allow inmates to express themselves or to reach their true needs. He, the inmate, must work his way up through the institutional standard. What happens is that the inmate adopts a double standard; he pays lip service to treatment, becomes obsequious and submissive while his anti-social quarrel remains unaltered.

Mr. Chairman, this is the sort of problem the reform institutions department leaves untouched.

The hon. Minister has repeatedly stressed—not to say harped upon—"the great value" of The Department of Reform Institutions training programme for its custodial officers. Oh, I apologize—I believe they are now called "correctional" officers—those men who are in direct day-to-day contact with the prisoner; those men whose influence is crucial in shaping his attitude to himself and to society at large. One would gather from the hon. Minister's pronouncement that his department has a wise appreciation of the vital role played by these men and bends every effort to ensure that they are judiciously selected and fully equipped for their tasks. Mr. Chairman, allow me to read to you the complete schedule of training provided for new correctional officers as outlined in the department's own directive.

O.R. Millbrook—primary basic training for all new personnel to be completed during first four weeks of service.

Now, this programme outlines who is to be the instructor, but I shall omit that.

Course outline, subject-matter:

1. Purpose and scope of initial training, explanation of training and what employment has to gain—one hour.

2. Conditions of employment. Explanation of work schedule, pay scale, sick leave, pension plan, etc.—one hour.

3. Conditions of employment. Training, etc. Must qualify on all courses for permanent appointment. All call any time in event of emergency.—One hour.

4. Institution tour. Guided tour to explain the layout and facilities.—Two hours.

5. The Ontario plan and its objectives. The peculiar relation to the whole programme.—One and a half hours.

6. Programme of this institution. Description of the organization, lines of authority, channels of communication, features of facilities of the programme for inmates.—One and a half hours.

7. Weapons. Legal use. Explanation, discussion and presentation of confidential memoranda.—One hour.

8. Weapons. Practical. Handling and firing of all firearms and protective equipment, maintenance, loading, safety precautions, etc.—Three hours.

9. Officer-inmate relationship. A commonsense discussion pertaining to handling of inmates.—One hour.

10. Policies and rules of the institution. The meaning and importance of rules and policies and interpretation.—One hour.

11. Daily routine. A description of daily routine and daily events in 24-hour period.—One hour.

12. Essential characteristics of a good officer, using material available.—One hour.

13. Experience on post. Cell wings, day room, work areas and shops.—Four hours.

14. Inmate programme. Reception to release. Show reception and release procedure, documentation, transfers, identification, etc.—One hour.

15. Emergencies. Typical situations which may occur outlining what to expect and what has to be done.—One hour.

16. Custody. Legal responsibility for. Methods of techniques used to ensure, observation, supervision, counts, etc.—Two hours.

17. Keys and locking devices. Observe and study locking devices and keys. Handle keys under supervision.—Four hours.

18. Reports. How to make proper reports. Keep a notebook, telephone procedure, etc.—One hour.

19. Treatment and training. Outline treatment and training, employment and recreation programme. Group therapy, counselling, etc. Two hours.

20. Religion and chaplain. Function of the institutional chapel and chaplain. One hour.

21. Purpose of institution education, explaining objectives of the educational programme. One hour.

22. Library. Explaining importance of a good library. One hour.

This may have sounded rather a boring recitation, but out of these 22 items enumerated here, four touch on the rehabilitation of the inmates under their charge. And in this I am being very liberal. Five is the Ontario plan and its objectives, that peculiar relationship to the whole programme—an hour and a half. Nine, officer-inmate relationship, a commonsense discussion pertaining to handling of inmates. I am willing to allow that that is an hour and a half an hour. Item 19, treatment and training, outline treatment and training, employment and recreation programme, group therapy, counselling, etc., two hours. That is now four and a half hours. Purpose of institution education is one hour. That is five and a half hours, and this is the great training that these custodial or correctional officers are supposed to get.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): That is the total—

Mr. Ben: That is the total course.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of order. I am prepared to sit here and not interrupt the hon. member, and answer him as is the usual fashion when the other critic is finished. But I must correct that statement. The hon. member is entirely wrong. That is the introductory staff training. There is further training and I will have that in my answer for him tomorrow. But just to correct the record here, he made the statement that that is the total staff training. The research of the hon. member has failed him there.

Mr. Ben: Oh, no, my research man has not. That is the total basic training programme, and it is given over the first four or some number of weeks there.

The hon. Minister implied that there is another training programme; I am willing to admit that there is. But this is for officers and supervisors, and I have studied the public accounts and the estimates with reference to that. But I would point out, Mr. Chairman, that today the hon. Minister gave me an answer to a question raised as to the educational qualifications of the custodial officers. They are called correctional officers now; they used to be called turnkeys at one time, then it became custodial officer and now it is correctional officer. The mean and average educational level, as the hon. Minister pointed out this afternoon, is grade 9½. Another question I asked for which no an-

swer has yet come forth is the mean and average education of the inmates. It is my humble submission, Mr. Chairman, that the inmates have a higher educational level than the people who are there to correct, educate and rehabilitate them.

An hon. member: The hon. member is contradicting himself.

Mr. Ben: They say I am contradicting myself. It is clear to everybody except the Chicago gang there, you know. As a matter of fact, I almost avoided being in the House on February 14. I did not know what to expect from the Chicago gang, but the day passed anyway. That is the total training that is given to the average custodial officer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is a suggestion that I did not answer a question. Will the hon. member, after he is through, find the question in *Hansard* and draw it to my attention so that I can answer it? I understood him to say that he had asked me a question about the average educational standard of the average inmate. Is that right?

Mr. Ben: I asked the same question about the inmates as I did about the custodial staff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would like to see that in *Hansard*; it is not the way we read it in *Hansard*.

Mr. Ben: I will apologize to the hon. Minister if that is not so.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think reading that statement took that long, although some hon. members think it took too long.

Mr. Chairman, is this the sort of miserable fact we are to find recorded by a Minister who, to quote from a letter to be found in the Minister's own fanmail, a letter he so proudly read to us last Thursday, is: "Tremendously interested in his department and has done more study than could normally be expected"? Mr. Chairman, let me conclude with Professor Ciale for the moment, with one further excerpt from his paper: "I would like to deal with—" I am sorry; I will not read this part because for the simple reason that the hon. Minister has already admitted in some of his articles that Millbrook would not be there if he had his way. He is not responsible for its location, and therefore it would be unfair to the hon. Minister if I started dwelling on locations of jails for which he has or can bear no responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to turn now to the report of the commissioner of penitentiaries

for Canada for the year 1949. In that report there appears this statement:

There is an increasing realization that the true purpose of the prison is not only to keep in safe custody those committed to its care but to train, uplift and educate its inmates for better citizenship. Greater attention to the basic needs and problems of the individual prisoner, more sympathetic concern for the needs and problems of the inmate, better facilities for readjustment on discharge, these are all evidences of a concern for a prisoner as a human being.

As I indicated in the beginning, I intend to deal almost exclusively with the enlightened concept and sound principles in this address, in an attempt to lay at least part of the groundwork for some of the bleak realities of the Ontario penal system that I intend to draw to the attention of the hon. members of this House.

Those who have been good enough to listen to the expert views I have provided thus far will already, I am sure, have some appreciation of the gulf that separates this government's observations about the prison system it administers and some hard and unyielding facts. When I deal in detail with the conditions of the Ontario penal system, probably tomorrow, I will relate these conditions to the views of many more outstanding experts in the field of penal reform, including those experts I have been able to quote today. It seems hardly necessary to remind the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions that these men are not two-to-three-week experts. The hon. members of this House may have perceived that some of the views I have provided today are the views of those the hon. Minister cited with such obvious delight as being prominent among his advisers. Mr. Chairman, there is little point in having an adviser if you do not occasionally take his advice.

I would like to give, at this time, at least one illustration of the discrepancy between the statements of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions and the facts; I intend at another time to deal in detail with these facts. A great many, far too many, of the hon. Minister's statements, Mr. Chairman, are little more than an expression of myths and legends of the Ontario reform institutions department that the hon. Minister nurtures so well. At this moment, I would like to deal only with the one statement, because it relates to what I have said earlier in this address and I have not now got the time to deal with others.

But first, to make an earlier point perfectly

clear, I would like to quote from another of the hon. Minister's distinguished advisers, Mr. Joseph McCulley, former deputy commissioner of penitentiaries, now—I believe—chairman or vice-chairman of the county—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Regional detention centres.

Mr. Ben: He is the chairman now. This quote is in reference to the previous quote I read of the commissioner of penitentiaries for Canada for the year 1949. He states:

Nothing is said here about vengeance, retribution or punishment. Nothing is said here about deterrents. There is recognition of the fact that the offender cannot be permitted to run at large in society, but there is a clear statement that it is the prime function of the prison insofar as possible to return the offender to society prepared to live a decent and law-abiding life.

Now consider a statement of the hon. Minister at a meeting of the same society:

Essentially, whether we are financed by personal or property taxes or by voluntary donations, we are given this money to protect society against the depredations of crime. I do not think society in general really cares too much as to our exact methods although I hope—

and these are the hon. Minister's words:

—public conscience has improved to the stage where most would prefer humanitarian rather than punitive methods.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister then continued in quite another vein:

While we ask ourselves what are the purposes of our institutions, the answer is, I would say, to provide for a therapeutic programme of rehabilitation in a custodial setting. Although we realize that the therapeutic atmosphere usually increases in inverse proportion to the amount of custody, we must recognize that necessary custody varies with individuals and that it cannot be reduced to such a level that it fails to protect the public. Recognizing that every institution in the correctional field must be a therapeutic institution with treatment programmes, one must immediately consider certain facts. Institutions must be designed to fit a variety of programmes, not the other way around. Treatment programmes will need to be many and varied in order to deal with every type of inmate, but we should also have programmes which are adjusted to every stage of an inmate's progress.

Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister really believe this reflects the state of things in Ontario's penal institutions? Fantastic! What variety of programmes, what many and varied treatment programmes are provided under the hon. Minister's benevolent auspices at Millbrook? If he wants to answer, I will sit down. Or does the hon. Minister believe that, in his own words, society in general really does not care too much?

Let me convey to you, Mr. Chairman, what life is like at Millbrook. It is a harsh life and a bleak life, a life virtually unrelieved by variety or interest or wholesome stimulation. It is a life full of the sound of clanging doors and the metallic clatter of machines stamping out licence plates. It is a life of bored, lonely and sometimes desperate men. Mr. Chairman, no man of goodwill would countenance a reform institution that was operated in a slack and undisciplined way like some ineffectual boys' schools. But, Mr. Chairman, no man of goodwill who has seen it could approve the dreadful monotony, the almost human sterility and the vacuousness of life for an inmate at Millbrook. And yet the hon. Minister recently condoned the use of tear gas for five consecutive days in Millbrook. This gas was used indiscriminately on men innocent of any part in the prior disturbance, and all of them were trapped in their cells—each to an individual cell. Was this part of the hon. Minister's therapeutic programme for the men and women entrusted to his care? Or, once again, does the hon. Minister really believe that society in general does not care too much?

I will read to you a statement by J. A. Graham, Deputy Minister of The Department of Reform Institutions, from the department's annual report:

They—

the inmates at Millbrook:

—constitute in general the type described by the former Chief Justice J. C. McRuer, as "a predatory class of people." They are so constituted that they either cannot live responsible lives or they prefer to be parasites. They demonstrate by their conduct that they will not live disciplined lives.

Remember, the Deputy Minister is talking about men.

I read to you an excerpt from an editorial in the *Peterborough Examiner* of July 10, 1965, dealing with that Millbrook disturbance. When I put the question to the hon. Minister a few days back as to how much damage was caused by the riot, he was quick to jibe at me that there was no riot. I was

quite aware that there was no riot, Mr. Chairman. One of the first things that struck me on my visit to Millbrook was the fact that although gas had been shot for five days and it was all over the papers as a riot and a disturbance, I could not find any evidence of damage. Now, if there is a riot or disturbance, they either smash dishes or destroy furniture or rip up mattresses or break windows or plug the toilet bowls or something like that. The amazing thing was that I could not find any evidence. I asked the staff what damage was done besides blankets being impregnated with tear gas. What were they doing?

As far as I could understand, they had all these people segregated because they tried to go on a hunger strike because of their objection to the food there. I am not passing judgment on the food, I am just saying that they were going to go on a hunger strike, but they could not get together because they were all in isolation. So the strike did not succeed. At any rate, I understand they took 15 of the so-called ringleaders and put them in a special wing—I think it was five wing.

After the fire they had there, simply because the custodial staff feared that they were going to lose control—these individuals were in individual cells behind locked doors that were operated by remote control from a booth outside the wing—the guards went in there and started shooting gas in cells where people were sleeping and where other people were lying down on their bunks reading and where others came to the door and asked for a light from the guard because their lighters had been taken away and they had been told that if they wanted a light to ask the guard. If I have ever met anything as inhuman as this—short of a way—I do not know where. These people were trapped like rabbits in a dead-end burrow, and for five days they got gassed. Now that is humane treatment!

Then, when a report was made on the incident, as reported in the paper—when you consider that all of these people were isolated in one wing and each in an individual cell behind a door that either opened simultaneously with the other doors or individually, the man who prepared the report said that at no time was there any risk of losing control. I should think not! Unless they were going to chew their bars through.

I say “shame” to the people down there! The only justification I can find for this, Mr. Chairman, is that the hon. Minister or the people down at Millbrook must have read the statement of the American government that tear gas is the most humane way of dealing with insurrection, or something. So

I guess he must have got some satisfaction out of that.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Is he right?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He has not been right for one minute.

Mr. Ben: Not been right for one minute! Well, I can produce signed affidavits on it and I will take the hon. Minister down.

Then there is the man who is sitting there while we were in there discussing the matter. The man makes a report and he admits in the report that he did not speak to a single inmate—did not speak to a single inmate when he was sent down there to make an investigation, Mr. Minister. And when we asked him why he did not speak to a single inmate, he asked, “You do not expect us to believe inmates, do you?” And I pointed out to the man, I said, “Well, you talk like the magistrates in the city of Toronto.”

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Do you believe inmates?

Mr. Ben: You never believe the accused when a policeman says something because policemen always tell the truth and the accused always lies, so the custodial staff at Millbrook always tell the truth and the inmates always lie. I pointed out to them that one of the things of which I had to take notice was that although the inmates lied, they all told the same lie!

Now, here is the excerpt that I started to read from the Peterborough *Examiner*, dealing with the disturbances:

A system that relies upon starvation, mental oppression and solitary confinement for control, has little or no chance for success.

they are referring to Millbrook:

It is obvious that the amount of training available for staff and superintendents is limited or non-existent.

I read the conclusions of the Anglican Church committee's report on Millbrook reformatory and I hope to have some words to say on that at another time, too.

The committee maintained that the location of the reformatory was bad.

The hon. Minister acknowledges that because it is not situated in an area where specialized psychological, psychiatric, medical, sociological and educational help was really available, and it is there—I am not going to bring up

that to the hon. Minister for he acknowledges it is there. He cannot pick it up holus-bolus and dump it anywhere else—it is there.

But the committee noted that:

The educational qualifications and pay rates of custodial staff are far too low and the training programme for these should be greatly increased. The committee warned also that the training of inmates left much to be desired and in its present condition was "unlikely to bring about rehabilitation."

And yet, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister tells us—if you remember his words—that:

Every institution in the correctional field must be a therapeutical institution.

Now, I must leave the subject of Millbrook, but we will get back to that at a later date.

The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions who congratulated himself warmly in his recent speech because his department had—and I use his own words:

—had the initiative to set up two new forestry camps on purchased property at Hagersville, for a training school.

What the hon. Minister at that time neglected to make clear was that these camps and training schools are not for those who require the most help, but for those who require the least; that is, those who are most likely to be rehabilitated. Now this is amply demonstrated by data collected by Mannheim, Wilkins, Vernon, Croft and Grygier, to the effect that "the mere fact of adjudication, classification and allocation creates measurable dynamic forces which make our good people better and our juvenile delinquents worse."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I must apologize. This is in very statistical language. There was another article by Grygier, a darn good article, a talk he gave to an association in St. Louis about—it must have been four or five years ago, before the hon. Minister came into office—where he pointed out that, according to his empirical studies:

Contrary to the belief that everything tends to the norm, when it came to penal institutions the trend was to diverge from the norm.

He put it in much simpler language in that article than he did here. What he was saying there—and I think he made a study of Brampton, if I remember correctly, or one of the institutions—was that incarceration makes the good better and the bad worse; that instead of coming toward the

norm—making the good become less good and the bad become a little better—the bad became worse and the good became better. I even have it here some place. It was a sort of white paper. So that if we take a successful institution, such as Brampton, which is a successful institution, Mr. Minister—if you will just wake up for a second, thank you.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am awake and I am listening to every word.

Mr. Ben: It is a successful institution and I suggest I know why, although it may not be the answer, because a psychologist can still bring out some reports. After the prisoners get into Guelph, they are in a manner classified, and there is no doubt that they send the best prisoners—those who have the greatest chance of improving themselves, as the hon. Minister's chart here points out, age 16 and 25, IQ over 85, good custodial risks, well motivated; in other words, the good ones—to that place and they are successful. Frankly I really thought that Brampton was really something special until I read Grygier's report. I still think it is a good institution, but at least now I know why it is so singularly successful. It is not just the treatment they receive, but the fact that you are managing to get the good there and I hope you will continue to send the good there and that they become better.

But is this something for this government to congratulate itself about? What about those who desperately need help? Undoubtedly this is useful work in Brampton, but our main concern should be making the bad better, as well as making the good more content. What has the department done in essence—and this, believe me, is reflected in almost every phase of its activities—in giving some help to the good and brushing aside those it so readily calls "the bad"? Now "brushing aside" is—there is a comment over there, Mr. Chairman. These are bold words, but let us deal with facts, not with words.

In the fiscal year ending March 1965, The Department of Reform Institutions set aside the magnificent sum of \$56,000 for staff training. This year it is \$75,000. \$56,000. Now that would go a long way, would it not, to educate these men, these custodial officers. I believe, according to the last record, there are 700 of them. It is approximately the budget of a three-room school.

And what did the department spend of that great sum to do this vital work? It spent half, \$28,000, and it did not even spend, so to speak, all of that. If you will look at the

public accounts on page S-6, it gives the staff and training development programme.

They spent altogether \$28,915.06 out of appropriation of \$56,000. For sundry persons, \$12,720.02. Travelling expenses account for \$1,800. \$1,178.43. Maintenance and lecturers accounts under \$5,000. \$13,601.63. \$27,500.08. Less government of Canada repayments, \$7,940.95, for a net of \$19,559.36.

Then, training courses. University extension and other specialized courses: Sundry persons, \$4,665.93. Less government of Canada repayments, \$1,310, for a total of \$3,353.93. And now that makes it roughly—sorry, Mr. Chairman, I am looking for a slip—\$22,800. Now it is supposed to be \$28,000.

So, the last item: Training fellowships to students in psychology and social work attending Ontario universities. Sundry universities, \$6,000. Yet the \$28,000 is shown as being for the training of staff, but in essence this government spent \$22,800 out of a budget of \$56,000 for the training of its custodial or correctional staff, the people who are doing a very great job and who, with an average of nine and a half grades of education probably do need some training at that. And this is what the hon. Minister calls training.

The preliminary training I listed before is not sum total of the training the hon. Minister tries to indicate. What kind of training are these 700 members of the staff—and he has got the number listed here in this report. I do not want to get the numbers wrong. I am sorry. Correctional officers grade 7, I do not even know what is exactly the difference between grade 7, 6, 5, 4, but at any rate, correctional officers, 718 of them. Correctional officers grade 4, 79 of them. Correctional officers grade 5, 25. There are over 800 of them and this department spent the smashing sum of \$23,000.

And they keep talking about this training programme that they have for their correctional staff, and about the school they have down in Guelph. This year there is \$75,000 in the estimates for this very important—what should be a very important—programme, and I am just wondering how much of that is going to be spent in direct training.

Mr. Chairman, could I, at this point, move the adjournment of the debate?

Mr. Chairman: No. We do not adjourn the debate in this case.

Mr. Ben: You do not? You go right on until 6 o'clock, do you?

Mr. Chairman: We will carry on, and the House leader will tell us when it is six

o'clock. We will move the adjournment at that time. At this particular time the subject of adjournment would be the committee would rise and report progress, but that may be at six o'clock. The member for Bracondale may carry on.

Mr. Ben: What kind of a programme does the department really expect us to believe it has been carrying on for \$23,500? It may be normal, if not laudable, for a government to grow, to express it in the kindest way, a little nonchalant about moneys required for a department that is rarely in the public eye. But for the government to deal in this cavalier way with some of the most vital work of The Department of Reform Institutions, for the Minister of that department to not merely countenance but approve that treatment, to me is grossly unconscionable, if not absolutely reprehensible.

As the hon. Minister indicated, during our caucus today, which incidentally finished in the afternoon, we were delivered a proof copy of the hon. Minister's report. It was fortunate that this debate, from my point of view, was not last night, because we would not have had this until the debate was over.

At any rate, we have got it here and I would like to deal with some of the things mentioned in this report, albeit I will have to gloss over them, because it had to be a very hasty reading, between one o'clock and three o'clock, in order to, in some way, try to prepare myself on the basis of this report:

This year at your request there was undertaken an evaluation of the department's activities and progress over the past 20 years, the period of time which the Ontario plan has been in effect.

Twenty years this Ontario plan has been in effect.

In this period great changes have taken place. The department now operates three times as many institutions.

Operates three times as many institutions. That must be progress.

We are getting more prisons all the time.

And now that must indeed be progress in this day and age.

Its staff is four times larger than in 1946.

Well, Parkinson could have predicted that even before 1946.

The work of social, welfare and probation services outside the department has expanded enormously and this has reduced the number of first offenders in reformatories.

I would question that statement on the hon. Minister's own statistics that come later on in this report.

As a consequence, the typical inmate today is a far different type of person than a typical inmate of 20 years ago.

Now, in what respect is he different; in what respect, Mr. Chairman, is he being treated differently? 20 years ago they had the cattle barns out at Guelph reformatory, they had the piggery out in Guelph. The cattle were still the same registered herd that they have, the carding mills were here 20 years ago. From my inspection of the buildings, they have all been there for 20 years.

What has changed in this 20 years? The instructions there — are they newer? Well, what has changed about that concept? What fantastic changes evolved in the 20 years with reference to the Ontario reformatories? True, about a year ago there were 900 inmates in there. A year before that, there were 1,000 inmates in there, on the average. When I was there, there were 719 inmates. It is a change, if you want to call it a change, but it changes from day to day, so every day there is a change.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, that is a pretty good change, isn't it?

Mr. Ben: In fact, when I first entered the door there were only 704, before I left there were 719, and as far as I know there were no women up there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member was out of his office then, they were losing cases for you.

Mr. Ben: I did not hear the remarks so I cannot reply.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I said the hon. member was out of his office and could not defend these people.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Ben: Now, one of the—we were dwelling on a subject, Mr. Chairman, of the education of the inmates. I pointed out that I lauded and applauded the hon. Minister on what he is doing with what I call "child training," but a section that has no business being under his control, not because of any inefficiency, but because I simply do not believe that these children should fall under what is called a Department of Reform Institutions. We could always give them to the smiling Scotsman over there; I think he could handle them pretty well, but to put it under The Department of Reform Institutions is

beyond me. But I applaud the fact that it is becoming a vocational training programme because one of the things that has struck me in all the statistics that I have studied—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which page of the report—

Mr. Ben: On the education statistics—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, do not bother.

Mr. Ben: Page 36. And similar statistics are to be found in the Dominion bureau of statistics and in the previous statistics of this department. It gives education status: Illiterates, 185; elementary, 5,515; high school, 3,371; college or university, 105. It seems that until you reach approximately grade 9½ the curve rises—that is, the probability of incarceration rises. When the education standard goes over 9½ or around 10, then the chances that you are going to be in jail diminishes. So I should think that the first battle to keep these people from returning to prisons would be to upgrade their education level.

But virtually nothing—I should not say "nothing at all" because there are some teachers in these institutions—but virtually nothing is being done in this regard. And I think that the government is making a big mistake in that the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) does not try to use his good office to have the present procedure of sentences reversed. The present trend is to give a determinate sentence and then a shorter indeterminate sentence. I think a lot more could be accomplished, Mr. Chairman, if the determinate sentence was the shorter sentence and the indeterminate sentence the longer sentence. Then you could use that indeterminate sentence as a sort of tool to rehabilitate the inmate. You could almost force him to upgrade his academic standing and if he was—while he was upgrading his academic standing—responding to the treatment of the institution, he could be released on parole but he would still have that indeterminate sentence, on condition that he continue his courses on the outside.

He could take one of these retraining courses, he would then be no longer the financial responsibility of The Department of Reform Institutions, but he would be receiving an allowance under this retraining programme. So he would be learning while he was earning.

But that does not fall under the jurisdiction of this department. The hon. Minister

cannot go and tell the judges what to do. I doubt very much whether the hon. Attorney General could tell them what to do, but I think he should try to bring about some amendments both through the federal government and through his own office to make this possible. I watched those people taking these so-called training trades and I could not see any future in it. Even the people there admit it, that most of them were just taking it to sort of ingratiate themselves with the institutions. And they were quick to admit that it had no therapeutic value, that a lot of these inmates were pulling the wool over their eyes, that one way to make it look good to the parole board was to get in one of these training courses and make out that you are going to take up this trade when you get out, although statistics point out that not 9½ per cent of them do it.

So I believe that something should be done in that regard.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member has the floor until he is finished and then he may sit down.

Mr. Ben: I will not be finished for another hour.

Mr. Chairman: He may carry on until six o'clock.

Mr. Ben: All right. Now, to understand the people we are dealing with, we have to try to examine every facet and the time to do this is before man is in captivity. By then, as our statistics on recidivism show, there is less chance for reform. Somehow, they keep coming back. Many people, far more qualified than I, have tried to find out why.

In most cases, they point to a lack of education and many other reasons—the home life, or lack of it; loss of contact with reality; subnormal intelligence; bad influences; lack of guidance. The major question today is what can we do to improve the record? Mr. Chairman, we in this House should be aware of a social revolution that is now taking place, with some extremely frightening aspects. Month after month, year after year, more people are trekking into our teeming cities from the smaller communities to make a new way of life. The rural children of the past had the opportunity and space to roam, seek adventure, grow and mature under the watchful eye of the parents. The father could hitch up his team and work the far 40 within sight of the home. The mother either worked in the garden, cooked or made preserves, or made clothes for the family.

Today, we find the father hopping into his car and driving through miles of traffic on crowded streets and highways, while the mother, in many cases, holds down a position to help provide the extra items for the family, or to contribute to pressing family needs. It is quite possible that only one, or neither, of the parents is at home when the children arrive for lunch. The child, however, can expect the parents home in time for a hurried dinner before the young ones are placed in bed, if they are lucky.

The problems we face with today's youth are staggering, but they should not be frightening nor impossible, except for the timid. As in the case of many of our resources, this government has remained unaware of the proper uses. Are our youth tired of politicians believing that they, the youth, are our greatest investment for the future of this nation? They want and need someone to invest in them. We are raising our youth altogether too impersonally in this jungle of cement and concrete with a minimum of mindful attention that we should be placing on our investment in the future.

Tired parents do not have all the time and patience needed to help the children, who wonder who they actually are and what they will become. The government itself helps to prolong emotional agonies of our youth by not pitching in to help our youth find a sense of security or belonging.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we propose to proceed at 3 o'clock, after the opening, with the Throne debate, and it being Thursday, from five to six will be reserved for private members' debate on private motions. In the evening at 8 o'clock, we will continue with the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, February 24, 1966
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Fourth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Reuter	835
Co-operative Loans Act, bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, first reading	835
Statement re picketing at the Tilco Plastics premises, Peterborough, Mr. Wishart	836
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Boyer, Mr. Nixon	845
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Nixon, agreed to	854
On notice of motion No. 17, Mr. S. Lewis, Mr. Eagleson, Mr. Ben	854
Recess, 6 o'clock	865

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have guests to the Legislature and today we welcome students from the following schools: In the east gallery, W. F. Herman collegiate institute, Windsor, and in the west gallery, Don Mills junior high school, Don Mills.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's fourth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Brantford.

Bill No. Pr27, An Act respecting the town of Burlington.

Bill No. Pr35, An Act respecting the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Windsor.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr6, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

As the following bill has been withdrawn, your committee would recommend that the fees less the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted:

Bill No. Pr33, An Act respecting the Salvation Army.

Motions.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves, seconded by **Mr. R. Gisborn** (Wentworth East), that resolution No. 11 standing in his name be discharged from the order paper.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Perhaps I could give one word of explanation of my motion, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: I shall put the motion first.

Mr. Bryden: I do not propose this motion because I believe that the resolution is in any way defective. However, there is no question in the world that the subject-matter was precisely covered by a vote held last Friday. That being so, it would be out of order now for it to be brought forward in this House.

I understand a procedure has been agreed upon whereby we will remove from the order paper items that cannot be debated in any case, so as to prevent the order paper from being cluttered up with extraneous items. That is the reason for the motion, sir.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. Speaker: Introduction of bills.

THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Has the hon. Minister nothing to say about this bill at all?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, it is a very simple amendment. It simply brings The Co-operative Loans Act in line with the amendments that were made to it last year, whereby the united co-operatives of Ontario could bring in other co-operatives through amalgamation. It would allow the united co-operatives of Ontario central organization to assume the first mortgage liabilities that the smaller co-operatives might owe. In total, this might well amount to more than the \$100,000 which is the limiting factor in The Co-operative Loans Act. This provides that they can do this.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day, the Attorney General has a statement.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise this honourable House that we have today instituted proceedings in the supreme court of Ontario to

bring before a justice of that court 28 men who are alleged to have been in defiance of an order of the court relating to the picketing of the Tilco Plastics premises in Peterborough.

The proceedings we have taken are designed to place before the court the facts substantiating these allegations so that our high court of justice may determine whether or not the conduct established by those facts is, in law, a contempt of the court that warrants the punishment of the individuals.

It is with personal regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have directed that these proceedings be undertaken. Never in the history of this province has the Attorney General had to institute contempt of court proceedings where persons have purported to act in defiance of the orders of our highest court. I had hoped that, by previous statements to this House, I might have counselled the leaders and members of responsible—

Mr. Bryden: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I submit to you, sir, that what the hon. Attorney General is now, in effect, doing, is commenting on the merits of these applications that are going before the court. We have had too much trial by headline already and I would suggest to the hon. Attorney General—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bryden: —that he refrain from further comments—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Bryden: —after having made his announcement.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would contend that the Minister is simply making a statement of his position with regard to the strike at the Peterborough plant and that it is in order.

Mr. Bryden: He has announced what he has done and I submit that he should make no further comment in the interests of a fair trial. This is *sub judice*, surely, and he ought to know that better than anyone.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that by previous statements to the House I might have counselled the leaders and members of responsible labour groups to pursue their desire for a change in our laws by the proper means.

Mr. Bryden: Again, Mr. Speaker, I raise my point of order. The hon. Minister is implying that what these men did is improper, that

therefore they are guilty of contempt; and I submit he has no business saying that. He has been acting as judge and prosecutor all through the piece in trial by newspaper headlines.

Mr. Speaker: I am of the opinion that the Minister's statement is quite in order, and I would ask him to proceed with it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would just say, Mr. Speaker, that the decision will be made by the court, not by me.

I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that by previous statements to the House I might have counselled the leaders and members of responsible labour groups to pursue their desire for a change in our laws by the proper means that have been effectively utilized by our society throughout the history of its development. However, since this advice has fallen on deaf ears, it is my intention that we shall bring the facts before the court, which may then take such action as it may deem proper and just in the enforcement of its own order.

It must be noted, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no violence in the assembly at Peterborough. I have been in constant touch with the Crown attorney, the sheriff, and the chief of police at Peterborough, through the officials of my department, and I have the assurance of all these responsible persons that the picketing and actions have been orderly. The police of the city of Peterborough have performed their duties admirably in this respect and will continue to do so. There is no law preventing a lawful assembly, and it would be a shocking commentary on our community if we even contemplated that such assemblies should be restricted.

This is modified, however, by the existence of an order which has been made and which relates directly to the assembly that has taken place. The problem that must be the concern of all law-abiding citizens of this province is whether this conduct is a contumacious defiance of the order of the supreme court, and this the court will ultimately decide.

I have deemed this question to be of such importance that I have undertaken the action on behalf of the public rather than leaving the process to be pursued by the private litigant, as might otherwise have been done. I assure this honourable House that the law enforcement agencies and my department will provide all the objective evidence available to the court, and such other assistance as the court may direct.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day and in

the absence of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) I have a question that he had phrased for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts). The hon. Prime Minister was not present in the House yesterday so I put it to him today.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, may I comment on the statement of the hon. Attorney General rather than—

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Would the hon. Prime Minister inform this House whether the government intends to submit a brief to the federal committee on justice and legal affairs which will conduct public hearings in an inquiry of federal legislation governing divorce in Canada?

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, there were two questions held over yesterday and perhaps my answer now could include both of them. The other one is from the hon. member for Scarborough West (Mr. S. Lewis): In view of the announcement last night that the federal government has set up a committee to hold public hearings on divorce and abortions, will the government of Ontario make representations on these important issues?

Mr. Speaker, I would say that upon making inquiry it appears that no special committee has been set up for any such purpose. I checked through the House of Commons debates of February 21, 1966 and, on pages 1539 and 1540, there is a most interesting exchange as to where a number of private members' bills might go in the House. The discussion indicates, to me, the complete confusion in the matter of divorce, abortion and so on. I might just point out some background to the committee to which the questions refer.

After some procedural byplay—to which we are also accustomed in this House—there were sent to the standing committee of the House of Commons on justice and legal affairs bills No. C16, C19, C41, C44, C55, C58, and C79. These private members' bills dealt with the dissolution of marriage, but ranged all the way from: An Act to amend The British North America Acts (1867-1965), to additional grounds for divorce, annulment of marriage, A Canada Divorce Act, A Divorce Act, A Canada Marriage and Divorce Act, and dissolution and annulment of marriage.

These were the subjects covered in this

group of bills that were sent to the justice and legal affairs committee.

This standing committee of the House of Commons on justice and legal affairs may or may not in due time deal with these private members' bills. There is no suggestion in what I read that public hearings were to be held covering the broad matter of divorce and there is no suggestion that public hearings, such as we understand the term—and as I would assume the hon. leader of the Opposition understood it when he put this question—were to be held.

To confuse the matter still further, there were four other private members' bills to amend the Criminal Code, and these are involved in the question by the hon. member for Scarborough West.

These private members' bills were C22, C40, C64, and C71, and they dealt with: Exemptions from the code for persons advising on family planning; Excluding criminal liability for pregnancy termination; Exempting agents distributing means, instructions, medicines, drugs or articles for the purpose of family planning; and, providing that it is not an offence to supply means, instructions, medicine, drugs or articles to prevent conception.

Now these four private bills, one of which has within it the elements of abortion as I read it, were sent to the standing committee of the House of Commons on health and welfare.

Once again, there is no indication that there will be any public hearings, as we normally understand the term, or that any submissions will be invited. I would make the point very clear that these are not government bills that are being sent to these committees, they are private bills submitted by private members of the House of Commons.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a comment concerning the confusion in this question of divorce. I would say first that the Criminal Code, of course, is a federal law, completely; and the dissolution of marriage is also completely within the jurisdiction of the federal government. Provincial governments are often criticized these days for their attempts to encroach upon the jurisdiction of the federal government. This perhaps is an area which is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada, and perhaps they might concern themselves more diligently with it.

In view of certain press reports today and yesterday, and the factual information that I

have now furnished to the House, I would point out that this government is not opposed in any way to the reform of the divorce laws of the province if they are necessary in the best interests of our people. The stand that we took on Tuesday—I believe it was Tuesday afternoon—was simply that we were not prepared to agree that the matter had been thoroughly debated in this Legislature; there was a motion at that time, of course, which would have closed off the debate. Nor were we prepared to accept a direction to enter into immediate discussion with the federal authorities. What I pointed out to you today indicates the state of confusion existing in this matter at the present moment.

Since the federal authorities have monopoly jurisdiction in this regard, I would say that if a Royal commission were established to deal with these problems, then I would think that commission should deal with both the problem of divorce and the problem which will be debated later on this afternoon—covered, I believe, in the private resolution of the hon. member for Scarborough West; and indeed what is apparent in some of these bills, the full question of the use of contraceptives and what amendments might be made to the Criminal Code. If there were a Royal commission established by the federal government, which has jurisdiction in this matter, this government would be very happy and pleased to develop and present to that commission a position which would represent what we might consider would be the position of the people of this province. I am certain that this would take a great deal of preparation; it might even mean the holding of public hearings in this province in order to ascertain what the feeling of our people is.

It certainly would require more debate and discussion in this House, but I think that this would be an approach to the whole problem and if this course of action were followed, or some other independent investigation were conducted by the body that has jurisdiction in this field, we would be very happy to take part and to do anything we could to assist in the matter of making recommendations for divorce reform.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, by way of a supplementary question: Surely the hon. Prime Minister will agree with me, notwithstanding the jurisdiction in divorce being solely a federal jurisdiction, that this province would bitterly resent any change in the divorce laws as they affect Ontario, without prior consultation with Ontario; and by the same token, would probably take the position

that what might be applicable in Newfoundland, or Quebec, or British Columbia, would not necessarily be applicable to Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree with what the hon. member says. I think that this is true in many areas in which we are carrying on discussions with the federal government at the present time. The question we are discussing here has not been raised, if my memory serves me correctly, in any of the discussions in which I have participated with the federal government. This does not mean that it will never be discussed. But to date it has not, and I do not think it is too far reaching for me to suggest that if there is an apparent need for changes—and I might say these private members' bills mentioned previously come from various parts of the country, they are not limited to members from one area—I do not think this is the way to suggest that there might be some initial action taken from that side.

Mr. Singer: By way of a further supplementary question: Do I understand, then, from the hon. Prime Minister's remarks, that for the present time he is not prepared to take any initiative in this matter on behalf of the government of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case at all.

The point really is that, in my view, it will require a great deal of investigation and study before any representations could be made to anybody, and this is the point that I made in regard to a Royal commission. We are quite prepared and happy, and would consider it perhaps our duty, to examine all phases of the law. We have a law reform commission operating in this province. We have various committees that we have established to look at various facets of the law here, and undoubtedly this subject will receive its share of scrutiny and examination as these matters develop. As a matter of fact I have discussed this with the hon. Attorney General.

The point I really made was that I was not prepared to accept a direction, at that stage of the game, that we would immediately enter into discussions with Ottawa on this matter.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, as a final supplementary question to that observation: If in fact the hon. Prime Minister felt that the debate was not sufficient last Tuesday afternoon in terms of the adequacy of expression of government opinion, and inasmuch as I am sure the

Opposition parties would unquestionably agree; would the hon. Prime Minister consider calling that resolution again this session, giving it a full debate with that portion of government opinion which was not expressed, and allowing the consensus of the House to be determined at a later time?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that this was a private member's resolution and what the hon. member is now asking me is to express in this House, some time during this session, I suppose in some detail, the position that the government itself might take. When the time comes for us to do this we will do so; but I cannot undertake that it will be done in further debate on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I would, with your indulgence, revert to the statement made by the hon. Attorney General today, and with his consent, comment on it.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member should ask his questions first, and perhaps in asking his questions there would be some opportunity to ask a supplementary one on the Minister's statement. I understand the member has a couple of questions relating to this subject.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the question which I had raised with the hon. Attorney General has now been answered by the statement which he made a few minutes ago in this House. It is in the light of that statement and question that I would like to now place a supplemental question to him.

Mr. Speaker: As long as the member does not debate the statement he is in order: that is the point. I will allow a supplementary question on the statement the Attorney General has made in view of the fact that you had asked a question on this matter. As long as the member does not debate the statement that was made, he is in order.

Mr. Renwick: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had placed on the order paper a question for the hon. Attorney General today, asking him if he would assure this House that he would not initiate any court proceedings by way of summons or otherwise in connection with the dispute at Tilco Plastics, so long as the textile workers of America continue to obey the terms of the injunction and so long as any other persons expressing support for the strikers conduct themselves in an orderly and peaceful manner. Mr. Speaker, the

statement made by the hon. Attorney General has answered that question and I would now ask him to answer the following supplemental questions in connection with it.

How did the hon. Attorney General select the precise persons whom he has seen fit to summons before the court for contempt of court proceedings?

Does the hon. Attorney General really believe that the interim injunction granted in a private dispute applies to every citizen of the province of Ontario?

Would the hon. Attorney General inform the House whether there is or is not an appeal from any decision of a high court judge in a matter relating to contempt?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, the persons named now in the notice of motion to which I referred in my statement were persons seen to be, in our opinion, disobeying the order which I have before me, not the interim but the final order, made by Mr. Justice King, which in its own language reads:

This court doth order that the defendants, their servants, representatives and agents, or any person or persons acting under their instructions, or person or persons having notice of this order, are hereby restrained until the trial of this action or other final disposition thereof (a) from watching, besetting or picketing or attempting to watch, beset or picket at or adjacent to the business premises of the plaintiff—

Then it describes the premises:

(b) from molesting, stopping, intimidating or threatening harm to or in any way interfering with the servants, agents, employees, suppliers, patrons or customers of the plaintiff or any other person or persons seeking peaceful entrance to or exit from the said premises of the plaintiff; and (c) from ordering, aiding, abetting, counselling, procuring or encouraging in any manner whatsoever, either directly or indirectly, any other person or persons to commit the aforesaid acts or any of them.

The persons named in this notice of motion were seen to be doing what in our opinion was contravention of a court order. Therefore we bring it to the court, charging contempt and leave it to the court to decide.

The second question was—I have forgotten.

Mr. Renwick: The second question was whether the hon. Attorney General in fact believes that the interim injunction issued in

this dispute, which is a private dispute, between two parties, is in fact operative against every citizen of the province of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I just read the order. Surely, the hon. member, who is a member of the legal profession, can interpret that language. It says: "Any person or persons contravening the terms of the order."

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, does the hon. Attorney General mean by that that it is now absolutely improper for anyone to parade around the Tilco Plastics plant regardless of where he comes from in the province of Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: If he keeps within the terms of the order he would not be contravening it or be in contempt of court. The language of the order is very explicit and very clear.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, the last part of my question is whether or not there is an appeal from the decision of the justice of the high court in a matter relating to contempt of court proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I do not have my law books in front of me; I have to speak from my general knowledge of the law. I think the answer is this—and I believe I am right—that there is an appeal against sentence in a matter of contempt proceedings, but I think not against the finding of contempt itself. I give that as an offhand opinion, but I believe that it is correct.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, there would then, in the opinion of the hon. Attorney General, be no way in which the substantive issue can come before—

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, order!

The member now has had several supplementary questions and I am afraid that he cannot debate the matter further.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have three questions. One is to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), notice of which has been given him: In view of the fact that some of the men over 65 who were discharged last Friday are continuing on staff, does the hon. Minister plan to review the cases of the other men so affected?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, as mentioned in a previous reply to a similar question by the hon. member on February 8, it is not the policy of the department to lay off tradesmen whose

services are needed. As the work of renovation of the Parliament buildings is nearing completion, it has been necessary to lay off a number of the tradesmen. Those over 65 years of age, along with others who did not have seniority in their position, were given notice in accordance with the usual practice when work is no longer available.

A review of requirements in the electrical trade indicated that two men in the 65-year-old range were needed for temporary work for a short period of time and their services have been retained. The other trades are not affected by this review.

Mr. Young: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? If work does appear within a reasonable time, as the spring season approaches, would these men have some priority in the matter of work?

Hon. Mr. Connell: There will be other work coming along. I cannot guarantee anyone any particular job, but there will be other work.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree). When will the regulations regarding electricians be available for The Apprenticeship and Tradesmen Qualification Act, 1964?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, an amendment to the electricians' regulations is being prepared and drafted at the moment. It will be brought into effect as soon as the work is completed.

I understand that the hon. member for Yorkview was in touch with the Deputy Minister of Labour on this matter two or three weeks ago.

Mr. Young: I have a further question for the hon. Minister. Could he inform the House if his department has laid charges against Joseph Suckonic of Fraserwood avenue in connection with the construction death, on January 10, of Nicola Michetti of McRoberts avenue, Toronto?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, charges were laid on January 25 last, against the company involved in connection with the construction death of Nicola Michetti.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond). Is he aware that many of the chartered banks have not received the OMSIP forms for distribution to the public, as is now being promoted on radio and in newspapers? Would the hon.

Minister advise as to the date and time radio and newspaper advertising commenced, and the date and time of distribution of these folders to the banks?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): In reply to the first part of the hon. member's question, I am not aware of this. The banks we have checked have the material but postal delivery is not as good as it might be in some parts of our province. It is conceivable that certain branches have not yet got it.

We received the names and addresses of 1,923 branches from the Canadian bankers' association who, in turn, received them from the individual chartered banks. Parcels of material left the Parliament Buildings last Monday afternoon, after I had placed the material on the desks of the hon. members as I had undertaken to do. It would have been expected that, in most cases, those should have been delivered on Tuesday. The advertisements in the daily newspaper appeared in the morning and evening issues of Tuesday, February 22; the radio commercial schedule commenced on the morning of Saturday, February 19.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister. Will he intervene to the same extent as he did in the *Oshawa Times* dispute to bring about the resumption of negotiations at Tilco Plastics Limited?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in reply I would say this to the hon. member: I will do anything in my power to bring this industrial dispute to a halt, and whatever degree of intervention is necessary will be exercised. I believe that there is a question being asked of the hon. Minister of Labour; in his answer he will detail what The Department of Labour has done to date and the procedures that have been followed.

I would say that, as I see it, the role of the government in this whole field of industrial relations is to assist the parties in collective bargaining. We are neither on one side nor the other; we attempt to perform a service in bringing them together. But you must understand, of course, that we do operate under a system of free collective bargaining—this was discussed in this House at really great length just about a year ago, when we were dealing with another industrial dispute—but any powers of persuasion we have will be exercised. I can assure the hon. member that I will do everything in my power to see that these parties are brought together and that they achieve, between themselves—

with our assistance, if this is necessary—a settlement that will be satisfactory to both sides.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Prime Minister permit a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I was not aware, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. member's skill as a lawyer. He likes to cross-examine and I am prepared to subject myself to this.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. Prime Minister for his comment. I am not skilled as a cross-examiner; I am actually trying to get some information. Has the hon. Prime Minister, in fact, personally intervened in this particular dispute?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, it is not always possible to say exactly what one has done in the course of these disputes, but I can say this: I have asked the hon. Minister of Labour to put himself in the position where he would ask the parties to the dispute to meet with him in order that we may establish a basis upon which negotiations may take place. As the hon. member well understands, it is not always possible to say publicly and precisely when these negotiations are taking place, or what one is doing, but I can give him the assurance that I will leave nothing undone as far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have two or three questions. The first one is to the hon. Minister of Health: In view of the information which the hon. Minister's department has received from the federal government concerning the extremely dangerous levels of pesticides in milk supplies, particularly in the Newcastle, Hamilton, London and Chatham areas, (a) would the hon. Minister inform the House with regard to this situation; (b) what action does he intend to take concerning it; and (c) what research or inspection staff has the hon. Minister to cope with this growing danger?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I have to take this question as notice. In view of the fact that three departments—The Department of Agriculture for Canada, The Department of Agriculture for Ontario, and my own department—are all involved in the matter, to correlate the information takes a little time. I will have an answer for the hon. member tomorrow.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, my second question — to which the hon. Prime

Minister alluded—is a question to the hon. Minister of Labour, asking him if he would indicate what role if any his department is playing at the moment in the labour-management dispute at the plant of Tilco Plastics Limited in Peterborough.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, The Department of Labour has been actively engaged, in an effort to bring the parties together with a view to finding some resolution to this dispute, since September of last year. The most recent action by the department was taken on February 22, when the union and the company were invited to attend a meeting in Peterborough to resume negotiations on February 23. That meeting did not take place; the company involved declined to meet the union.

I think that the hon. members of the House would want me to record with them the sequence of events which have taken place with respect to this particular labour dispute. On July 30, 1965, the union was certified—namely, the united textile workers union—as the bargaining agent for the employees at the Tilco Plastics Company Limited. On August 30 of last year the union applied for conciliation services which, as hon. members will know, is a technical step to involve a neutral chairman and the facilities of the conciliation branch of the department.

On September 7, 1965, Mr. Norman Soady was assigned to this matter by the chief conciliation officer. On September 30, after various private discussions with the parties, the first meeting was held with both parties. On October 12, a scheduled meeting was cancelled by the company.

During October the parties met by themselves without the presence of anyone from The Department of Labour.

On October 21 a second conciliation meeting was held indicating that the parties had requested the conciliation officer to return to the proceedings.

On November 19 a third conciliation meeting was held and on November 26 a fourth meeting after a misunderstanding between the parties had apparently caused a breakdown in negotiations.

On November 29 the conciliation officer filed a report, which was directed to me, recommending that no conciliation board be appointed in this matter because no useful purpose would be served.

On December 6 of 1965 the parties were advised of the “no board” situation, meaning that I, as Minister, was not going to

order the appointment of a board, and a strike followed on approximately December 15, 1965.

Now in late January and early February the department resumed its activities in the matter and there were numerous and many contacts made with both parties, either personally or by telephone communication. On February 8 the chief conciliation officer of the province, Mr. Dennis, and Mr. Soady of his staff, met representatives of the union.

From February 8 to February 17 contacts with the company were established with respect to renewing negotiations.

On February 17 Mr. Keith Brown, member of the Legislature for Peterborough, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Eberlee, and the chief conciliation officer, a Mr. Dennis, met with officials of the company but failed to persuade the company to agree to resume negotiations.

On February 22, on behalf of the mayor of Peterborough or after some communication with him and with me, the chief conciliation officer wired both parties requesting them to attend a meeting for bargaining purposes, as I mentioned earlier, to be held in Peterborough at 2 p.m. on February 23. The union agreed to attend, the company refused.

At the moment I have discussed the matter on several occasions in some depth with the hon. Prime Minister as to what the actual situation is and what is keeping these parties apart. We are aware of the fact that it is a fairly tight situation and that emotions are not normal, if I could put it that way, with respect to the situation. Feeling is running high, and we currently are endeavouring to develop ways and means and procedures, or some method of bringing the parties together so that negotiations can be carried on and resumed in an orderly fashion with a view to trying to get some resolution to this labour dispute at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would entertain a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. MacDonald: In view of the repeated failures of management in this instance to come to meetings, the latest being on February 23 when convened by the hon. Minister himself; does the hon. Minister not think—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Conciliation officer!

Mr. MacDonald: Conciliation officer—does the hon. Minister not consider that this is a refusal to bargain in good faith?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, to be quite frank about it, it certainly has all the appearances of it.

Mr. MacDonald: A further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Does the law not have certain penalties for a management which refuses to bargain in good faith, and if so when are they going to be implemented?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: As the hon. member for York South knows perfectly well, the procedures are all set out and the remedies provided for in The Labour Relations Act. The practice in these matters is for the aggrieved party to proceed and seek leave to prosecute before the labour relations board.

Mr. MacDonald: Meanwhile the strikers go to jail.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I think in the meantime it is in everybody's interest to obey the law, whether they agree with the law or not.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to ask my question, one is moved to ask the hon. Minister of Labour if perhaps he would have the hon. Attorney General take up the matter on behalf of the aggrieved union and the people of the province.

I have three questions for the hon. Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker, notice of which was given some 24 hours ago:

1. Why has it been necessary to commence installation of telephone monitoring equipment for lines into the claims division of the workmen's compensation board?
2. Will outside callers be aware that their conversation can be or is being monitored by a third party?
3. To the hon. Minister's knowledge, does any other branch of his department employ a similar monitoring system, or for that matter any other branch or government?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, I have had no knowledge of this matter or of any complaint in connection with this subject until I received the question from the hon. member. On investigation I find that no such monitoring by the workmen's compensation board exists. Nor does it exist in The Department of Labour.

Some months ago, on another matter, I

had conversations with the hon. Minister of Public Works, Mr. Speaker—not related to this particular matter but on another matter—and I was assured by him and his officials that no such monitoring existed with respect to any branch or department of the government of this province.

With respect to the compensation board, however, I am informed that the board has been reviewing its operation and, in an endeavour to (a) improve its service to the public and those concerned with claims, and (b) as part of a training programme for the staff, discussions have been held with the employees concerned—and I take it that that means those engaged in answering the questions, probably people in the claims department—and with their consent a monitoring system was agreed upon as a means of improving the service and as part of their further instruction and training in their work with respect to their employment.

My information is that the staff concerned have participated in the discussions leading to this proposal and have agreed to this approach, but the monitoring has not been instituted.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister answer the second question that I put to him? Will outside callers be aware that their conversation can be or is being monitored by a third party?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am not aware of that situation. I do not know the answer to that. I will be having some discussions with the board itself, probably early next week, and I will raise it with them at that time.

Mr. S. Lewis: I ask this supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. In view of the fact—

Mr. Speaker: I am afraid the member is beginning to make a statement.

Mr. S. Lewis: I had asked no supplementary questions at all, Mr. Speaker. I merely repeated a question that was not answered. I am going to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: Oh, I thought you were about to make a statement.

Mr. S. Lewis: No, I was preambing the question.

In view of the fact that, as the hon. Minister says, this policy has not been applied to any other branch of his department or of the government for reasons which may appear obvious, might he not perhaps analyze

the administrative procedures within the board which have prompted this action; and whether or not there are infringements of rights involved when outside callers do not in fact know the conversations are being monitored?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I would be glad to take that into account, Mr. Speaker, when I am discussing the matter with the board next week.

Mr. Oliver: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the leader of the Opposition, his question was to the hon. Minister of Health: Will the hon. Minister advise if there are 17 beds in the general hospital and six in St. Vincent de Paul hospital in Brockville not covered by Ontario hospital insurance, when there is a waiting list for beds by subscribers of this plan? And, if this is the case, why does this situation exist?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no, I am not aware of this. All of the rated beds in both of those hospitals are covered under the programme.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I was going to address to the hon. Prime Minister yesterday, but I withheld it in his absence. It is in five short parts:

1. How many leaflets on OMSIP were printed?
2. What agency handled this promotional material?
3. With what company was the printing order placed?
4. When was the order placed?
5. When was delivery of the leaflet made?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The answers in the order in which they were asked are:

1. Three million.
2. McKim Advertising Limited.
3. After competitive quotations were received by McKim Advertising Limited, they placed the order with Telford and Craddock Printers Limited.
4. The printer was advised on January 21 that his quotation had been accepted.
5. Initial delivery of the leaflets was made to the medical services insurance division on February 10. Delivery of the full quantity will not be complete until March 4.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order of rather extreme importance in this House.

A week ago, on the 14th day of the month, I raised a question in this House with regard to the fact that the hon. Minister of Health had indicated that this literature would be distributed on the 15th of the month.

I referred to an article in the *Toronto Telegram*, in which the hon. Minister was reported as saying:

Health Minister Dymond said in an interview yesterday he hoped to get promotional pamphlets and application forms out to everyone over 21 in the province by mid-February.

The hon. Minister intervened, as found on page 481 in *Hansard*, and he said:

Sir, this is a misstatement of fact. I did not say that I had literature prepared; I said that literature would be prepared and ready to go out when this bill received passage in this House.

Mr. Speaker, at that time you compelled me to withdraw because I had suggested that the hon. Minister had misinformed the House. I suggested again that the hon. Minister was misinforming the House, but I had to accept his word for it. The hon. Prime Minister has now confirmed that four days prior to that, on February 10, the first delivery of the literature had been made.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Health had misinformed the House at that time and he must have known it, and he compounded it by misinforming it a second time after I had drawn it to his attention.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, speaking to this point of order, I still say that what I stated in the House and what the hon. member just quoted now was completely correct. This is the first time I, myself, knew that this material was delivered on February 10. It was my understanding that it was delivered to The Department of Health on Monday morning of this week. Now I grant you I did not even know that this question had been asked, or I would have certainly looked into it myself, but I say to you, sir, unequivocally, the information I gave and which the hon. member read out from *Hansard* now was correct insofar as I knew it.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I draw to your attention that the hon. Minister's original statement to the *Toronto Telegram* was on January 29, when he said that it would be distributed by February 15. Furthermore, his deputy, on January 29,

as reported in the Toronto *Daily Star*, is quoted as saying:

Deputy Health Minister Dr. K. C. Chan-non said today promotional pamphlets and application forms will be mailed to every householder after mid-February. This will be combined with an extensive advertising campaign in the newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, I find it difficult, to the point of impossible, to believe that the Minister of the department and his deputy would not be aware that the literature was available when he—two weeks earlier—had said that it was going to be distributed by that date.

Mr. Speaker: The member has spoken more than once to this point of order, so I am afraid the point of order has concluded.

I have a request from the Attorney General to correct an answer regarding the member for Riverdale's question.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member asked me a question of law as to appeal from a conviction for contempt of court, I mentioned I did not have my law book before me. I gave it as my opinion that there was not an appeal from the conviction against the punishment.

I was partly right. I had forgotten that there is a division in the section dealing with this. I am reading from the Criminal Code, section 9:

Where the court, judge, justice or magistrate summarily convicts a person for contempt of court committed in the face of the court and imposes punishment in respect thereof that person may appeal against the punishment imposed.

That was what I had in mind. The section goes on, however:

Where a court or judge summarily convicts a person for a contempt of court not committed in the face of the court and punishment is imposed in respect thereof that person may appeal from the conviction or against the punishment.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Today the Toronto *Telegram* carried this quotation:

Outside the House he—
referring to myself:

—said that prisoners were being punished for their part in starting a protest fire which got them transferred to a federal penitentiary.

This is referring to the people in Millbrook reformatory. This statement does not mean

what it states. I have spoken to the reporter who will indicate that I am saying that they were punished for taking part in the fires. The statement is intended to imply that the reason they were punished was for taking part in the fires, but does not imply that I said so. As a matter of fact, in going through the draft of *Hansard*, I find that I stated quite categorically that these people were innocent of having taken any part in that disturbance.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech of the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, may I say that it is a pleasure again to be taking part in a session of the House and I would like to compliment those hon. members who have participated in and provided an interesting debate on the Speech from the Throne, commencing of course with the hon. members for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) and Armourdale (Mr. Carton), who moved and seconded the motion for reply.

By way of introduction to what I would like to speak about today, I will refer to our nation—to Canada—and the attitudes of Canadians toward our country and how, in my opinion, Canadians need to be possessed of a greater feeling of Canadianism and of pride in their own nation and its accomplishments.

We are aware at the present time of great conversations or debates which are taking place on several matters relating to our country. There is a debate on Canadian cultures and their place in and their effect upon national unity. There is another debate upon the government structure of Canada, and if we are to replace The British North America Act with new legislation—the Constitution of Canada—then how to ensure that the new system will protect and serve all parts of our country.

Then there is the vaster consideration of nationalism versus continentalism and whether our public policies will, more and more, be influenced by continentalism. I do not wish particularly to develop any of these themes, only to note that these are matters which are affecting our political life and attracting the attention of all who are concerned in the

administration of the country and its various parts.

As a nation we have had, and are having, our problems politically, but it is a fact that the union that we enjoy—and hope to be able to maintain—is in itself one of the world's outstanding accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, the chronicle of Confederation and development of our country is without parallel in the history of democratic government. Never before had a mere handful of people occupied and administered so vast an area of country in a way which has brought increasing natural wealth. In the beginning there was a population hardly as big as some of the world's great cities, and this population was spread over half a continent, but democracy was made to function by these people and, as a result, the citizens have prospered.

We in Canada have enjoyed the steady influence of parliamentary and judicial institutions patterned after the British system. Free government under the Crown has proved a success in our nation, because this system has shown itself as adaptable to this great half continent and as useful to Canada as to the island where this system was developed.

But to look at Canada from the other side of the fence, as it were, many consider us to be backward—not in the sense, I would say, of newly developing countries in other parts of the world—but backward in the sense that we are greatly overshadowed by our big neighbour to the south. Indeed, many Americans seem to consider Canadians to be "slow Americans." Mr. Speaker, Canadians are not slow. To the contrary. But we are slow to speak out about ourselves; and unfortunately, when we do speak out, we tend to downgrade ourselves. This reserve and reticence is a characteristic of our people; it is a heritage that has been handed down to us generation after generation. Here in Canada we tend to accept that others should lead and that we should follow.

In the early part of last year, I read the book "Lament for a Nation" by Professor George Grant, in which he expressed the view that our country may have already lost its national sovereignty.

Similar thoughts have found their way into Canadian publications. Indeed, on the last day of 1965, in commenting on certain developments of the year, the *Toronto Globe and Mail* suggested that it was dishonest and dangerous to refuse to admit that in the next few years Canada is almost certain to lose economic and, to a certain extent, political control over large areas of our national being.

These are ominous words. Are they valid? Have we indeed already lost our Canadian sovereignty? I do not concur with this, but if there has been a trend toward losing our country as a country, then I submit that one of the reasons has been because we have not been more vocal. As Canadians we have not—

Mr. J. H. White (London South): It is because of the Liberals in Ottawa.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, I might accept what was just said, but I was going to give another reason.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): I certainly hope so!

Mr. Boyer: I believe that if there is a tendency to lose our country, as a country, one of the important reasons has been because we have not been more vocal. As Canadians, we have not proclaimed our accomplishments and our abilities to the world and, what is even more important, to ourselves. For probably we need to be impressed with Canadianism, as much as we need to impress Canadianism upon the world.

Last spring, to learn about American views on Canadians generally the Ontario government concluded an opinion survey. Without giving details about the findings, I would like to mention that the consensus seems to be that our southern neighbours, by and large, look upon Canadians as simple, hard-working people surrounded by vast empty spaces. The Ontario Department of Economics and Development has developed a policy to cope with this particular attitude and to impress upon other countries of the world the stature of Canada as an industrial nation—to make known, to the world at large, how well we have developed in these fields.

I would like to read a few paragraphs from a letter from the hon. Minister of that department (Mr. Randall), which was sent to several members of the House in recent weeks. I quote:

When the department's economic and industrial promotional efforts became more intensive in foreign markets, we found that Canada was not recognized internationally in an industrial sense, and people did not seriously think that Canada had any significant industrial capability or potential. We were primarily considered as a source of raw materials and a good export market. We were not considered to any extent as a

source of supply for industrial and consumer products that required any degree of technical skill and manufacturing know-how.

Indeed, advanced manufacturing was considered an unusual activity for us. We subsequently confirmed this estimate of Canada's industrial image from a major in-depth public opinion survey of foreign attitudes toward Canadian products among those individuals and those areas that we should be dealing with. The results of the study confirmed the estimate.

As a result of this survey, we launched our international advertising campaign, a campaign that was designed to provide an umbrella over all of our international activities. In this campaign we present an image of Canada, through Ontario, as a progressive, technically advanced, major industrial centre able to compete in a great many areas on an international level.

To establish this image, we not only talk about our industrial achievements, but Ontario's achievements in education, transportation, the arts, construction, architecture, research, and electrical generation, just to name a few.

As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, one of our faults as Canadians is a hesitancy to talk up accomplishments. We have very much to be proud of in this country. And there is no reason why we should be afraid to let our voices be heard, hailing the progress that is going on around us, and giving due credit to fellow Canadians who have contributed to that progress.

After all, this has been an attitude in the United States which has impressed American industrial know-how upon the world at large. We are very familiar in our country with the message which is sent through all forms of media, in a very deft manner: American magazines, television, and so on preach to us a story of American superiority, but I submit we do not need to take second place in our own country.

I would like to recommend to hon. members of this House a study which I think is most fascinating. It has to do with the scientific accomplishments of Canadians in many fields; that is to say, the inventiveness by which Canadians have contributed to and hastened scientific progress the world over. They have been pioneers in countless developments.

There has been research into the scope of these achievements by the Dominion bureau of statistics, and a good source of informa-

tion on this subject is an article which was printed in a recent issue of the *Canada year book*; though even this list is far from complete.

We need, I submit, to overcome feelings of inferiority as to our country and its accomplishments. I might mention one instance in particular; one among many hundreds of Canadian achievements. There is in our country a young man, 37 years of age, whose name is Dr. Gerald Bull. He has been a pioneer in space research. A native of North Bay, he is a member of the faculty of McGill University.

It almost appears that federal support for his project, which has proved itself most successful, may be withdrawn and that by default this programme may have to be taken over by authorities in the United States. I trust that this will not be the case.

But I quote a statement that was given in the *Toronto Daily Star* in December, the words of Dr. Bull:

How often have I heard people say a thing can't be good because it is developed in Canada. No group has less faith in Canada than Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, this I hope is not going to be the attitude of our country. I trust that Dr. Bull's accomplishments will be well supported and that he will be able to continue his great work in this field, though evidently he has a feeling that the support he requires is not forthcoming.

There may be no way of reaching a conclusion upon this matter, but I think if hon. members would take the time to look into the matters that I have mentioned, the long history of scientific accomplishments in this country that have had their effect upon the progress of the world at large, I would think that there is hardly another nation in the world, on a per capita basis, which has produced so many first in fields of engineering, scientific accomplishments, medicine, in navigation techniques—whether by water, by air or space—in communications, transportation and so many other fields.

In our province we are trying to develop a feeling of patriotism and pride in Canada. It has been said about Ontario that this is the only part of Canada which has never seriously considered separating from the rest of the country. We have in the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts) one who is dedicated to the great Canadian ideal and who is doing his part in trying to maintain a great spirit of unity in our nation.

Among world pioneering developments I might have mentioned several in connection

with administration of affairs in our own province. In the field in which I have the honour to serve, in Ontario Hydro, it is true there have been many great pioneering engineering accomplishments.

I would like to refer also to the Ontario water resources commission, which within the past decade commenced a great programme in this province in maintaining the quality of water, in cleaning up difficult situations where water quality was impaired in many of our watersheds and in our greater lakes. I would like to say of that commission that its work in this field is actually far ahead of jurisdictions which are neighbours of our province, and that other parts of Canada are looking to Ontario. The progress that has been made by this commission is a model for what they hope to do themselves.

We do not talk about these things enough; we do not claim, as we properly could, that we have undertaken great pioneering efforts in connection with matters of this sort.

Mr. Speaker, I continue by referring to a few matters in the Speech from the Throne which indicated that many important matters would be brought before the House. A number have already come before us in the form of legislation and there is one matter to which I would particularly like to refer, and that has to do with an enactment which will be brought before us before long.

I welcome the statement that legislation is to be introduced to extend financial aid to small businesses in those areas of the province where mortgage or other capital funds are not readily available on reasonable terms or conditions. While, as I say, the details of this legislation have yet to be disclosed, I sincerely trust that small businesses, as mentioned, will include a number of tourist establishments which can qualify.

We have already had an interesting debate in this House on this aspect of the tourist business of the province and I do not wish to go over that ground again, except to say that it was made plain in that debate that the Ontario development agency has been performing a most useful service in giving advice to a number of operators as to their financial arrangements. In co-operation with The Department of Tourism and Information this agency has done much to mark out good pathways of sound administration for small businesses.

As it is with industrial firms, so with tourist establishments; quite often it is not so much money that is required as it is better business technique.

The question of capital assistance or guarantee of loans has been discussed in this House in previous years. One big forward step was taken in the time of the Diefenbaker administration at Ottawa when tourist establishments were included in the small business loans enactments. It may be now that the federal authorities will consider special aid to the tourist industry under the designated area arrangements, since this was one matter which was mentioned by the Rt. hon. Mr. Pearson in last year's federal election campaign. Nothing further has been said on this matter from Ottawa to this date, so far as I am aware, but I would submit that it would be logical for the federal area development agency to undertake such a project in designated areas in the same way as grants are made to industrial firms.

Sir, I would like to point out that the provincial government's contribution to the development of tourism in Ontario is one of very large dimensions indeed. For 20 years we have had a separate department of government here in Ontario dealing with this subject, publicizing the travel attractions of our province and promoting ever higher standards of accommodation.

Consider the tremendous advantage this province's tourist areas have in the excellent and ever-improving system of highways. On a number of inland watersheds, it is the province which has provided the navigation aids and which provides efficient locks when required, which is very important with the great growth in small boating in our inland waters. This is a responsibility for the province in connection with inland waterways which goes back to Confederation, at which time a division was made between the federal government and the province with respect to responsibility for public works to improve navigation as between those waterways which are connected with the Great Lakes and those which are wholly inland.

The Department of Lands and Forests, the parks integration board, various parks boards, have programmes of vast importance in the matter of encouraging travel in Ontario. And indeed there is hardly a department of government which is not concerned in some way with the tourist business. In every part of the administration policies are formed with the requirements of the tourist industry in mind. This has been made particularly plain in the recent report of the Ontario economic council.

It has been in the field of capital investment that there have been difficulties in connection with the tourist development in

parts of the province. We know that this is a matter which in the first place is within the jurisdiction of the national government, but it is evident from the quotation I have made from the Speech from the Throne in this House, that our government here has considered the need and will do what may be possible within the limits of provincial responsibility to overcome this difficulty.

In mentioning the services of the provincial administration to the tourist industry, I would like to speak of one aspect of the situation of particular importance. In order to preserve the recreational advantages of the main bodies of water in the province, the Ontario water resources commission in a number of areas makes periodic checks as to water quality. In the district of Muskoka this work is carried out in conjunction with the Muskoka health unit. The waters of Muskoka have always enjoyed a reputation for their high quality, and indeed over the past ten years the greater requirements for sanitary and sewer installations have resulted in the overcoming of possible sources of pollution so that the water in Muskoka today is even better than a few years ago. The 1965 report of the OWRC as to the Muskoka watershed showed that the bacteriological quality of the water in the lakes was excellent and entirely suited for the recreational activities of that area.

Now, sir, no surface water anywhere can be considered safe for drinking without some minimum disinfecting procedure, and remarks about the Muskoka lakes as to water to be used for drinking purposes applies just the same to any lake in the province, even a lake back in the bush far from human habitation. But while water quality in the Muskoka lakes may be high, there is no ground for complacency, with the continued growth of shoreline summer home construction.

The Muskoka lakes association, which is one of the oldest such associations in the province, conducted a most worthwhile water workshop at Port Carling last May when representatives of provincial departments were among those on the programme for a day-long conference attended by many summer property owners, municipal representatives, officials from Muskoka district bodies and other interested citizens. The responsibility of each person was stressed in developing what President Frank Fisher of that association called "a sanitary conscience." Mr. Fisher made it plain that it was the duty of each property owner to make sure that no pollution was permitted to enter the water from the owner's premises and he pointed out that existing summer dwellings were so

numerous that no public body could possibly check each premises. With new construction, of course, the health unit has the responsibility of passing upon the sanitary arrangements provided and Mr. Fisher asked the complete co-operation of each person in this respect.

When the report of the OWRC based on the 1965 testing programme in Muskoka was issued lately, out of the vast area of the watershed three individual locations were mentioned where the bacteriological quality of the water was said to be unsatisfactory. I want to make plain to hon. members that in each case the local municipal council had been advised of this problem last fall, and I would like to pay tribute to the municipal people in the Huntsville area, at Port Carling, and in Medora and Wood, for having acted at once to investigate and to endeavour to overcome the problem.

In this connection may I observe that it is a worldwide phenomenon with the daily news services that it is the exceptional, the unusual, which makes news. Perhaps there is nothing newsworthy in the fact there is no great problem of pollution in the Muskoka lakes and that it is entirely doubtful if there is any trend towards wholesale pollution. There is no news, it would seem, in the fact that experts in the field say the bacteriological quality of water in the main lakes of the Muskoka watershed is excellent. I am among those who are concerned that when, out of the very many locations tested, only three small areas were found deficient, these particular places were given practically the entire attention of newspapers—which used sensational headlines—and the radio news reports.

I do not believe for a moment in trying to hide such matters, or trying to hush them up, but neither do I believe that Muskoka as a whole, with its many resorts and shoreline properties, deserved to have a statement taken out of the much larger context and given such sensational treatment. I realize that I cannot fight against the ways of the world and the press; however, I can emphasize here that the quality of water in the Muskoka lakes is excellent.

I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that in the last day or so I have received a letter from a lady in the Toronto area who is a property owner on one of these lakes. She says that she had been approached by representatives of a realty company who were trying to obtain her property, buy it from her for resale, at a good profit, of course; but the argument that they gave to her was that the newspaper reports had lately shown

that there was pollution in the lakes and that perhaps it might be a good time for her to sell. I advised the lady that no doubt the company concerned would not be interested in the properties if they did not see a good opportunity for themselves to resell this property to their own advantage.

There is, as I have said, sir, no reason to be complacent about the existing situation with respect to excellence of water, and I would report that there is a determination on the part of our authorities that if Muskoka has good water for swimming and other water sports it must be kept that way.

Some time ago arrangements were made for a meeting one day soon of officials of the Muskoka health unit with the Ontario water resources commission to consider ways and means of strengthening procedures in our anti-pollution programme; but I will just assert that this meeting is in no way a sequel to the publication of misleading articles recently.

It is known that the law provides penalties for those who do not co-operate in anti-pollution measures, but so far, Mr. Speaker, education and persuasion have produced favourable results.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, am I permitted a question? In the United States, in a pollution programme down there, there is a deadline in 1968 to clear up pollution in Lake Michigan. What deadline is the government setting to clean up pollution in our Great Lakes? All we do is talk about it. Is there any firm deadline in meeting with industry?

Mr. Boyer: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member was not in his seat at an earlier time when I was mentioning that, in this province, we should take great pride in the fact that the Ontario water resources commission takes leadership among all the jurisdictions in this section of the continent in the matter of an anti-pollution programme; and that a great deal has been done in and by this province, in cleaning up pollution.

I was talking, though, about one particular watershed, showing that it was already in excellent condition and that we were making every endeavour to keep it that way. Of course, this watershed feeds into one of the Great Lakes, Lake Huron, and I think it will be an advantage to that lake if we overcome any problems that there may be before the water reaches there, but—

Mr. Sargent: Are these people fined?

Mr. Boyer: I have already dealt with that, Mr. Speaker. I hope that I do not have to repeat myself.

I certainly think that, as Ontario people and as Canadians, we welcome everything that is being done across the line in the anti-pollution programme in which the federal government of the United States is now taking such a part and intends, evidently, to devote much money.

Mr. Sargent: But you have no firm programme or deadline.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Boyer: Mr. Speaker, I think that this is away off the subject that I have been discussing. The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) will shortly be presenting his estimates to the House and I am certain that he will show what has been done—

Mr. Sargent: I do not think he will.

Mr. Boyer: That is just your opinion. I think that the hon. Minister will present such a programme, and I hope that the hon. member will be here and will listen to it attentively.

I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, in connection with something that the hon. member for Grey North said, that it is known that the law provides penalties for those who do not co-operate in anti-pollution measures; but so far education and persuasion have produced favourable results. In some cases, it may be necessary to go to court, but I trust that this extreme measure will not be necessary. If it were, however, I am one who would support the authorities if they had to lay charges.

I do not think that the number of cases brought into court is any index of the great progress that has been made by the province in this field.

It is some time, sir, since I have spoken in the House on matters concerned with my own riding in any detailed way. Today I have endeavoured to refer to Muskoka only as part of the provincial picture and on matters which I felt have a wider interest than just this one constituency. I would like to conclude with a reference to our municipalities in Muskoka. With the growth of shoreline developments—what might be called summer properties, although many of them are used throughout the year—there has been a corresponding growth in the responsibilities of the municipalities, particularly

the townships, to provide greater services and to furnish additional services to look after such growth. But, also, if the assessed values of properties are to be protected, a greater measure of planning and land use standards can be recognized as a requirement. This is one of a number of subjects where, if it were possible to have some system of district standards, there would be much advantage to all property owners.

Muskoka is not a county; it is a provisional district. There is no form of common, local, territorial administration. Each of the 25 municipalities has a high degree of sovereign autonomy. I can outline this difficulty by mentioning the details of the rather cumbersome method required to establish a district child welfare budget board under the new Child Welfare Act. Since there are to be five members on the board, the executive of the association of councils, which we call the district council, suggested by letter to each council that they get together with four neighbouring municipal councils and propose one name. Eventually all five names were received.

It was then necessary for the secretary of the district council to submit all five names to each of the 25 councils, which then were expected to pass a by-law to appoint the five persons. What we would do if we did not have a district council, I do not know; but I think there should be a simpler method of dealing with this and other business. I am not complaining about The Child Welfare Act or its provisions; I am only using this as an illustration of the cumbersome method of trying to do business on a district level in Muskoka.

I must report, however, that with the present understanding that municipal government in general is being closely examined in this province, changes in administrative methods are being considered. Many municipal people in Muskoka are seriously thinking about possible means of possessing some form of common territorial administration. I have to say that they do not seem to be convinced—nor am I—that county status is the solution, for even county government may not provide all the answers required. Several meetings have been held lately under the auspices of the district council, at which this subject has been discussed. There will be further meetings with representatives of all municipalities and others interested.

The Department of Municipal Affairs is well aware of these developments and has given much assistance, including the staging of a municipal workshop last autumn at

Muskoka Sands, which was a very great success.

Whatever happens for the benefit of Muskoka in its future form of municipal administration, or whether a decision is made to keep our present status, I emphasize that this movement is taking place in the district itself. And this, sir, is the best way. I deplore the ideas of a number of Opposition speakers who seem to think, for example, that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) should force district or county welfare units upon local jurisdictions in a mandatory way, or that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) should force county or district assessors upon municipalities without their co-operation and agreement. This Legislature may have the power to do so; but this strikes me as being the opposite of democratic.

I would like to thank the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and many members of his staff for their interest and concern with the subject I have mentioned with respect to Muskoka.

I have further notes and I wish to take up another matter, but I feel that I have already transgressed on the patience of the House, so I will leave this subject for a later time. Thank you for your attention.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I remember the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) referring to this House as the most select club in Ontario; but the really select group are those of us who attend debates of this nature, particularly when the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) and myself are on the speaking list. I think this group is much more select indeed, but I am delighted that you, sir, are in the chair today so that I have the opportunity to extend to you, officially, my congratulations on your election as Chairman of the committee of the whole, and of course as Deputy Speaker.

I am sure you will recall with me the campaigning days back in 1962 when both of us were candidates in the winter by-elections in that year and of our experiences then and since then. I am delighted that you have been selected to occupy the chair and I must say to you, sir, that I have complete confidence in your impartiality and firmness in dealing with the deliberations of this House.

As a matter of fact, I would like to extend the same compliments to Mr. Speaker himself, the member for Ottawa West, whom you are relieving now. I regret in some measure that I have been one of a large group in this House who have been

called upon to question his rulings on two or three occasions since the House began a few weeks ago. I believe that this is caused entirely by the disorder that has crept into the rules and procedures and customs of the House over the past years.

We on this side have done our best to convince the government that a committee of the House should be struck to look into this matter and to report as soon as possible. It appears that this is not going to occur and I was wondering if it might not be possible if Mr. Speaker, and his assistant, Mr. Deputy Speaker, and the Clerk of the House might, in an *ad hoc* fashion, go over the rules and customs that have developed over the past years and bring some order out of them; even though it might not be presented to the House for any far-reaching change, certainly not a root-and-branch investigation, but just so that so many of the rules and customs that have been amended, either through practice or by motion of the House, would be brought up to date.

I understand that Lewis' book of rules was published in 1939, and whether or not it has been extensively amended since then I am not aware, but I know that the present Clerk, who is a precise expert on the customs and rules here, might very well be given this assignment by the House. I am sure that the present Clerk would have a continuing and great interest in keeping the book that we use as our basis of order in this House up to date; and I was thinking particularly that some action might be taken before your present term of office is concluded some time in the future. This is a suggestion. I think it is a workable one and I would hope that you, and those with whom you work, would consider it.

It seems many weeks ago that the motion on the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was moved by the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) and seconded by the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) and I want to congratulate them on their attempt to defend what I would call the indefensible and to find words to make this government look good. I remember very well the hon. member for Lambton West talking about the waving palm trees of that earthly paradise down there at Sarnia, but perhaps even more direct is my memory of the hon. member for Armourdale referring to the ship of state of Ontario.

In our opinion, and in the opinion of a good many people across Ontario, his description falls a bit short of what we would term the tortuous and ineffective course that

has been laid out for the Ontario ship of state under the guidance of our myopic friend, the navigator from London North, the hon. Prime Minister. It is in this connection, sir, that I want to speak this afternoon, because I am speaking in favour of the amendment that has been put to the House by my hon. friend, the leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Thompson), which points out the shortcomings in the courses of action which have been taken by this government and which have been pointed out in the Speech from the Throne that we are presently considering.

I would like to say, sir, although we have dealt with at least one important piece of legislation this session, the amendment to The Medical Services Insurance Act, it appears that although there are a number of orders already on the paper none of them is of overwhelming importance. There are a good many matters that will be brought to our attention later no doubt, but I hope that the hon. Prime Minister is able to prod his Ministers so that the legislation is put before us before the last few days or the last few weeks of the session, so that we will have an opportunity to consider it ourselves, and take it back to our constituencies where a good many of the citizens would have opinions to express; and that there will not be the unseemly rush that has occurred in other sessions, particularly the last one.

For my part, I feel that a reversion to the former practice of having a fall session would very much expedite and improve the work of this House. I realize the hon. Prime Minister did not have a good experience with the fall session in 1961 and it may very well be that he looks back on that situation.

Hon. J. P. Robarts: I enjoyed it very much.

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I remember very well reading about the calling of the Royal commission at that time and I realize that it was my hon. friend's indoctrination into the leadership of the House, but I feel very strongly that he has shied away from fall sessions from that time because of his feeling that debates are repetitious and actually there is altogether too much talk in this House about matters that he would not consider important.

Now this is something I feel could be improved considerably if the session were called in the autumn. We would have an opportunity to consider the reply to the Speech from the Throne and to complete that debate before the end of the year. We

would also be able to deal with the private bills that are put before us each session and a considerable amount of private members' business; as well as, of course, any government business that was ready that early in the season.

Then, returning for the second part of the session after the new year, we would be able to address ourselves to the Budget immediately and also to the main burden of the government business.

This suggestion has been made before, I realize, but it is a useful suggestion and I hope that the hon. Prime Minister has not dismissed the idea of a fall session entirely from his mind. The day has long since gone when the requirements of those of us who are members of this House who are also farmers are going to affect the ordering of the business. I am sure that a good many people, presently members in the House, can recall the day when the warm breezes began to blow and the snow melted away and the tulips out in front here began to sprout, that it was necessary for the farmers to get back to the business of the land. I suppose this day has gone forever. I for one regret it; nevertheless I am very much in the minority in this regard and am prepared to sit here all summer, as the hon. Prime Minister so often says, if this is necessary to deal effectively with the business of the province.

Nevertheless, it would be possible to order the business of the House not just so the farmers would find it more convenient, but so that there would be a division over Christmas and the New Year that would divide the two major sections of our business very effectively indeed. Even the hon. members of that most exclusive group, the Albany club, would have an opportunity to go and get their tan before they return to deal with the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three matters that I would like to deal with in the unrestricted atmosphere of the Throne Debate and the first has to do with the responsibilities of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). I know that he has particularly heavy responsibilities these days pertaining to matters that were discussed before the orders of the day, and even though he has this heavy weight of responsibility on his shoulders he is looking forward to a very pleasant evening indeed, because I understand that he is going to attend a meeting of the Progressive-Conservative association in Brantford. This will surely buoy him up indeed, and I wish him a pleasant trip. Even

though he is attending the city of Brantford under what I suppose are questionable auspices, I would warn him—he is not present in the House right now—but I would warn him that he might come in for some criticism based on a statement that he made publicly some weeks ago, and which may not appear to be too controversial. But I would like to read it to the House and I quote from the *Toronto Globe and Mail* of January 1, 1966, in which the hon. Attorney General said, in releasing the list of QC appointments that

Character, general capability, leadership in the law profession and contribution to public service were taken into consideration in naming QCs.

That is, those who are designated Queen's counsel.

I understand that the hon. Attorney General makes these designations under section 6 of The Barristers Act, and in making these decisions he is guided by the qualifications that I have read from the newspaper clipping. But the people in Brantford and Brant county, to whom he is going to speak this evening, are a bit put out about this.

In the last two years and, in fact, for a good long period of time indeed, there have been no designations of a single Queen's counsel in that area—even though there have been qualified applications of those who, in the opinion of any reasonable judge at all, do have a good character and do exhibit general capability and have shown their leadership in the law profession and have made significant contributions to the public service. And I want to say something about the designation of these QCs in the two or three minutes that remain to me before this debate should be adjourned.

I was interested in my research on this subject to read of an incident involving Sir John A. Macdonald, a former Prime Minister of Canada, and a former Premier of Ontario, Sir Oliver Mowat. These two gentlemen were associated in the practice of law; Sir John as the senior partner and Sir Oliver as his junior to begin with, and advancing as a partner. Before their ways divided politically Mr. Mowat, as he was then, was chiding Sir John about the awarding of QCs to his political friends. Sir John, in reply, apparently said that he would be glad to designate Oliver Mowat as a QC and, so that it would be different from some of the more common designations, he would give him an entire edition of the *Ontario Gazette* for the announcement in order that this would be set apart for his friend, Oliver Mowat. And I understand that this was done, although I

have not been able to locate a copy of that Ontario *Gazette*, or at least the *Gazette* of the day—I suppose it was of the united provinces of Canada—that would bear out this tale.

But it is true that, in the years following, Sir Oliver and Sir John had serious differences of political opinion. Sir John went on to become leader of this nation, and when Sir Oliver Mowat became Premier of Ontario he was moved to begin the practice of awarding QCs on a provincial basis. I understand that it was under his regime that section 6 of The Barristers Act was introduced. It is also true that he made an attempt, and a successful attempt, to make the provincial QC take precedence over any other QC awards—that is, the federal award—and I believe this continues to this day. So even in those days there was some evidence that political partisanship, in fact patronage, had some part to play in the award of this honour.

But as far as we are concerned in 1966, our main complaints are these: That the designation Queen's counsel has become common. There are, in fact, too many of them. In 1966, 110 lawyers were so honoured; in 1965, 107; in 1964, only 79, because under the direction of the immediately previous Attorney General, a much stricter policy was in force towards these appointments.

I must certainly excuse my hon. colleagues in this House, who themselves have received this award, when I say that it has become too common; because in their cases certainly it is well deserved and recognized by all the members as such. But in other cases the award is, in fact, a misleading one. For the man in the street who is looking for some legal counsel, these magic letters following the name should mean much more to him than in actual fact they do. They do not place any special responsibilities on a lawyer, nor do they assure his client that he is of special competence and, in this way, I feel they are misleading.

Mr. Speaker, I have some further remarks to make on this and other topics and if you will permit me at this time, since it is five o'clock, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 17, by Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): *Resolved*,

That this House urges upon the govern-

ment of Canada the repeal and subsequent redrafting of the relevant sections 237(1)(2)(3) and 209(1)(2) of the Criminal Code in the direction of liberalizing the grounds for the granting of therapeutic abortion to take into account such factors as, in addition to preserving the life of the mother, rape, incest, emotional well-being, and related considerations.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I move resolution No. 17 standing in my name, which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, according to statements made by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) in this House this afternoon, he is apparently not willing to pursue vigorously at this time questions of divorce reform or reform of the abortion laws. And in regard to abortion, Mr. Speaker, the insensitivity of that statement is breathtaking.

Suppose for a moment that every year 25,000 men were being forced by government edict, or, in the absence of government definition, to undergo a painful and dangerous operation in the city of Metropolitan Toronto. Would the hon. Prime Minister, I ask you, sir, be so bland and brusque in his countenance of delay? I say that, Mr. Speaker, because we should be very clear what we are talking about when we discuss the abortion laws.

The question, as some think, is not whether abortions should be done; abortions are being done, they are being performed—criminal abortions in staggering numbers.

It is our responsibility, I suggest, to face the fact and to decide whether the abortions shall be done in fear, in secrecy and in danger, or whether they shall be done safely and equitably in a humane society.

In case the hon. members of this House are unmoved by the abstract word "abortion," or its medical definition — the premature expulsion of a fertilized ovum or foetus prior to what is considered the age of viability, namely 28 weeks—assuming that the hon. members are not moved by those definitions, I would like them to recall for a moment the recent case of Mrs. Barbara Diane Butcher. Mrs. Butcher was so desperate to avoid having a child, Mr. Speaker, that she tried to abort herself with a ball-point pen, and in this enlightened province of ours died a peculiarly painful and horrifying death due to an air embolism. Mr. Speaker, these tragedies do not merely grace the headlines of the newspapers; they are documented regularly in reputable medical journals. Let me indicate to the House what is involved.

In a recent issue of the *Ontario Medical Review*, there is an entire page of cases entitled "Maternal mortality report No. 19—abortion." Let me read two of the cases into the record of this House:

A 33-year-old patient of unknown parity and gravidity had a criminal abortion performed and was brought to hospital dead on arrival. Autopsy revealed the seven-month pregnancy with an intact normal male foetus. The membranes were intact but the placenta was separated from the uterine wall by a large blood clot. There was extensive and widespread air embolism all through the body, including the heart, pulmonary vessels, kidneys and even an incising into the abdominal cavity.

Another case, Mr. Speaker:

A 30-year-old widow was found slumped over the toilet seat, about eight hours after her death, by two of her children. Apparently a douche syringe had been used by the patient to inject toxic material into her uterus in an attempt to procure an abortion. Autopsy revealed an intact five-and-a-half-month pregnancy and evidence that the injection had been directly into a retroplacental blood vessel. There was acute congestion of lungs, liver, spleen and kidney, also suggestive of overwhelming toxemia.

Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. members are perfectly capable of imagining the tragedy of those deaths.

I wonder how our genial and imperturbable hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) feels about it. In his own laboratory, he can examine at leisure, Mr. Speaker, the kinds of instruments to which an estimated one out of every four pregnant women in the province—40,000 a year—resort each year.

The other day I visited that laboratory, Mr. Speaker—and I suggest that hon. members of this House might be similarly inclined to do so—in the Ontario provincial police building at the foot of Jarvis street. And there, stuck neatly into a cupboard-like arrangement, is a showcase of instruments of injury and death, visual aids for criminal abortion. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is an open indictment of our system. Dr. Sharpe, who is the medical director of the laboratory, went through the array of instruments—the pathetic grouping of manual and mechanical devices, the irritants and drugs, all the methods, all the apparatus that causes so much unbearable tragedy for so many thousands of women. And one needs simply to contemplate the consequence in human terms to recognize that this Legislature, as part of

a confederal system in this country, has a compelling responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, how is it that we are collectively so sanguine about a public health problem in our midst of this dimension? We are so calm and rational about it. Can it be because we are, in fact, men? Because we will never know, personally, the tragedy of abortion?

And does this explain, sir, why our laws are so callous and senseless? Our laws, Mr. Speaker, made by men, presume to rule over the personal physical destinies of all the women in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that this government is supposedly dedicated to individual liberty. It has become a fetish—so much a fetish that we will not countenance compulsion for having people buy medical care; we will not force municipalities to provide houses for the homeless or to educate the disturbed children—and all this always in the name of individual liberty.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, this Legislature has no such delicacy in presuming to interfere with the most intimate aspects of the lives of women, to pronounce to them in tones of moral righteousness what they shall do with their own bodies. This Legislature is guilty, I suggest, of an intolerable infringement of personal liberty on an impressive scale.

The most authoritative studies in the United States, Mr. Speaker—and in this country—show that the incidence of abortion varies from one in every three pregnancies to one in every seven, which would mean something in the vicinity of 20,000 to 50,000 criminal abortions in this province alone. Others suggest that 22 per cent of all pregnancies end in abortion, of which ten per cent is criminal. The Metro Toronto morality squad estimates that there are 35,000 abortions in Metro Toronto every year. The most learned consultation available, a meeting of 43 medical specialists in the United States in the late 1950s, said that one out of four was a perfectly legitimate figure.

The death toll is high; and the crucial fact, Mr. Speaker, is that criminal abortion is considered to be the major cause of maternal death. I re-emphasize that: the major cause of maternal death. This contention is made by the Ontario medical association in its journal, as well as many other medical associations.

Now that is a fact to ponder, Mr. Speaker, when one considers that the maternal death rate is commonly considered to be a good indicator of the level of civilization in any society.

A study by two Toronto doctors, Dr. Noonan, head of obstetrics at St. Michael's hospital, and Dr. Cannell, of Toronto general hospital, shows that between 1958 and 1963 there were 333 obstetrical deaths in Ontario; 69 of these, or 20.7 per cent, resulted from criminal abortion. The OMA, to put it on record, says this:

Criminal abortions are still the most common cause of preventable maternal death in all major centres. This deplorable fact probably will not change until our laws, our philosophy, or at least our methods of communication with the public change.

The deaths, of course, Mr. Speaker, are not the only result. Medical complications, suffering, and possible sterility are other side-effects of this disease. In a London, England, teaching hospital, where much study has been done, it is found that one out of six admissions to gynaecological wards are as a result of criminal abortion. In conversation with a leading member of the department of obstetrics and gynaecology at Toronto general hospital yesterday, I learned that it runs as high as one out of four admissions to our gynaecological wards in this city.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a very great part of this is due to the incredible legal ambiguity which is involved in the Canadian law. There are lawyers in this House—I believe one of them intends to speak—but I feel I should indicate that medical-legal opinion is very much divided. There are some who contend that abortion is illegal, therapeutic or otherwise, under any circumstance in this country. In a very excellent article, "The doctor, abortion and the law," Dr. J. J. Lederman, who is also a lawyer, says this in the *Canadian Medical Association Journal*, August, 1962; and I quote:

It is the object of this paper to demonstrate that the law of Canada does not permit abortion on any grounds whatever, and that legal sanction for abortion on therapeutic grounds does not exist. Nowhere does the law make provision for the ground on which an abortion may be lawfully procured, therefore even where the life of the mother is threatened by the continuation of her pregnancy and even when consultations are obtained confirming the threat to the mother's life and even when all consents to the operation are obtained and valid and even when the operation is performed by a qualified and registered doctor in a recognized hospital, even when all these conditions have been met an abortion performed would appear to

this writer to be in the present state of the law as much a crime as any criminal abortion.

Now very simply, Mr. Speaker, there are two sections of the Criminal Code which supposedly relate to this matter. The first is section 237, which defines the crime of using any means with intent to procure an abortion. It speaks of no exception. It provides for no exemption from criminality, and the lawyers say that surely it is reasonable that the section of the Criminal Code which explicitly sets out the word abortion would provide for the exception for therapeutic abortion.

Another section of the Criminal Code, Mr. Speaker, does deal with an exception, section 209; and it makes an exception in favour of any person who causes the death of a child that has not become a human being where such a person acts in good faith to preserve the life of a mother. But, Mr. Speaker, the word abortion is not used; the word miscarriage is not used. Such an operation is never referred to, and the contention of many legal authorities is that other operations—such as a craniotomy—are referred to; that, in fact, to apply therapeutic abortion under that section means criminal abortion.

It does not seem reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that doctors should be subject to this intolerable ambiguity of the law because that results, I suggest to this House, in inability on their part to make the pronouncements and the judgments which they would otherwise make. It is a state of legal farce because, Mr. Speaker, as everyone in this House knows, medical interpretation already exceeds all the legal definitions.

Mr. Speaker, what my resolution does is ask that the laws be clarified to permit the indications for abortion which accepted medical practice have already make legitimate. What do we mean by "legitimate"? Well simply, Mr. Speaker, that there are a great many therapeutic abortions already being performed.

The statistics are minimal and fragmentary, but even those available in Canada and in Ontario reveal a fascinating set of trends. I have two studies which I want to reveal to the House; I do not think either of them have been made public before. One of them, of lesser import, by a Toronto doctor, shows vividly how difficult it is to penetrate the barrier of secrecy that our laws create. This gentleman—I met him incidentally, Mr. Speaker, in the presence of one of the hon. members of this House—was investigating

so-called legal therapeutic abortions in hospitals right across the country, and attempted to find information from hospital services commissions in various provinces.

His information, to say the least, was fragmentary. It amounted to this: That in British Columbia between 1958 and 1963 there were 259 therapeutic abortions; in Alberta during 1960 there were 50; and in Saskatchewan, there were 53 between 1960 and 1964. The Ontario hospital services commission at first declined to answer because it had to apply a computer to find out; when it did answer it gave him the one figure of 28 therapeutic abortions during the six months of 1962. That those figures are absurdly incomplete, certainly for the province of Ontario, is borne out by a fascinating study conducted by Dr. J. Norris, of Wellesley hospital in Toronto, along with Dr. T. G. Reilly and Dr. B. W. Mustard. I would be pleased to table it in the House at some point for members who are interested.

This piece of research covers six Toronto hospitals: Toronto General, Women's College, East General, Grace, Wellesley, and Western. For the years 1957 to 1961, the total number of therapeutic abortions was 168. That is an incidence of one abortion for every 566 live births. But most interesting of all, Mr. Speaker, is what it reveals about the women who get a hospital abortion. One hundred of them were over the age of 30, and 52 over the age of 36 years; and it is commonly acknowledged in all countries where studies have been made of therapeutic abortion, indeed of criminal abortion, that most of the women involved are married and most of them are in their mid or late 30s.

Dr. Robert Hall of the Sloan hospital for women in New York made a survey of 65 major hospitals in the United States and showed that 75 per cent of the women receiving abortions were married. Sir Dougald Baird, who is chief of obstetrics in Aberdeen, Scotland—a courageous pioneer in this field—points out that of 203 abortions in his hospital, 179 of the women were married. So it is the older women who have abortions.

Yesterday the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) said to me with great good humour that perhaps the resolution related to sex and the single girl. He was, I think, inadvertently voicing what is a common misconception. In fact, the view is really nothing but a guilty projection of our own conception of what thousands of women are involved in. And I suggest to you that that kind of projection is at the root of this problem—one of

the reasons why we have not yet reformed the laws, and is nothing short of shameful.

To continue the analysis of the report of abortions in Toronto hospitals, it contains the most damning piece of evidence about the way in which the law discriminates in favour of the middle class, and against the poor and unsophisticated who most urgently need help. Just as in the case of divorce laws, Mr. Speaker, and just as in the case of the dissemination of birth control information—I am sure the resolution of the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells) will point it out—we have class legislation, and again the study confirms it.

It shows that 133 abortions were performed on private patients but only 35 on patients in public wards; and even that figure was inflated, Mr. Speaker, because a large number of clinic, or public, patients were really private patients referred to them by psychiatrists. So the number of genuine public patients was really very small.

Yet another growing trend shown in the survey is that most therapeutic abortions are granted for psychiatric reasons not covered by the Criminal Code of Canada. It is worthwhile pointing out that, on the private patient's side at least, most of the abortions—over 50 per cent of the therapeutic abortions—are now provided for psychiatric reasons.

Mr. Speaker, as more and more abortions are performed on psychiatric grounds, it becomes more and more difficult for an impoverished woman—the woman with a large family and limited financial resources, the woman who has no recourse from financial despair, precisely the woman who most desperately needs an abortion—to get one. The inequity of the law has been increased with the passage of time, not decreased.

The Toronto study, Mr. Speaker, also highlights the invidious position our doctors are being forced into by the law. Psychiatric abortions are the most important but are not sanctioned. Not only does this force the doctor into an anomalous position but it makes him, out of his own insecurity, enforce a particularly rigid selection system in their hospitals. A woman must have strong letters of recommendation from at least two doctors, and the application must be passed by an all-medical board of the hospital. It is a cruelly capricious system, Mr. Speaker.

We demonstrated on a political party broadcast last night that it is purely a matter of chance whether a woman will be granted a therapeutic abortion in Toronto or in Montreal, or in one of the states of the United

States—dependent upon which of the doctors she approaches and the strength of a letter of recommendation.

Will the hon. members for a moment imagine the panic of a woman whose own life, whether physical or emotional, is threatened, whose precarious family and financial life is hanging in the balance, who must face an unpleasant operation on her own body, and then on top of all this must seek out the furtive and sleazy unskilled abortionist with his or her little armoury of lethal weapons.

I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it simply need not be; that there are many jurisdictions around the world which have liberalized abortion law. And it is possible, Mr. Speaker, to do so without any increase in the incidence, to introduce a dramatic measure of reform.

The reality, surely, Mr. Speaker, is straightforward. Although the effort to obtain an induced abortion may indicate that the woman is physically ill, more often it reflects one or more of a complexity of factors—such as poor social or economic environment, disturbed marital relations, psychiatric or neurotic disturbances in the family, or quite simply a need to keep her family at its present size. And all of these, I hasten to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, can be valid and compelling factors beyond the restrictive nature of our present Canadian law.

The countries of Finland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia grant abortions, therapeutic abortions; where pregnancy is likely to endanger life or health, physical or mental, of the mother; where intercourse is of a criminal nature—incest or rape; where there is evidence of hereditary disease, a grave risk of a physically defective child; and they often include social factors producing a psychiatric reaction.

And they have a variety of boards which hear these cases, Mr. Speaker, not confined purely to medical opinion in the physical term but medical opinion in psychiatric terms. Opinion from social workers, from psychologists, from responsible lay people, and from a very strong application on the part of the woman herself.

Certainly the most dramatic evidence of an excellently functioning board is in the case of Sir Dougald Baird's experiment in Aberdeen, Scotland. I want to read to this House his brief account from the *British Medical Journal* of the way in which his community views abortion cases:

In arriving at our conclusions whether

or not to grant therapeutic abortion, many factors may be taken into account, such as the personality of the mother, the relations between husband and wife, the number of previous pregnancies and the outcome, the mother's physical health and emotional state, living conditions, prolonged and serious illnesses in other children entailing added work for the mother and the effect of fear of giving birth to a defective child on the health of the mother. Discussions take place with the family doctor and a health visitor, and reports of home visits by hospital social workers are studied. The public health apparatus is worked directly into the analysis. In a city where all patients are referred to clinicians working in a unified and integrated obstetrical and gynaecological service, broad lines of policy can be agreed upon. The same organization and teamwork exist in the department of mental health. Difficult problems can be discussed more formally at the weekly staff meetings. There is a large measure of agreement among the Aberdeen consultants on the present policy of both tubal ligation and termination of pregnancy, and it has the strong backing of the family doctor.

This makes it possible, Mr. Speaker, for therapeutic abortions to be granted for different reasons and to a large number of older women who show extreme debility usually associated with excessive child bearing; not medical in the limited sense of the term, but medical in the sense that anemia and lethargy and emotional well-being are involved.

This is what Dr. Baird says about his study and I commend the thought to the hon. members of the House:

The incidence of therapeutic abortion in Aberdeen is about two per cent of all maternity, and there seems to be very little termination of pregnancy by unqualified persons possibly because women know that their difficulties will receive sympathetic and unprejudiced consideration from the medical profession in Aberdeen.

Now, contrast that with the fearful, insular, difficult procedures forced by Canadian abortion law.

That is a significant statement, Mr. Speaker, because it deals with one of the two major fears in this area. There is no reason to assume that liberalizing abortion laws increases illegality or irregular sex

relationships. It was Dr. Cannell of the University of Toronto, head of obstetrics at Toronto general hospital, who pointed out that when Sweden reformed her abortion laws there was a decrease in deaths—a significant decrease in deaths—due to criminal abortions.

Now the second fear, Mr. Speaker, and a legitimate one, relates to the possible psychiatric trauma associated with terminating pregnancy; fear of the emotional upheaval subsequent to the operation. The statistics are slim, I admit to this House, but the opinions we do have suggest that this is not so.

Dr. Hall suggests that in the post-abortion period—the post-operative period—there have not been deleterious psychiatric effects. Dr. Baird draws four conclusions from his study of over 200 cases: there was improvement in general family well-being; a more congenial home atmosphere; better marital relations; and obvious improvement in mental health. This after abortion.

In the best study that we have today, conducted by Dr. Exblad of Denmark in 1961, a progress report of 200 women was carefully documented in the post-therapeutic abortion period for 10 years. The *British Medical Journal* makes this comment:

Psychiatric and neurotic symptoms were no more common than one might expect in the population generally. In those who had been disturbed, results were very good. In general, Exblad's experience agrees with our findings that the results of therapeutic abortion are most satisfactory.

Mr. Speaker, for these and equally important reasons, the cry for abortion reform has become worldwide and irresistible. The British House of Lords gave second reading to Lord Silkin's bill on reform of abortion laws, on November 30 last, by a vote of 67 to eight. A House of Commons Conservative member is about to introduce a private resolution whose frame of reference almost exactly corresponds to the one before this Legislature.

The committee of the Anglican Church has resolved its stand in precisely the terms of this resolution. The Ontario medical association agrees; the American medical association has it under discussion; and most of the legal authorities in the land agree. Dr. H. B. Cotnam, our supervising coroner in Ontario, agrees. The United Church board of evangelism and social service asks for a liberalizing of the grounds, and a recent survey of all the obstetricians in the state of New York showed that more than

85 per cent favour liberalizing our abortion laws. Which brings me, Mr. Speaker, to my conclusion.

Why, I ask this House, are all these learned individuals and organizations pressing for reform of this law? Why is there a worldwide groundswell of demand? My party, and these others, are not champions of licentiousness, Mr. Speaker. We are not advocating, nor do we think it psychologically or socially desirable, that abortion become a casual affair—let us say as casual as the buying of contraceptives by males.

Abortion is by no stretch of the imagination a substitute for a general public contraceptive programme; a programme which, one hopes, will one day be instituted by this government through its public health offices. Abortion is in no sense sufficient without also working to remedy the causes of abortion—poverty, family upsets, emotional distress and related factors. But the present law cannot be so continuously strait-jacketed; nor can doctors be asked to operate under such a law; nor can we continue to condemn 30,000 or more women each year in the province of Ontario to the extremities of procuring a criminal abortion.

We are tired and impatient with the old moral hypocrisy of governments which find it easier to do nothing and, in doing nothing, to cause misery and desperation all around them. I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the impasse here, as perhaps in divorce reform, is primarily the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church—which it may well be—then I say that the attitude of a religious minority should not govern the will of the majority who remain, and should not impose its own moral criteria on an entire population.

If this Legislature prefers to sidestep the issue by talking about destroying the life of the unborn, then I suggest that it is seriously intruding into the privacy of others and destroying their lives in the light of its own questionable puritanism, guilt and evasion.

I join with thousands of others around the world in pleading the cause of the right of the individual to decide for herself, subject to the opportunity of consultation with experienced and expert counsel. I thus propose the reform of our abortion laws in the context and with the impetus and direction that is inherent in the resolution here put forward.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Sudbury is not here, so perhaps we will not have any embarrassing moments. In any event, as I rise to speak on this resolution—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The big boss is not here either, so you can say what you think—

Mr. Eagleson: Has the hon. member finished?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Are you?

Mr. Eagleson: As my friend, the hon. member for Scarborough West, pointed out, Mr. Speaker, there is a rather technical and legal problem involved in this matter. We have the Criminal Code not spelling out specifically whether or not abortions are legal or illegal. We have section 209, subsection 1, referring to the taking of a child's life before it is born, and in subsection 2 of that section there is reference to a "saving" clause that allows this to be done if it is to save the life of the mother. However, section 237 of the Criminal Code goes on to have a general prohibition against procuring miscarriages, and there is no such "saving" clause in it.

Section 303 of the Canadian Criminal Code, before it was amended in 1955, contained the word "unlawful." In the 1955 edition, and since that date, this word has been removed. As such, some doctors—and I think that they are justified in their thoughts along these lines—feel that there is no such thing as a legal abortion because there is a general rule of law that specific legislation will overrule general legislation. Therefore, the law under section 237 might be considered to overrule the legislation covered in section 209 (2).

Another problem is the exception referred to in 209 (2). This has been discussed in the case of *Rex vs. Bourne*, which was an English case. In that case, Dr. Bourne, who was the Queen's physician, did an abortion and had the charge laid as a test case. In that particular case, a girl became pregnant after a brutal rape. After a consultation with fellow doctors, Dr. Bourne performed the abortion and the jury found him not guilty. The trial judge could not find, in that case, any distinction between "danger to health" and "danger to life." He stated that what was dangerous to health may sooner or later be dangerous to life and that the law should not condemn that which is performed without evil intention.

If we go on further in this same case, it is apparent that Dr. Bourne did what he felt was necessary in the circumstances because of the incident of the rape, rather than the concern as to the mental or physical welfare of the 14-year-old girl.

It seems to be the only area in our law on this particular point. There have been several cases of people charged with committing abortion and, to my knowledge, there is nothing in the Canadian law that reflects directly the law of the *Rex vs. Bourne* decision.

Also, in Canada under our Criminal Code, there is no distinction between the unskilled abortion and an abortion performed in a hospital. The general impression one obtains from speaking to the members of our morality squad here in the city of Toronto is that any abortion carried out in a hospital is considered a legal abortion by them, and any abortion that is carried out in any number of other places is considered to be an illegal abortion and should result in a charge being laid.

The Criminal Code, at present, does not cover this situation of the termination of pregnancy to preserve the health of the mother, although there is an unofficial recognition of the need for such a provision. The rationale behind the law is that it served generally to protect against the unskilled abortionist and to concern themselves with the physical and mental health of any woman who has to undergo an abortion in a hospital. Abortion laws do not seem to be enforced to uphold the moral standard, but rather they are upheld to protect pregnant women against unskilled abortionists. In the 1949 case, Lord Chief Justice Goddard stated and I quote:

It is because the unskilful attention of ignorant people in cases of this kind often result in death that attempts to produce abortion are generally regarded by the law as very serious offences.

If the rationale behind the law is to uphold a certain moral standard, then, in the law, there should be a definition of the moral standard to be followed. Whether we should extend the abortion laws to cover the physical and mental health of the mother, would depend on the definition used. Lord Devlin has stated that every society must have an enforced standard of morals and the standard enforced is that which is accepted by the great majority of the people in the country. And he further states that no society can solve the problem of how to teach morality without religion. Therefore, to determine the standard of morality with regard to abortion, it is necessary to decide what standard is accepted by those religions which represent the great majority of Canadians.

Most Protestants, and I believe the members of the Jewish faith, agree that abortion

should be allowed for therapeutic reasons. I am led to believe that the Roman Catholic Church is opposed to such laws. One solution then, would be to remove the matter of abortions completely from the Criminal Code and let each individual group determine its moral conduct. The argument against this is that you may corrupt society with such removal of legislation, but really there is no evidence to support these arguments against abortion laws. There are substantial numbers of abortions performed in our society and there is no indication that our society is becoming less moral.

The second argument against this philosophy of not having abortions recited in the legislation is that abortions will increase. This is quite natural, because people will not mind saying that they have had an abortion done upon them, and in Japan legislation was enacted which permitted legal abortions, and in fact the abortions did increase. But, by the same token, there is no indication this resulted in a lowering of the moral standards in that country. There is no need to keep these laws unless the increase in the number of abortions has some detrimental effect on the country involved, and I suggest that this is not the case in any country that has less restrictive laws on abortion. Legalizing abortion will also do away with the crime of abortion by the unskilled practitioner. Any woman would be able to obtain an abortion at any hospital, by a skilled physician, under the best circumstances.

The number of deaths and injuries that result from these unskilled abortionists would then be removed from society. Another objection against legalizing abortion is that it would lead to an increase in promiscuity. As the hon. member for Scarborough West pointed out, figures and records show that the bulk of the women involved in abortions are over the age of 30 and a substantial number are over the age of 35. In addition to this, we also have contraceptives being sold at every drug store anyway.

Mr. S. Lewis: And what business is it of ours what they do with their private lives?

Mr. Eagleson: There have been several examples recently of a public outcry in favour of less strict abortion laws. In one case, a Colorado housewife became pregnant as a result of a violence which resulted in rape. Because there were no physical or mental complications, in Colorado and in no state of the United States or in Canada, could that woman obtain an abortion. As such, she

was required—she did not feel she should travel abroad as some have inclined themselves to do, going to Sweden, Denmark or Japan—to have the abortion. There was quite a series of articles in the press, as this woman's pregnancy ended in a birth and the headlines in several American papers indicated it was a sad state of affairs when a child should be born as a result of such a rape relationship.

Another case that was given widespread coverage involved Mrs. Sherry Finkbine, from out in a western state; and she had used thalidomide during her pregnancy and was quite fearful of what might result from the termination of the pregnancy in the normal course of events. She saw fit—because they would not allow her to have an abortion in the United States—to travel to Denmark and the abortion was done there and from all reports we have on the matter, she seems to be coming along well. Yet many people indicated there would be fearful physical and mental repercussions from such an abortion in such circumstances.

When I met—with the hon. member for Scarborough West—the gentlemen at the Toronto psychiatric hospital, he advised us of one situation in the city of Toronto that struck me as being a major reason and if it were the only reason it would be a sufficient reason for a change in our laws on this subject. A 16-year-old, or 17-year-old, boy had had an incestuous relationship with his 14-year-old sister and a pregnancy had resulted. Yet in Canada, there is no remedy in that situation, from a legal point of view. From a moral point of view, I would suggest that something should happen, and I suggest to this House that, in spite of the fact that the laws state there is no such thing as a legal abortion, in such a series of circumstances, medical practitioners in Toronto and in Canada, will find some reason to have an abortion in that particular set of circumstances.

In a very illuminating study in California, in the late 1950s, various doctors and hospitals were provided with a hypothetical set of facts concerning abortion. These doctors and hospitals were of the highest reputation and submitted to them was the following set of facts: What would you as a doctor or a hospital do in circumstances such as these? A 15-year-old daughter of a local minister is raped and pregnancy results. Would you have an operation for abortion on this girl? Sixty-eight per cent of the hospitals and 87 per cent of the doctors approved of an operation in such a set of circumstances, based

on the fact of the rape alone, without resorting at all to the proven need to preserve the life or the health of the mother.

These two examples illustrate that not only is there popular feeling against the legal restraint as it is presently constituted in our Criminal Code, or in the American penal code, but also that the legal norm does not comply with actual medical practices.

The fact remains, however, that neither in Canada or in any of the 48 states is there a privilege to abort in circumstances of rape. In 42 of the states the law is the same as it is in Canada, and in only five of them and in the District of Columbia, has the statute been extended to include the preservation of health as well as the preservation of life.

No Anglo-American jurisdictions specifically exempt rape abortions or incest abortions from illegality, although such provisions are spelled out specifically in Sweden and Denmark. Recently the framers of the model penal code in the United States have provided for justification in the case of rape abortions and the draft code has now been approved by the memberships of the American law institute. The draft which might serve as an excellent model is as follows:

Section 207, 11 subsection 2: A licensed physician is justified in terminating a pregnancy if (a) he believes there is a substantial risk that continuance of the pregnancy would gravely impair the physical or mental health of the mother or that the child would be born with grave physical or mental defects or the pregnancy resulted from rape by force or from incest and (b) two physicians have certified in writing their belief in the justifying circumstances and have filed such certificates prior to the abortion in a licensed hospital where it was to be performed.

The extension to incest abortion appears to be equally legitimate. Denmark and Sweden go even further and exempt abortion from illegality in the case of carnal knowledge involving a child or a girl under the age of 14. My own personal opinion is that there should be an exemption in the case of rape abortion and incest abortion, independent of any risk for physical or mental harm to the mother involved. Some would have it that the practice of abortion, under any circumstances, even when the life of the mother is at stake, offends morality. Those who hold that view are, of course, entitled to do so, and they can regulate their conduct in

accordance with it. It does not follow, however, that this view should be imposed upon others, and that those who do not share it should be forced to accept it, on pain of being branded as felons. To say this is not to say that the criminal law does not have a degree of moral content. It is only to say that the case for labelling conduct as criminal is not made merely by the assertion that it is contrary to morals. Particularly this is true where the morality of conduct is the subject of sharp dispute. The existing legal practice in such moral and civilized countries as Sweden and Denmark and Japan would indicate that there has been no such drop in those countries of the moral standard. Existing medical practices and statistics show, in any event, that the present law is not being followed anyway. I would add my support to the resolution proposed by the previous speaker.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on a most contentious subject, so contentious from a moral, religious and legal aspect that our party decided in its wisdom not to impose its collective opinion on any of its members but to permit a free discussion and a free vote on this resolution.

I should add that it came to this conclusion without going into the merits of the resolution. I rise, therefore, not as a spokesman for the party but in my own capacity and as an individual member. Because, however, I will undoubtedly be the principal—I suppose in fact the only speaker for our party—I feel I owe a duty to my colleagues to endeavour to be as impartial as possible and try to present the viewpoints of the different members so far as I am aware of them and am possessed of sufficient knowledge so to do.

Although I will be endeavouring to speak even for those who will not be rising, and who may have views contrary to mine, I should not be considered by this honourable House as being the official spokesman for our party.

Religious beliefs, Mr. Speaker, ingrained during a lifetime of practice, are hard to dispel or to sway. Life would be intolerable if we did not have religious beliefs or if we practised none of them. Religious beliefs and morality are the catalyst that bind us together and make us a society. In the eyes of observers, some of our religious beliefs may hold no truth, in substance or in fact, and our society permits us to endeavour to sway people from their beliefs, or to alter those

beliefs. I will endeavour to do neither, though some of the remarks I will make may possibly be interpreted as such.

I would also stress that a law, which only permits a course of action, does not compel a person to follow that course. A law, permitting therapeutic abortions, will not compel a person to have an abortion. That no one would countenance.

In debating this motion, Mr. Speaker, we are, in fact, debating children, and all of us recognize that a child is enrichment of life, that a child brings out the best human qualities—devotion, understanding, tenderness, self-sacrifice—in our technical and impersonal society. A family's happiness will certainly be increased if children are born at the most suitable time as regards the parents' age, health, financial resources. Unfortunately, however, Mr. Speaker, all children are not born at the most suitable time as regards the age of the parents, their health and finances. In fact, we are debating this resolution because many children are born with complete disregard for those points that I have mentioned.

Marriage entered into because of pregnancy, without real love, offers little prospect for happiness. The best guarantees for family happiness are children wanted by both parents, but particularly by the woman, who, after all, bears the main burden of their upbringing.

We are debating this resolution because many children are born completely unwanted, unloved and in many cases unexpected. These children are unwanted, unloved and unexpected for a variety of reasons. The advanced age of the parents; the fact that there is an existing large family; the loss of a husband; the invalidity of a husband; the disruption of a family; the woman being unmarried; the woman being in very poor mental or physical health; the woman being the main breadwinner in a family; inadequate housing; low income; hereditary diseases; or the pregnancy being the result of an unlawful act.

Some of these reasons are medical, some are moral and some are religious. They are, however, reasons—good, bad or indifferent. Here we must weigh the arguments to decide what lead we, as representatives of the people, shall give in this matter.

One religious group takes the position that, when at a birth, complications arise, under which either the mother, or the child, must be sacrificed to save the other, the mother should be sacrificed to save the child. Another

religious group takes the position that, in the same set of circumstances, the child should be sacrificed to save the mother; and a number of religions frown on, to put it mildly, the use of contraceptives.

But how many women die each year as the result of hole-in-the-wall attempts to relieve them of unborn children, which they did not want, or for which they could not provide a home? How many others ended up in hospital, with bleeding or sepsis, after an induced or criminal abortion? How many others suffered from hormonal or psychic disturbances following an illegal termination of a pregnancy? How many cannot have children when they have homes for them, and want them, because of infertility arising out of an unauthorized abortion? In how many instances did both the mother and the unborn child perish because we could not make up our minds whether to save the mother or the child?

Remember, Mr. Speaker, in legal abortions, the chances are overwhelming that only one life will be lost, whereas with illegal abortions the chances are just as overwhelming that both could be lost.

We must, therefore, I submit, protect the woman from the consequences of abortions performed illegally, often by unauthorized or ill-equipped persons and under unhygienic conditions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to the present I have been discussing more or less the medical and religious aspects. I should now like to dwell, for a few moments, on the moral aspects.

The woman, and the family, are of paramount importance and status in our society. Women, who enjoy political and economic equality with men, must be equally free in the vital question of parenthood.

There is no equality where a man can freely desert a single girl who is pregnant by him, while she is obliged to bring his child into the world with no father and little financial security. There is no equality when a man can come home the worse for drink, and irresponsibly force on his wife an unwanted child.

There is no equality when a man can, to satisfy his lust, force himself on his wife and thereby force an unwanted child on her. There is no equality or humanity in compelling a woman, who is worn out with the feeding and caring for a houseful of children, to add another mouth to feed and personality to her daily routine.

There is no humanity in forcing a frightened adolescent, who lost her head after a

party with a boy of short acquaintance, to take on the responsibility of motherhood before finishing her education or training.

There is no humanity or equality that makes a 40- or 45-year-old woman, widowed or divorced, take on a child which she admits she cannot bring up alone, simply because she once succumbed to the magic of the evening with a man she cannot marry.

But let us not fool ourselves into believing that abortions will become something that women will enter into lightly or with gaiety. The pull of maternal instinct, social and financial pressures are, and will be, inexorable. Emotionally, whether it be legal or illegal, abortion is a shock mentally, a most humiliating and degrading course of action. We, as mere men, will never know or appreciate the fear, anxiety, self-scorn, and guilt that must plague the mind of a woman contemplating such an act, especially if the act is illegal. It is fraught with the risk of complications and of sterility, when done under the most sanitary conditions, by a most competent physician or surgeon, for the risk of sterility following an abortion cannot be entirely eliminated.

The most that can be said is that sterility is caused much less frequently by a legal abortion than by illegal or induced abortions. It has been shown that an abortion can endanger future pregnancies. When there has been a previous abortion, the number of premature births is three times as great. The cases necessitating abortions to avoid complications, and the number of stillbirths and infant deaths are twice as frequent as in a normal situation. Hormonal disorders occur in one per cent of all women who have not suffered them before abortion, most frequently in adolescence.

Abortions to my mind, Mr. Speaker, are not something, as I said, that women will enter into lightly. It is, however, my opinion, that, were abortions legal, there would be a better chance for women to receive proper advice, counselling and guidance, and therefore a better chance that the woman would become mentally attuned to having a child, with perhaps even the financial situation remedied.

I am certain that some of my hon. colleagues, were they standing in my place, could offer other reasons and perhaps other solutions, but I will not try to speak for them in the short time I have left. What I believe we need to do is take the initiative in sex education. Sex education is part of the preparation for life and therefore should begin before adolescence. Although properly the duty and responsibility of parents, this duty and re-

sponsibility is not being performed or exercised by parents, or not being performed or exercised adequately in many cases, for various misguided reasons, ignorance or sheer embarrassment.

Children, therefore, in school, should be taught sociology of sex life, the dangers of premature sex, the meaning of monogamy, the growth of the human embryo, child care, love as an expression of sexual life, the dangers of abortion, contraception, family responsibility, and family law. These subjects should, however, be presented in such a manner as to avoid the slightest suggestion that sex is something special and apart.

I believe we should also have family planning clinics to guide and give instructions to parents contemplating having children. It is true that sex education and planning clinics would not solve the problem surrounding rape, incest, mental illness, hereditary diseases, and so on, but at least they would be a step forward.

There is no getting away from the fact, as the hon. member for Scarborough West pointed out, that of the approximately 35,000 miscarriages last year in the province of Ontario, about one quarter of them were criminally induced. This is only an estimate based on those that were brought to the attention of the police. There is also no getting away from the fact that the criminally induced abortions are the third most lucrative crime in the Criminal Code according to the police.

I would, at this point, like to mention one of the remarks made by the previous speaker, where there was an implication that, because of the lawful abortions in Japan, the number of abortions had increased. I submit that only the known number of abortions had increased; all that happened was that, where, previously, the abortions would have been illegal and not known to the authorities, they now came in to the open. I suggest there is no evidence that the number of abortions, both legal and illegal, have increased.

There is no getting away from the fact that this problem is of the most serious magnitude. Perhaps it can be best illustrated by drawing to your attention page 31 of today's *Toronto Telegram*. The *Toronto Telegram* recently won an award for having the best front page and perhaps it is entitled to another award for this page.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that one article is headed "Happiness home may be saved," and deals with the Bell family and their ten adopted children. This article denotes what

family life should be like—full of love, tenderness and affection.

Another article is headed, "She combed continent to get a legal abortion," and tells of a Metro woman who feared she would die if she had another child, but was unable to get a legal abortion in Ontario or the United States.

Between these two articles is one headed, "CAS budgets 'no Metro deals,' Cecile." This article deals with the children's aid society which—just as this article is between the article dealing with people who love children and want children and an article dealing

with those who do not want children—stands between those in our society who do not want children, who do not love children, or do not know how to raise children, and those who cannot have children, or who have no children, but do want children.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present arguments for both sides. I do not know whether I have succeeded or failed, but I do want to go on record personally as supporting the motion of the hon. member for Scarborough West.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, February 24, 1966

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Crossman, continued	869
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	899

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 24th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. W. G. Noden in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(continued)

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, you will remember that yesterday, in speaking upon the annual report of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), I dwelt in detail upon some of the modern and developing concepts of penal administration in an effort to lay the groundwork for some remarks I plan to make at this time upon how they relate to the record of The Department of Reform Institutions of this province.

It is my contention, Mr. Chairman, that the very few excerpts from a great wealth of thought in a similar vein that is available in this field show, or at least illustrate, the extreme discrepancy between what is being done by Ontario's reform institutions and what is being said about the real needs and purpose of the penal system by distinguished experts, not only in this country but throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to take up very much of the time of this House today. I have not the slightest doubt that some hon. members of this House had difficulty in appreciating the meaning and the importance of some of the excerpts I read yesterday, and at such great length. But this is a rich field of contemporary thought and I was convinced that at least some attempt should be made to give you an appreciation of the range, the variety, and the stimulation of this thought if I were to have any success in my declared objective of dealing with this subject in a logical and progressive way. I cannot say what degree of success I have had so far in contributing something, to the awareness of some hon. members not acquainted with this field, of the great problems and enormous challenges facing

this province, facing the world, in the crucial field of penal reform.

To those who are of the opinion that I dwelt too heavily yesterday on the conceptual aspect of penal reform, I would say only that an understanding of some of the concepts in this field is an absolute prerequisite to an appreciation of their practical aspects. Much of what I read to you earlier was in the academic and sometimes veiled language of the theoretician and occasionally it was, to put it simply, pretty heavy going. But I would remind you again that often there is to be found, in what seems to be the most abstruse and academic theorizing, the hard nub of a brilliant practical ideal.

It is not my intention at this time to relate every one of those comparatively few excerpts to some of the bleak facts of practices of The Department of Reform Institutions of this province.

That would take too long. And, besides, the inference of nearly every one of these learned statements must be abundantly clear to almost anyone who is willing to take the time and study to relate them to the real state of things in Ontario's penal institutions and in the department charged with administering them. I hope, nevertheless, to make clear the unmistakable and direct application of every one of them to the remarks I plan to make here today. And I would ask you to consider them as the pervading theme of these remarks.

Before I begin, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address to you a few remarks about the attending press. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is rarely suitable or appropriate for a public figure to attempt to instruct the press, which in my experience does its job on the whole in sometimes the most trying circumstances in a thoroughly competent and admirable way. But in passing, I would merely like to suggest to the members of the press who are present in this House, to those who were at one time and so memorably called the "strangers" and who are today an indispensable part of our system of government, that they not dwell upon the more vivid aspects of what I have said to the

exclusion of the important things I am trying to say.

Mr. Chairman, what I am trying to say is that what is needed is some clear, consistent and progressive thinking in this field; what is needed is not a perpetuation of outmoded systems and concepts—a continual building upon the same creaking, 20-year-old structure; but an intelligently contained departure into new fields of thought and action; into new areas of experiment and design.

This requires courage, Mr. Chairman, but the stakes are high. At stake is the reclamation of vital human material—the many thousands who inhabit our penal institutions today; and, even more important, the countless thousands now being recruited in unhappy homes; in bad company; in miserable and sordid circumstances beyond my power to describe—for that endless, long, bleak and miserable procession who will enter them at some future time.

Mr. Chairman, the answer—at least a part of the answer—to this great problem, is not the sort of answer that is being provided by The Department of Reform Institutions of this province today. Let me re-emphasize my conviction, already expressed, that virtually the only truly worthwhile work being done by that department with human material is in that important but limited field in which it strives to improve the outlook and character of the promising young. Those others—and I am speaking for the moment only of the young—who do not readily show this promise, are for all practical purposes abandoned to the often permanently damaging severity of a system that so often so demonstrably serves only to reinforce their miserable views of society and life.

As for the greatest, the currently most unyielding, challenge of our present system—the rehabilitation of at least a satisfying proportion of the great mass of men and women who inhabit our reformatories and our jails—that challenge is evaded by that department, if not altogether ignored.

Mr. Chairman, it would be altogether false to suggest that that department is lacking in men of goodwill, who are dedicated to the discharge of their most vital work and duty to our society, and I want to make it abundantly clear that I wish no remark of mine to reflect adversely on the many loyal public servants, who are bending the utmost effort to meet the challenge of their role.

Mr. Chairman, while I am quite prepared to do my duty by criticizing men when I feel

it is in the interests of society, my main, my overriding criticism is of the present system.

Mr. Chairman, I am no visionary, but I have been genuinely perplexed by the failure of the department to act upon some of the excellent advice it has received. I am seriously disturbed by what I am obliged to refer to as the lack of initiative shown by many of the department's senior personnel, by the lack of thrust from the top and, Mr. Chairman, I am at an utter loss to explain the lack of a well-rounded, coherent and imaginative approach in this province to the many problems in this field.

To those who have been unable or unwilling to perceive it, Mr. Chairman, let me emphasize that I am not speaking in any narrow or partisan sense, but with all the earnestness and conviction I feel. There is a most pressing need for far more imaginative and practical departures in this field, than the present department has shown or given promise of showing. Let us not be in the position of saying that when bigger jails are built, Ontario will build them. Let us not accept the easy fatalism of one of the admirable advisers of the department, Professor Grygier, who declares in his recent essay on crime in society and I quote:

To study the criminal's social background or his psychological makeup is not only irrelevant, but positively dangerous; for if we accept that social or psychological forces may be the basis of criminal behaviour, we undermine the concept of free will and of criminal intent, and we may be accused of undermining the moral fibre of society as well.

Let us instead take the more perceptive and questioning approach of another of the advisers of the hon. Minister, Mr. Joseph McCulley, who in a paper entitled "Some present problems in correction" endorses a view taken by the late Sir Alexander Paterson, for many years prison commissioner in the United Kingdom. Mr. McCulley points out and I quote:

We cannot rehabilitate a man until we know what made him a criminal, and to find out we must establish an institute for research into the roots of criminality.

He suggested that when we know how to rehabilitate men, we will not put them in prison to do it, but that the ultimate aim—and I quote—"should be abolition of prisons."

Mr. Chairman, I would be failing in my duty to this House if I did not commence to make at this point, concrete recommendations—as a direct and practical expression of some

of the general statements I have made, with a view to bringing about the correction of some of the many deficiencies I have found in the Ontario system.

But first, I would present to you a number of recommendations made by Mr. McCulley himself, one of the hon. Minister's advisers, writing almost eight years ago. His remarks are as applicable as though they were made today and I subscribe to them in full. Here is what Mr. McCulley recommended:

An improved parole and probation system—more and better paid parole and probation supervisors. The building of numerous prison farms and camps.

He is speaking, remember, of the adult offender, not the child.

The building of institutions properly equipped and staffed for the treatment of the criminally insane. Improvement of the classification staffs in the institution.

I believe that I have given you some idea of the present state of things in that regard—and finally:

More competent psychiatric advice for parole and classification boards.

I would add the observation that this is the sort of service that can no longer be done as it is being done in Ontario institutions on a part-time basis. Mr. McCulley also recommended:

Improvement in salary and status of prison guards and all professional persons in the prison service; improved educational and vocational programmes in the prisons.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with Mr. McCulley's points, I referred earlier in my address, in general or specific terms, to nearly all of them. I shall recapitulate at least three:

1. Competent psychiatric help is still desperately needed in our institutions. Professional services are grossly inadequate to the need.

2. In our institutions, educational or vocational programmes of demonstrable value virtually do not exist.

You will remember my remarks about Guelph and Millbrook in this particular regard.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to make certain recommendations of my own.

The hon. Minister alluded in his remarks yesterday to the importance of research in an intelligent and intelligible developing pro-

gramme. With this I am in complete accord, but I do not share the hon. Minister's apparently content view of what is being done now in this regard.

I believe the research staff and the research facilities of The Department of Reform Institutions are extremely inadequate to the present needs.

Consequently, as my first recommendation, I would strongly urge the government to concentrate much more of its resources and much more of its talents in a coherent study of penal reform. The formation of a research department is a sound first step. Now, let us give it the financing and facilities and the manpower that are demanded if the government is going to respond adequately to the many grave needs.

Hand in hand with this programme is point two: Let us establish a research library of penology that can one day stand as a model to the world, a library to which any student can refer with complete assurance that he will find in it the latest word—every worthwhile relevant word—on this subject, from the books and periodicals being published every day on this subject throughout the world.

Let us have a research staff that is differentially qualified and "specialized"—a staff that is adequate in expertise and numbers to do a superlative research job and keep The Department of Reform Institutions fully cognizant of the going work and study in this field.

I am not referring to the existence of the central criminal library at the University of Toronto. I suggest that The Department of Reform Institutions should have its own library.

3. It will follow almost naturally from the establishment of such a staff and such a facility that interest in enlightened concepts of penal reform will be stimulated and given a focus and an impetus. It is not too much to expect that such a facility, fully computerized, if necessary, to collate relevant data in an instant, would stir such an interest and informed and informing debate in this province, that all of the various public and private agencies concerned with, and active in reform—all the newspapers and periodicals—in fact, all men of goodwill would have an enhanced appreciation of the enormous problems and challenges to society in this field.

4. Let us never lose sight of the day-to-day need to finance the new research staff sufficiently to permit them—and they must be

exceptional men—to travel widely whenever advisable or necessary—in studying on the spot the kind of work that is being done in this field.

5. Let us encourage more interest in the universities in the field of penal reform by providing larger research grants and bursaries that will return to this province a body of valuable and original work.

To this point, Mr. Chairman, I have dealt entirely with the one theme on which the hon. Minister and I are in complete agreement, the enormous value of sound research.

6. Let us let a little more air in the penal institutions of this province. Let us not be so timid and dubious about the job they are doing as to talk of restraining members who wish to visit them unannounced. Let us make them, all of them, institutions of which we can be proud. I will go on record that I went into the institution unannounced and I was not impeded, Mr. Minister.

7. Let us, to use the usual word, up-rate the quality of our penal staffs, at least to begin with to a point at which we are not forced to the shameful admission, tacit or implicit, that the inmates of our penal system are better educated than our custodial staffs.

8. Let us be realistic enough to accept the fact that a professional staff of the quality we are seeking must be paid salaries commensurate with their work. To take a single instance, it is shortsighted in the extreme for The Department of Reform Institutions to balk at hiring competent psychiatrists on a full-time basis because the government would have to pay \$45,000 a year or more for them.

Mr. Chairman, all the things I have talked about so far will cost this government money. What this government must do before anything else is accept the fact that money must be spent. It is virtually worthless to perpetuate the present stagnant, not to say retrograde, system in effect to-day in this province by merely providing sufficient increased funds annually to meet the few needs this government is willing to concede.

9. Let us concentrate the greater part of our efforts, not on those who Professor Grygier called the good—you remember the observation, I quoted it to you yesterday in that regard—but on those who are in direct need of help. Those, for example, at Millbrook, those who Mr. Hackl, the Deputy Minister, once referred to as “parasites—who demonstrate by their conduct that they will not lead disciplined lives.”

Let us not be soft-handed or silly or sentimental, but—I adjure the hon. members of this House, Mr. Chairman—let us remember that we are dealing with men, men who, however despicable the lowest of them may appear to us in our present state of understanding, may be shown, in some more ideal and enlightened age, to be not merely the victims of what Poe called so unforgettably “the giants of circumstance,” but the victims of their society; a society that does not understand them.

10. Let us, in Professor Grygier’s phrase which I quoted to you yesterday, “ensure that the sentence fits the offender and not the offence.” Our present system is far too indiscriminating in the treatment it now provides. Undiscriminating treatment, Mr. Chairman, is hit-and-miss treatment. The possibility suggests that such treatment too often will do far more damage than good.

Mr. Chairman, I made some of my views apparent about some of the specifics of my charges about Ontario’s penal system in my speech yesterday and hope I have made others apparent today. I will leave many that remain for the period of consideration clause by clause of the hon. Minister’s report.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to engage in dialectical ruses or the tricks of controversy with the hon. Minister in dealing with this vital subject. I do not question the hon. Minister’s goodwill, and I am sure he does not question mine. But I have been struck by the stark contrast between the admirable principles enunciated by the Hon. George Drew in this House 20 years ago when he was the premier of this province. I have been disconcerted by the great gap all too dreadfully apparent, the great gap between what seems to be the vision of those early years in this province and the all-too-dreadfully apparent fatalism of today.

We must devise a better system than that employing tear gas, the boot, the truncheon, the softening-up, the isolation cell, the restricted diet, the unnumbered cases of psychological cruelty as practised in our institutions today. Let us give ourselves a better chance with the men and women and let us give them a better chance with us.

Mr. Chairman, there was a Hindu philosopher, Gautama, who refused to believe the world ceased to exist when no one had taken the precaution to perceive it. The Department of Reform Institutions of this province administers a system largely out of the public eye, a system that does not usually touch the public for this reason, the responsibility upon this hon. Minister and his staff is appreciably

greater than the responsibility of most hon. Ministers of this government, in discharging what I earlier called some of the most vital work of our time.

I believe we must concern ourselves more than we have in the past with this system. I believe we must employ some pragmatic as well as theoretical tools in reaching demonstrably sound results. It is no accident that the prison population of this province is steadily increasing. No accident that the department has been required to build three new jails. These are all links in one chain, Mr. Chairman, or spokes in one great wheel.

If we are to snap this chain, to halt this inexorable grinding wheel, we must be more concerned with reforms and less concerned with punishment. If this sounds too visionary for some who consider themselves to have a rigorous grasp of reality and a profound knowledge of men, I would recall to you one of the simplest, most moving and most beautiful concepts from which we draw some of our greatest strength—the concept of the brotherhood of man.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, we have been listening first of all to the report of the hon. Minister about what has been happening over the past year and what he hopes to do. Then we have been treated again, to a philosophical treatise of what ought to be done, and listening to the hon. member for Bracondale, I was struck by the many bits of wisdom there and by the many excerpts which many of us have used from time to time in this House. Repetition is always good and in a subject like this, all of us will repeat ourselves from time to time, there is no question.

I do want to emphasize what the hon. member for Bracondale had to say about the report being put upon the desks of the hon. members, or at least the leaders of the parties at 12 o'clock just before the hon. Minister's estimates were to come before this House. It seems to me it is rather inexcusable for that kind of thing to happen. There may have been extenuating circumstances, but for the Minister of a responsible department to expect any proper dealing with his estimates when he only places reports of this nature before the members in limited quantity, so soon before his estimates, is rather unthinkable.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Not the estimates.

Mr. Young: Well, I am sorry; his report for the last term then. We have the esti-

mates—agreed. All right, we have them and are able to look them over. We will have a chance to compare them with other estimates, perhaps at a later time, for the benefit of the Whip.

Now I do want to say, before I use that significant word “but” which is always used, that I feel that this Minister has been doing a pretty good job over the past year or two in the department. As the House knows, I am critical of him and of the work of his department in many ways. At the same time, I have a feeling that he has dug into his department, that he knows what is going on, at least in large measure, and that he has worked hard to build this department and to build its staff.

I was impressed, as I saw this report of the hon. Minister, to see the picture of the appointments during the past year. People were appointed in August, 1965; June, 1965; July, 1965; July, 1965; September, 1965; November, 1965. And as I look at these pictures, and read the biographies and the histories of the people who were appointed last year, I am very much encouraged as to the future of this department. And the fact that emerges in my mind is just how right the hon. Minister was a year ago, when he painted his rosy picture of the good situation, staff-wise, in his department. There seems to be a big improvement here.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Good; but it is better now.

Mr. Young: I congratulate the hon. Minister. How it could be good when all these department heads were appointed within the last twelve months—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: These are new positions.

Mr. Young: New positions, fine. All right, and we may have a word to say about that later. But in any case we are delighted to see this. We congratulate the people who have taken these posts, these very responsible posts; we wish them well, and we assure them of our interest and our co-operation in the days to come. Now that does not mean to say that we are not going to criticize.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Young: But we are going to offer whatever co-operation we can to these people and hope that the department will continue to build, and that this hon. Minister will continue to show the energy that he has been showing over the past period of time.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I have come to the "but"—the hon. Minister expected that, he would not have expected me to speak without it. I have to throw a few bits of constructive criticism in here and I am sure the hon. Minister will take it in the way I express it.

Having said that I am impressed with the progress that he is making, I will say perhaps that the hon. Minister has been just a little too touchy in some respects. When we do criticize occasionally, the hon. Minister has been prone to go into a long tirade in defence of his staff, as if we were criticizing his staff as such. We are criticizing shortcomings in his staff but he does not have to rush to the defence of staff and throw up this kind of a smokescreen simply because we criticize.

Last week I was extremely interested and fascinated as a matter of fact, to hear the hon. member for St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman) singing a great paean of praise to the Minister of Reform Institutions. It was a touching scene and it was one wherein I felt that the new hon. member for Bracondale had really been elevated to very high status in this House, when a Minister of the Crown would spend that much time in talking about the kind of things he talked about.

Certainly perhaps the hon. member for Bracondale needed to be answered, but at that length by a Minister of the Crown, I am not sure. I would just offer a little bit of advice to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that this kind of criticism perhaps is not entirely called for.

But the thing that intrigued me about the statement of the hon. Minister was that he showed us in chapter and verse the tremendous progress that has been made by his department over the past year, or year and a half, or two years. As I say, I was tremendously impressed by that progress, and I do not take a bit of credit away from the hon. Minister for his energy and for his wisdom and the wisdom of his advisers in this respect.

But the thing that intrigued me was the fact that while the hon. Minister was telling us about the great progress that had been made by him in his department, he was also telling us, chapter and verse, of the terrible failure of his predecessor.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is not so.

Mr. Young: Oh, yes, and so it was not surprising that part way through that recital one of the former Ministers got up and

walked out, because he could not take it any longer.

An hon. member: You cannot have it both ways, now.

Mr. Young: You cannot have it both ways. In other words, what the Minister was telling us, Mr. Chairman, is that this department was so far behind when he became the Minister that he had to run like fury in order to catch up and bring in all these reforms.

Again I say it is a credit to him. I also have heard, Mr. Chairman, that the former Minister was a good guy. I have heard this. And he worked hard but without too much success. Now why that was, I do not know. But in any case the present Minister said that about him the other night, because he said all these things had to be done when he became Minister.

And so it seemed to me that night the hon. Minister was again demonstrating how far behind this government had dropped in the whole matter of reform institutions. How far it had dropped back in correction. This again is par for the course, that this government is now running hard to catch up in reform institutions as well as education and a lot of other things. By the time it is up to where it ought to be in 1966, this government, by the time it is caught up, by the time this Minister has disappeared from the scene either one way or the other, then perhaps he will be at that point where he should have been in 1966.

Then you will find that you are still a decade behind—pardon me, I am waving my arms a little too strenuously for my partner from Riverdale (Mr. Renwick)—but by that time this government will find it is at the place where it should have been in 1966. Then it is going to be up to the new Minister to get the new vision and new staff to carry on from that point into the future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this hon. Minister has been prone, I think, to paint just too rosy a picture in the past and to tell us things he is hoping to do and planning to do as if they were done.

An hon. member: Done!

Mr. Young: Yes, he checked off the word, too! In any case, I think the hon. Minister could just have a little dose of humility here and realize that he is talking to people who are at least fairly mature. He is talking to a staff that knows its business; he is talking to institutions and people in institutions who know the job at least as well as he knows it;

he is talking to a public who knows of the failure of correction over the years gone by and the long distance we have to go.

In other words, I say, Mr. Chairman, that this Minister should be just a little more realistic. He makes good speeches, but those speeches are too often a cover-up of a situation that exists.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: We were given yesterday a chart and that chart is a beautiful thing—all coloured, I loved it. It looks good, and it is a nice chart and I congratulate the Minister upon production of this chart. All I hope is that the new stream of offenders now moving into his institutions are going to follow these circles and lines in the proper way at the proper time.

In other words, while this chart may have, as the hon. Minister has said, attracted almost worldwide interest, the fact is he just has not yet the staff or the specialized institutions to make this chart realistic. I agree with this chart. I say it is a good thing the hon. Minister drew it and drew it to our attention.

I say to the Minister he should present it to us as a guideline, a plan for the future, a hope that is there, glimmering before us, and a pattern that these men and women who have now come into the institutions to do a fundamental job at the executive level, can follow—a target, if you will, that they must measure their achievement against.

Mr. Chairman, we have to recognize in spite of all the beautiful words we have heard, that in this country—the figures do not apply specifically to Ontario but Ontario is after all the largest province in this country—that Canadians have eight times the chance of serving time in some of the institutions of the hon. Minister as citizens of Britain, Scandinavia or Holland.

It is time we took a serious look at what is wrong here. We are obviously blundering our way into prisons which are too often geared to punishment, into reform institutions which just do not reform. We find the offender too late—and this is the stress I want to make tonight—after antisocial attitudes are set, and we spend far too little in scientifically and patiently restoring the social misfit to a useful role in society.

When we as a province start to pick up the child—and the hon. Minister realizes this as well as anyone—who has emotional problems and antisocial tendencies, he is already past the time when he can most easily be restored to socially healthy behaviour. Then,

of course, if there is room, we crowd him into Smiths Falls or Thistletown and we hope for the best.

If the situation in these overcrowded institutions does not avail, then there is the next step and this is where the hon. Minister gets them—into one of the training schools. Some good and some not so good. Finally into the reform institutions which all too often are undertaking a hopeless task on young people already well steeped in a life outside the bounds of orderly society and without the motivation to get back within those bounds.

And so, Mr. Chairman, the fundamental problem we face is an interdepartmental reorganization of our correction processes. The hon. member for Bracondale yesterday made the statement that The Department of Reform Institutions should disappear. Now, last year we gave the hon. Minister the solution how not only the department could disappear but he could disappear.

Mr. K. E. Butler (Waterloo North): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. member is not even in his seat, what is he raising a fuss about?

Mr. Butler: I would just ask this question: Did the hon. member say that the odds were eight times as great that someone in this country would wind up in a reform institution?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Young: That is a long piece back. We did point out last year that with redistribution, of course, the hon. Minister himself could disappear and it may be the hon. member for Bracondale is setting his sights on that achievement, too, I do not know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member may disappear without redistribution.

Mr. Young: It could well be, who knows? In any case, the matter of a total reorganization of our approach to correction is one which not only this hon. Minister but the Cabinet and this government has to face up to. Social machinery is needed which can move in to assist the child at an early age, as early as possible. This means supervision and corrective schools for the under 6-year-olds when needed. It means specialized treatment for the very young, who are showing tendencies toward emotional disturbance and

antisocial behaviour. It also means carrying this process through with adequate treatment facilities and staff for the younger children of elementary school age.

If this were done, it would logically reduce the need for training schools as we know them today, as well as cut down on the facilities for reform institutions which, of course, should be small and specialized.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister in his report yesterday said this:

In concluding this section, I would emphasize to all hon. members that when the youngsters originally arrive in our training schools, they are usually immature, hostile, insecure or badly frightened boys and girls. They believe that the world is frightfully hostile since this is what their experience has taught them.

Now, the hon. Minister, I think, should take his conferees out back of the woodshed and talk to them the way that small children sometimes are talked to in early days. At least he should sit around that conference table and point out to them that he should not have to deal with these young people after their emotional patterns are set, that more emphasis should be placed upon the very small children who need that kind of treatment long before they come into the Minister's care.

This is the kind of reorganization which is needed and which this government now ought to undertake. The hon. Minister has a group of specialists now in his own department. We hope that that is going to bring great results there, but why in the name of common sense should we ask these specialists to have to face up to a task which never should be theirs, a task which should begin long before? We should bring to the Minister only the rather impossible cases so that his results perhaps then should be even less than we expect him to get today, because he only gets the hard core cases.

Now, if the hon. Minister would really talk turkey to his Cabinet brothers in this field, it seems to me we would be making progress.

I have in my riding a school, Powell Brown school: the hon. Minister attended the opening of that school a couple of years ago. This school is dealing in a very limited way with emotionally disturbed children, children who may have brain injuries, who are neurotic, who are schizophrenic, who have behaviour disorders, who are just emotionally upset, and who in their homes have emerged as real problems.

Now this school is just underway, but it

takes the children at a very young age, the pre-schoolers by the large. I want to read just two cases here, one of Janice:

Janice was admitted to the school in February, 1965. She was a timid little girl who looked as if she was released from a cage. She was so withdrawn, shy, nervous, that when she had a drink during snack time, she bit out a piece of the cup.

She had no speech for three months. In May she started to speak. She had come from a very unfortunate home background. She used only single words, "Things," "boy," "lady." Now she is speaking coherently, she is very relaxed, plays well with the other children, has been promoted to kindergarten work.

Her behaviour, when she was admitted, appeared autistic, and the psychologist declared that she has a neurotic response to hostility. She is making real progress and the hope is that that little girl will be restored to become a sane, normal child.

Now if it were not for this kind of work beginning early she would be a ward of the Minister before too many years pass.

Another case is Joseph, who was referred from the children's aid society. He was very disturbed, hostile, aggressive, subversive, and his only security was in food. During play therapy sessions he would grab the plastic knife and stab the other children even without provocation. In two months, he was changed. A very pronounced improvement has taken place. If there is no regression he will be ready for normal nursery school in September.

In speaking of this school, Dr. John Rich, who is the consulting psychiatrist says this, and I think these words are very significant:

I think the Powell Brown nursery school is doing a surprisingly good job. Some of the children there are particularly difficult problems, that would tax the ingenuity and devotion of any treatment centre. But nevertheless every one that I have watched over the last few months has improved.

Given the nature of their difficulties, of course, some of these improvements are minimal but this is in no way the fault of the school. I have seen several schools like this begin and what surprised me most about this one is the fact that it has got off the ground so quickly. It usually takes much longer than this for the staff and programme to become sufficiently consolidated for the results to show up in the children themselves.

Nevertheless, the school is still handicapped by changing staff and a certain lack of equipment, but I do not see how this can be easily rectified. When it is, I would expect even greater advances. In short, I can wholeheartedly support the continuation and expansion of this school. The need is desperate and your board can congratulate itself on performing a vital public service in an extremely difficult field.

Yours sincerely,

John Rich, MD, PhD.

I know that there is work being done among children in pre-school years. But, Mr. Chairman, we are not systematically going after this era of child life. We have not yet faced up to this kind of responsibility and it is time we did. I know that the children's aid society is doing a good job in certain fields. There are schools like the Powell Brown nursery school picking up the bits and pieces of the fragments of society, but this is not in any way systematic, it is not being done as a matter of public policy and by putting public moneys into this field. And I say to this House that in the long run society would save itself large amounts of not only capital investment but of current expenses if we invested it in a place where the investment would count most. My submission is in this field of correction, the great investment ought to come right there among the very, very young.

Having said this, Mr. Chairman, I go on to say that institutions without adequate staff are useless. The hon. Minister huffs and puffs his way across the province talking about the great changes he is making in the reform setup. Fine! But he admits to a desperate shortage of staff, particularly at the specialists' level. He knows this and has taken some moves to correct it but even then, that staff is desperately short. He told us the other day that they had no full-time psychiatrists and then he tells us that he is making virtue out of necessity and indicates that he is doing the best he can under the circumstances. He says:

We propose to use our psychiatrists primarily as consultants with the aim of enriching a total interaction between staff and inmates, rather than using their services directly with a small proportion of the total inmate population.

Apart from considerations of necessity, this department of professional staff is more particularly suited to the type of inmate in our institutions. On the whole, we

find more of the impulse-ridden character-disorder than we do the neurotic or psychotic person. With these people, it is found that a combination of environmental and psychological treatment offers a promising approach.

Now these are brave words for the hon. Minister to utter and under the circumstances, perhaps they are the only words that he can offer to us but it seems to me that something more is needed. We must have an admission from the hon. Minister that the long-term goal is to build the kind of staff needed—psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers, so that small institutions can be adequately manned and so that those smaller institutions can have the kind of personal supervision and help for the inmates there. So, if the hon. Minister does not need to cover up this way, he can tell us that over the next five or ten years he hopes to have so many people trained, so many changes made in his institutions.

I know that he has to deal with the Cabinet, and there is capital money invested here, but at least he should do what he has done on the pretty charts and lay out that five- or ten-year programme—last year I suggested a ten-year programme; it would be a nine-year programme now, I suppose—but lay it out on a chart and say to his Cabinet colleagues, "This is what should be done; you have lots of specialists now to give you advice. This is what should be done this year; and the next year, this; and the next year, this; if we are going to achieve the goal. It will cost so much money and we want this much to achieve these ends."

If the hon. Minister would lay this before the Cabinet and before this House, and make it a matter of public discussion among his advisers and his staff, I think it would have a very salutary influence.

The hon. Minister has told us in his report—this is in the report for the year ending 1965—that:

The department is encouraging graduate and post-graduate students in psychiatry, psychology and social work to join the department after graduation. This encouragement comes in the form of fellowships for students and close working relationships with universities and it is expected to ease the shortage in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, it is true that many extremely able custodial staff members and other staff members can be recruited from among the

general public—because I think it is fundamental that an attitude is important here—and there are people with skills other than those conveyed by university degrees or university knowledge. Many people can be recruited who have an outgoing and sympathetic point of view, people who can communicate with these young people who need help and assistance. At the same time, if the hon. Minister is really going to solve this long-term problem of staff, he should be looking right now in our high schools and in our universities; in these places he should be stepping up his recruitment drive.

The hon. member for Bracondale has already stressed this tonight. If the hon. Minister is going to find the psychiatrists, psychologists and social workers so necessary to a corrections programme, these people must ultimately be found in the post-secondary system. Because of this, the hon. Minister should now be undertaking a strong promotional campaign within the high schools and the universities to persuade good students to enter the corrections field as a life work.

The hon. Minister mentioned this, but the very fact that he has not told us anything of the scope of the bursaries being offered, or anything of the scope of response being elicited on the part of the university students, my suspicion, again, is that the programme so far has not been successful enough. He can not put it out in bald terms and say, "this and this has been accomplished." So, I think that if we are going to face up to the problem, it means first of all more financial aid to the universities to strengthen those departments' training personnel in the corrections field. The hon. Minister has made a start here, but the start is not adequate.

Then, of course, there is the stepping up of a bursary programme, which has already been mentioned tonight, in conjunction with an intensified recruitment drive. Here again, perhaps more inducement should be offered. I understand, from what the hon. Minister said last year, that he is already offering that full tuition may well be paid, provided that the student will, in return, serve a certain number of years in the reform field. This, perhaps, could be expanded.

Then, of course, there could be an expanded in-service training to give present staff ample opportunity to become fully qualified professionals in this field. Again I was struck by one of the statements in one of the reports of the hon. Minister, that it is planned to have this kind of in-service training and that a manual is to be prepared.

I have in my hands here—for the informa-

tion of the hon. Minister, and he no doubt has a copy of it, too—a manual which is being used and has been used for many years in the province of Saskatchewan. The date is March 24, 1960, and this manual has been used very successfully in that province. There are manuals of this type available and surely it does not take this long to get proper manuals and a proper standard set for in-service training—to allow the people, who are now in service, the time they need to build up the knowledge and the training that they ought to have.

Certainly, it would pay this province to release some of these people a year at a time. Because they have had some experience, they are building on experience. It would pay to release them a year at a time to take further training at the university, or at other levels.

There is one other problem that I think the hon. Minister must face in his total reorganization programme. In speaking to specialists in this field, one of the problems is this: Psychiatrists, psychologists, and social workers do not like to be isolated. Perhaps this is one of the reasons why the offices of some of these people in Millbrook and other institutions lie empty, except on the half days when people come in from outside to do the job. People in these fields like to be in a group where they can consult with each other, and I think this is something that the hon. Minister ought to think about seriously when he is revamping his institutions.

As he rebuilds Guelph and Mercer, and these other places where smaller institutions and smaller groups are going to emerge, perhaps larger groupings are needed so that specialists can be used to the full. And, too, these specialists can come together easily and quickly for consultation, for the kind of intellectual stimulation they need, and for the kind of social life they like with each other.

So it may be that we should think, not in terms of spreading out these institutions as we have in the past, wherever some hon. member may want an institution in his own riding, but that these should be more centralized, near the larger centres of population, where specialists could be grouped together and where those specialists could then be utilized to their full ability. I think this is very important, Mr. Chairman, and I am sure the hon. Minister is aware of this; and I stress it for his edification again tonight.

The other feature I want to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Chairman, is that of rehabilitation. I am not going to spend too

long on this tonight, because it will be coming up again in the estimates—and perhaps that is the time to really discuss it more in detail. But the estimates that were presented to us show that about three per cent of the budget is devoted to rehabilitation. This is in the parole service, and the grants to John Howard, Elizabeth Fry, and others.

I know that more rehabilitation work is being carried on than this, by voluntary agencies. But as far as the expenditures of this government are concerned, it looks to me, and I stand to be corrected if the hon. Minister has other figures, that about three per cent of the total budget is being spent on rehabilitation. This is just not good enough, even if the figure was several times this. As a matter of fact, it again underlines the fact that in this department, emphasis is still on punishment rather than the restoration of the offender to a self-respecting place in society.

Last year I asked certain questions about the rehabilitation staff attached to this department and, as usual, I got the answer just in the dying days of the session. Some changes have taken place since a year ago, and I hope those changes are for the better. But on the basis of the figures given then, and these are the only ones I can operate on at the present time, an extremely unfortunate and inexcusable situation exists.

This is not the fault of the staff—lest the hon. Minister tries to throw up another smoke screen and say we are blaming the staff and he is coming to the defence of the staff—I stress that. It is made up of dedicated and hard-working people, for the most part; but too many are being asked to undertake tasks and workloads far beyond what they should be facing. Of the 52 active parole officers listed last year, only one is a university graduate, and 44 have an academic achievement of grade 12 or less. It is encouraging to note that most officers are now upgrading their qualifications by specialized courses, although the department at that time did not offer an in-service training course and, I understand, still does not.

The caseload carried by the staff is far too high. They average 45, at least ten more than it ought to be. In many cases it goes up well over 50; and in two cases, 75 and 96—an impossible situation, no matter how good the officers concerned may be. Thirty-two of the 52 have caseloads of 40 or more. This is too high for effective work.

There is absolutely no evidence that the department is setting higher standards for new recruits for the rehabilitation staff. Perhaps the hon. Minister can tell us if this is

wrong. Recent additions have grade 12 standing, except in the one case of a B.A. What are needed then, in the rehabilitation service, are four main things:

1. Increased salaries, so that higher standards can be demanded, and I know the problem here of civil service negotiations and all this. But we did overcome this in this case of the teachers last year; and certainly the civil service, I am certain, is willing to negotiate higher standards for many of these people.

2. A rapidly stepped up training programme for present staff, so that they can qualify for higher pay scale. As I said before, this may mean leave of absence with pay for university training or specialized work, for longer periods than now obtains.

3. The immediate setting of higher standards of admission to the service, with a university degree or its equivalent as a basic requirement.

Adding sufficient staff to reduce caseloads to proper proportions.

With this done, Mr. Chairman, there is still the whole problem of placing the emphasis upon rehabilitation, the problem of halfway houses, the problem of adequate treatment within the institutions. I have a case of which the hon. Minister is aware—I do not want to use names, so I will change some of the details so that no one is recognized. But last year, a case came to my attention of a young man, married with a family, who had an abnormal sexual drive and who one night assaulted a young lady. He did not complete the assault, because he came to his senses when the girl started to scream. He went home, and he told his wife what had happened.

In the meantime the girl had laid a complaint with the police and a week later he gave himself up, because of his guilt feelings, and asked that he be given treatment. He had already, as a matter of fact, arranged for private treatment for his abnormal sex drive. Here are a few excerpts I would like to read to the House from his solicitor:

Mr. X was convicted on a charge of indecent assault after he had given himself up and asked for treatment. He was convicted, was sentenced to a year in jail. He spent several weeks at the Don jail in Toronto and was subsequently transferred to Guelph. Mrs. X was on relief along with the children and, of course, having a very difficult time. Two jobs, as a matter of fact, were available for Mr. X when he came out of Guelph or if he could get parole.

And the solicitor goes on to say:

I found Mr. X a very sensitive man, and he feels that he would be susceptible to treatment and that he is very much in need of the same. Upon talking to his wife, I find that he has received no psychiatric treatment whatever to date in Guelph. I think it is important to note that the particular offence was not accompanied by any physical violence whatsoever and, on the contrary, when the accused realized what he was doing he immediately went home and, to his credit, told his wife.

He also gave himself up voluntarily to the police after approximately one week, as a result of his guilt feelings. In addition, he appears to have sufficient insight to appreciate that he needs treatment and is willing to take treatment. Appointments had been made at the forensic clinic and the family had arranged to pay for private treatments until such time as this appointment had been obtained.

Now the unfortunate part of it was that, before the treatments were available to him, he was sentenced and the treatments were not given. The doctor, the director of psychiatric services, Dr. Hughes, says this:

The logical way to control his behaviour is not by punishing him as much as by trying to treat him and remove the excessive drive from which he suffers. There are techniques presently available for this kind of operation, which have at least some chance of success.

These could be carried out either at the forensic clinic or at the Toronto psychiatric hospital, or could be arranged to be set up on a private basis. It would seem to me, at the moment, reasonable to offer such evidence in court, and to attempt to persuade the court perhaps to deal with the patient by placing him on probation, with his acceptance of some treatment to try to change his behaviour as a condition of that probation.

The only difficulty about the forensic clinic is that there is a relatively large demand for their services and it may be that the waiting list for outpatient care would be rather long.

Now I am not blaming the hon. Minister for this. The matter of sentencing is not his prerogative. But I think the whole matter of sentencing has to be reviewed, in the light of cases like this.

This man was paroled, and is receiving treatment. It just seems that the whole

gambit, from the very young to the top limit of age as far as that is concerned, of people who need treatment, ought to be looked at carefully. Emphasis not on punishment; I think the emphasis of this department is away from that now, as far as possible. The emphasis must be upon the kind of treatment the offender needs to restore him to society, because all too often his condition is a result of mistreatment within the society in which he found himself.

So this kind of rehabilitation is the thing which the hon. Minister is interested in, which his staff is interested in, and this is why it seems to me there has to be some unity along the whole line of corrections, and a change of emphasis. But that change of emphasis just cannot come in the present institutions as we find them except in some that are now developing.

I would hope in Hagersville and Ingleside, institutions like this, that there is real hope and that this kind of pattern will emerge and that this Minister will resolve that within a given number of years. I would hope that soon institutions, such as we have known in the past and which still are there, with hundreds of men or women in them, will be rebuilt and that the old concepts will go with them so that the emphasis of the future will be on the need of the human being.

I wish the hon. Minister well in his endeavour. I hope he will level with this House and that he will find real success in the couple of years that he has left in this post.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Before we proceed with the vote I would like to make some comments on some questions which were raised by the hon. members. In the first place I might deal with some statements made by the hon. member for Bracondale yesterday. I will only deal with those which I could make out as being the specific matters which he had raised yesterday. It was a rather long speech and, as the hon. member knows, the transcripts are not yet available; *Hansard* is not yet available, so we could not go into it in detail.

There are a number of things which trouble me and I think it would be important to get them on the record. I would like first to deal, right at the outset, with the charges he made about the use of tear gas in Millbrook reformatory. I want to do this because, of all the points, Mr. Chairman, brought up by the hon. member for Bracondale yesterday, this is the one which con-

cerns me the most; because hon. members of this House listening to the account as presented by the hon. member would get a completely wrong impression and certainly must have been disturbed by the charge. I would like to get the record straight right now.

This was a completely exaggerated, albeit colourful and moving, account, based on something which happened, but in no way giving any indication of exactly what happened.

The hon. member has stated that there was no riot, although parenthetically I might remind the hon. members that he asked a question before the orders one day in which he asked something about what happened as a result of that riot. Yesterday he said there was no riot; he found no evidence.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): On a point of order. I sat here for that. The hon. Minister misrepresented what took place. He tried to get the hon. member for Bracondale to say that there was a riot, and I think myself that he is still trying to give that implication. As far as I was concerned in listening, it was the hon. Minister who wanted to get a suggestion that there was a riot, and I want that in *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. leader of the Opposition might have been just a little more cautious, because it is right in the record that the question was asked "as a result of a riot," words of that nature; but he did use the term "the riot," and I was trying to elicit from him at that time whether in fact he felt that there was a riot. I did not get an answer. So I was quite correct, Mr. Chairman; he did ask that. Yesterday he said there was no riot. I said there was no riot. And the reason for that was the action taken by the staff prevented a riot.

If I may quote from the hon. member, he said, and I quote him:

Simply because the custodial staff felt that they were going to lose control.

"Simply because"—now, Mr. Chairman, that is a very important phrase—"Simply because."

Really, this is not a simple matter at all. In an institution of hardened offenders, surely the hon. member must appreciate what losing control can mean? Action taken by the staff over a period of five days caused annoyance and discomfort to 28 inmates. What untold injury and suffering they prevented will never be known, because had there

been a riot obviously things would have been much more terrible.

The institution is a maximum security institution, the only maximum security institution we have in our system. It is built with many precautions, some of which are only necessary on rare occasions but are designed to reduce the effect of mob violence.

There have been, in the past, riots in many penal institutions across the world and in Canada which invariably do untold physical damage to inmates and staff alike, and often enough result in death. The situation in Millbrook, thanks and thanks only to the action of the staff, was prevented from developing into uncontrollable violence.

Following the fires there were growing disturbances in the institution. The superintended reported, and I quote:

To prevent the possibility of the situation worsening, the officers were equipped with gas billies and the inmates cautioned that further disturbers would be subdued with this gas.

The use of tear gas is never a pleasant operation but it is a relatively humane and effective way of quelling a disturbance.

I have already quoted in this House, I think, in the past, the American correctional association training guide which states, and I quote:

The use of riot control gases is the most effective way of achieving temporary incapacitation of a riotous group with the least permanent injury. It is much more satisfactory than the use of direct force in subduing a rioting prisoner. The use of force can, of course, result in injury to both prisoners and staff members who are trying to subdue them.

Tear gas was used in small enough quantities to limit its effect to individual cells on the following dates: July 6, 12 inmates; July 7, two inmates; July 8, two inmates; July 9, five inmates; and July 10, seven inmates.

I would like to make two points about this, Mr. Chairman.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give the hon. member an opportunity, if he lets me finish this point.

Mr. Ben: This is apropos to what the hon. Minister is now reading.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, I will quote it again to the hon. member if he likes.

I would like to make two points about this, Mr. Chairman. The hon. member gave the impression that there was widespread, indiscriminate, unnecessary use of the gas. This is totally incorrect. This was the first occasion that the present superintendent ever ordered the use of tear gas and he did this only because in his opinion it is a most necessary precaution when the circumstances warrant it.

The second point is that the situation most definitely did warrant it. The hon. member's statement that it was used while men were sleeping, innocently asking for lights and so on, is completely ridiculous. It would have been impossible for any inmate to sleep through the noise that was being created which caused the use of the tear gas.

It was never administered to anyone who was not creating a disturbance. It was never given to anyone except after a warning. Every person to whom the tear gas was administered was warned most definitely that unless he ceased his unruly conduct gas would be administered to him. The tear gas was used only to quieten those inmates who were shouting abuse, banging doors, damaging property, and indulging in similar uncontrolled behaviour which could incite others to a riot. I should add, Mr. Chairman, this is generally the beginning of riots in penal institutions; this is the way they begin. And I would like to get that clear.

If the hon. member has a question.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want to ask a question of the Minister?

Mr. Ben: Of the hon. Minister, yes. In reading, Mr. Minister, you read as follows:

Tear gas was used in the recent disturbance in small enough quantities to limit its effect to individual cells—
Is that not so?

Mr. Chairman, is it not also so that in a report made by Mr. James Marsland, the superintendent, the words were: "riot gas was used in the recent disturbances"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I have said that here too—

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister used the words "tear gas," with all due respect.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I quoted, Mr. Chairman, from the American correctional association—they call it "riot gas," but it is, in effect, tear gas. There are other nauseous gases which could be used and which are much more uncomfortable than tear gas.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I will ask the hon. Minister once more: Was not the word used in the report of Mr. Marsland the word "riot," rather than "tear," in the phrase which was read to this honourable House? And I quote the hon. Minister's phrase again:

Tear gas was used in the recent disturbances in small enough quantities to limit its effects to individual cells.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that the report made by his superintendent to him said:

Riot gas was used in the recent disturbances in small enough quantities to limit its effects to individual cells.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if it will make the hon. member happy, I will tell him that this tear gas is a riot gas.

Mr. Bryden: That is not the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Then what is the question?

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister misread the report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not misread the report at all. I was quoting from the American correctional association training guide.

Mr. Bryden: You were quoting from a report—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know that one can make a point of anything here, Mr. Chairman. It is riot gas and it is tear gas.

Mr. Ben: May I direct another question to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: If he wants to accept it.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, was there not a paragraph subsequent to the one describing the quantities of gas used—or rather the dates the gas was used and the inmates on whom it was used? This paragraph from the report of the superintendent, and I quote:

The situation was at all times well under control and a great deal of credit is due to the staff for the way they conducted themselves. Staff morale was high throughout and voluntary co-operation beyond the normal hours of work was exemplary.

Was that contained in the report of Mr. Marsland?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What report is the hon. member talking about? The one dated July 15?

Mr. Ben: I cannot swear as to the date, Mr. Chairman, I am not the Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have a report before me; perhaps this might have better waited until we went into the votes when my specialists were here, but the one I have here is a report from Mr. Marsland dated July 15: "Attached are dated lists showing the names of the inmates who were subdued with tear gas."

Not that it really makes any difference, but to be exact in the terminology, he has used "tear gas" here. Perhaps the hon. member might ask that when the vote comes and maybe there is another report with which, at the moment, I am not familiar.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the educational levels of the staff. This concerns me a great deal, too. The hon. member was advised that the average formal educational level of the correctional officers at Guelph and Millbrook was 9½ grades of schooling and then he was quick to make, as he called it, his "humble submission" that the inmates have a higher educational level than the people who are there to correct.

I do not know where he got that information.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): You agreed.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I did not say that at all. I said that they were smarter than the hon. member and myself in many instances, and I will still say that.

I might add that these statements are reported in the press this morning. Again, I do not want the hon. member to feel that I am lecturing him or anybody else, because I have used this kind of an argument before and I am most sincere in this particular area—in this particular field you have to be careful of the nature of your criticism. This has already caused disruption in two of our other institutions.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, no! We are sick of that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is the truth—

Mr. Bryden: That is always your shelter from criticism.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is the truth because they read in the papers, "Inmates Top Staff in Education, Ben says"—it states here. They listen to the radio, they read the newspapers, and the inmates begin needing the staff and make life very difficult.

Mr. Bryden: They are even more sensitive than the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course they are sensitive.

Now let us find out about the average educational level. This morning I had a survey made of 8,260 inmates who have come into our institutions during this fiscal year, up to the last weekend. The survey shows that the grade they stated they had completed was as follows: "Grade 6 or less—1,416, grade 7—"

There is no one going into all the grades. I will tell the hon. member that the average education of the inmates comes out of just over grade 8, and when this is the level—

Mr. Ben: May I ask a question of the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Let me finish this, please.

Mr. Chairman: I think that what we had better do is to inform the member of the procedure of the House. What has been the procedure of this House when in committee is to have the Minister speak and to allow two spokesmen—from each of the other two parties—and then allow the Minister to answer questions before proceeding with the vote.

Any question or any discussions the member has I suggest he holds for the individual vote.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is the level claimed by the inmates—I say this advisedly, because very often we find that their claims are a little exaggerated when we check their actual school records for particular purposes, so it is probably even lower than this.

Simply aside from these facts, the hon. member's submission is anything but humble as he suggested. Really, it does bespeak some contempt for honest, law-abiding citizens who have not had the opportunity to have the same kind of an education. There is an implication here, because these people have a grade 9 or grade 10 education, they are not capable of doing this job.

I do not feel that there is any relationship between school achievement and a sense of responsibility to one's fellow man, or to one's job. I believe that a correctional officer with 9½ years of formal education can, through his honesty and personal maturity, set a good example for an anti-social youth placed in his care.

The hon. member may wish to challenge me in this regard and perhaps I am biased because of my own limited formal education, yet I must speak out for these people

who are subjected to unfavourable comparison with the inmates of Millbrook and Guelph reformatories by a member who seems to feel that education is an attribute to be rated higher than maturity, honesty and hard work and the attempt to do a difficult job under trying circumstances.

However, everything else being equal, we would, of course, certainly hire individuals with higher educational standards. But let us get this clear, Mr. Chairman. How far should we go? Should we have university graduates as correctional officers? This would be highly desirable in some ways, but in other ways it would be undesirable even if attainable. The socio-economic gap between staff directly associated with inmates and the inmates themselves might be too great in some instances for optimum communication. I think this is a self-evident statement.

Secondly, it is somewhat impractical. Should we insist on a minimum of grade 12? This would be $2\frac{1}{2}$ grades higher than the existing average. What is there, however, in the content of grades 10, 11 and 12, which will enable an individual to form a better relationship with inmates with a view to modifying their attitudes in desirable directions?

Certainly, by and large, individuals who have completed grade 12 have probably indicated a higher level of initiative than individuals who dropped out in a lower grade, but so many other variables are important here that it is extremely difficult to generalize.

Does formal educational level indicate intelligence? Certainly if one measures the intelligence of a representative group of grade 12 graduates, and a representative group of grade 9 graduates, the mean for grade 12 will be higher. However, intelligence tests are much better measures of this in individual cases, and I think that is self-evident. These, we use. People with higher grade levels are, on the average, more trainable and are better able to write a report. However, there is so much overlap here that one has to look at the individual case rather than consider groups.

We are interested in obtaining the type of person with some sensibility for other people, with some understanding of other people, and the ability to maintain a reasonable level of objectivity. The only way to assess this effectively is by on-the-job observation of behaviour. An example of the danger of generalizing in this area I think I mentioned the other day—I think I used this in reference

to playing hockey on the basis of scoring statistics—the Chicago Black Hawks are probably a better team than the New York Rangers. However, some New York players can play hockey better than some players for Chicago, and I think that is self-evident, too.

Another point worth considering: even if all the things the hon. member said are desirable, are in fact desirable and we should do something right away, would he suggest we fire all staff members today whose formal education was no higher than grade nine?

Mr. Bryden: No one said that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I mean, we are doing whatever we can to upgrade the training of those we have in our employment today. What shall we do? Fire all those people who have been there for years for no other reason than that they have not got a higher academic education?

Further, Mr. Chairman, I resent the implication by the hon. member that the term "correctional officer" is euphemistic. He made some jokes about this the other night; he kept saying "custodial officer, pardon me, I mean correctional officer." I think this is not worthy—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I do not think this is worthy of the hon. member. The reason for changing this name from custodial officer in the first place was to emphasize to the man himself the rehabilitative nature of his job. This is part and parcel of the staff training.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): A rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well now, that is ridiculous. If the hon. member knew anything about the work and the problems you always have in changing staff attitudes, he would appreciate that this sort of thing is important.

Now I do not know, Mr. Chairman—the hon. member has made some point about the fact that I always use this argument about the effect it has on tensions, creating tensions in other institutions. This is a particular type of work. It is not quite the same as work in other departments. You have penal institutions in which any kind of action can be triggered off into a riot at any moment, at any moment—and it does happen.

As a matter of fact, this is what is happening in some of the institutions today as a result of all the publicity about Millbrook

and the suggestions now that the inmates have a better educational standard than the staff, because they get needled by the inmates who are always trying to prove that they are somewhat better than the staff at the institution.

An hon. member: Are you sure you have got the best?

Mr. Bryden: I should think they are mature enough to put up with it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, they are, but a human being can stand only so much and it is very difficult for them.

Mr. Charman: I might ask the member to direct the question through the chair, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am very pleased the hon. member also raised some questions about the training, and I told the hon. member yesterday that what he was reading was in fact only the introductory training, and I think he said that if I could point out to him that this was only a small aspect of their training he would apologize.

I have here quite a lengthy list of the complete training. I will not trouble the House with it at this time; if they would like it, when we get to the staff training in the estimates, I will be glad to read it to them, but the introductory training which the hon. member referred to the other day is only a very small proportion of the training undertaken by our staff.

I think some of the other items which I was going to raise, Mr. Chairman, would be just as well raised in the votes themselves so far as the hon. member is concerned.

He did quote quite extensively from Mr. Kirkpatrick of the John Howard society in respect of giving inmates more responsibility, and the main point concerning the quotations which he read from Mr. Kirkpatrick was the need for self-responsibility by inmates as training for them after release, and we agree with this.

We do make very determined efforts to increase responsibility wherever possible. We obviously cannot give every man complete freedom of choice but all men have some area of personal responsibility.

Take the inmates in the Hillsdale forestry camp where the only man on duty at night is the night watchman. He has complete responsibility and he responds to this responsibility. I have been out there and I have talked to the inmates and I would at this time point out to the hon. member that

having met and talked with them I would not describe them as he did the other day, the dross of society and the common criminal. I would never mention it.

Mr. Ben: I was quoting the Deputy Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We will go into that. The hon. member was not quoting the Deputy Minister—this was the same thing that happened last year, Mr. Chairman—somebody quoted the Deputy Minister who was quoting Justice McRuer. Justice McRuer made that statement.

Mr. Ben: It was quoted in the handbook of the hon. Minister for last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In the Deputy Minister's report to the Minister contained in the annual report he quoted this as a statement made by Justice McRuer. He talked about the problems after release.

Mr. Chairman, the statements he made about the problems of the releasee after he gets out in society, are familiar to us. I have mentioned this on numerous occasions. We are very much concerned with them. We do everything possible to help them. I have on a number of occasions discussed this problem in the House.

We have completely reorganized our rehabilitation and after-care services. We have increased our grants to the social agencies, working in the after-care field. I think the hon. member for Yorkview has mentioned this, too. In fact, there is an extremely strong programme at the moment. I think the hon. member will appreciate this when I say we gave assistance to 6,597 inmates. We contacted 1,930 employers and made arrangements for employment in 1,712 cases. We arranged board and lodging for 1,144, provided clothing for 1,158 and provided other types of assistance to 2,507 inmates.

Now insofar as the amount of money expended, I have this further on in some comments made by the hon. member for Yorkview, insofar as the percentage of the budget that we spent on rehabilitation, this really does not bear any relationship to the problem that we have.

As a matter of fact, in many instances the money set aside to help buy clothing and tools and things of that nature, the cash we give to some of the inmates when they are released, is not even always used up, for the simple reason that you cannot give everyone who comes out of the institution this help.

Many of them refuse it, they want to have nothing to do with the people who have kept them in an institution. Others, because of their record, it is known, the minute you give them \$20 or \$30 or \$40 or \$50, or buy them new clothing, even sometimes, will go out and hook the clothing to get some money or use the cash for alcohol and they are back in trouble again.

And I will say this flatly, without any hesitation at all, no inmate goes out of our institutions who is properly motivated and is prepared to accept our assistance, who does not get every possible assistance that is available. Money is no object, money is no object.

Mr. Young: My point is your kind of institution cannot motivate them!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we will get to that later. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will not go into some of the others. They will probably develop in the vote.

As far as the hon. member for Yorkview is concerned, I want to thank him for the compliments he has given me. I want to say that this is the first time really, since this started, that I have heard someone get down to real cases where we can have a good, intelligent debate on philosophy and the manner of carrying out our programme, when it appears to have gaps.

We may differ in some of our opinions, but at least there was an intelligent discussion and I appreciate it very much, particularly the compliments.

Now I just want to point this out. Of course, it is very obvious in a Legislature that if a Minister gets up and points out the advances, the progress that his department is making, there is only one answer that the Opposition can give: "Well it is about time," or, make the suggestion that the hon. member has made, that this implies criticism of my predecessors.

It does not imply criticism of my predecessors at all. My predecessors made progress in their day. And I am making, I hope, progress in mine. There is no criticism of them at all and I am sure they did not take it that way.

There was also a suggestion, and I think with a certain amount of truth, that I have not shown too much humility in this job of mine. I agree with the hon. member, that I might show more humility in this job. I will be quite frank with the hon. members of this House. I am not showing any humility and for a very good reason. For too long

The Department of Reform Institutions has been taking a shellacking from everyone in this province who felt they needed a head-line and I decided it was going to stop, so long as I could help it. They have been doing a good job. We have had thousands of staff, year in and year out, being given public abuse where it was not deserved.

They have, I think all hon. members will agree, one of the most difficult jobs in this province. The hon. member for Yorkview admitted this in many instances. It is most difficult. They are getting the most difficult types in society to handle. And why should not somebody start telling the story of this department and the hard work that the staff is doing, and why should we not tell people—

Mr. Thompson: Did your predecessors tell that story?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did they tell the story? I presume they did.

Mr. Bryden: Why then were you implying that they did not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I guess my predecessors had more humility than I have. Let us put it that way. I just decided, as I say, that the department was hiding its light under a bushel. Now the hon. members have themselves said; "Open up your doors, let us see what is going on." Well, this is what I am trying to do. How do you do that, unless you go out on the circuit and tell people what you are doing and advertise what you are doing, even though there are many hazards attached to it? And this is what I have been attempting to do.

Now the hon. member has pointed out that we should not have to deal with those, I think he said, who have already reached age six and are in difficulty; they should have been dealt with by other means. As I say, I am glad that he appreciates the difficulties we have with many of these youngsters.

Mr. Young: Will you tell your Cabinet—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, let me say this. He suggested I talk to my colleagues. We have already set up two interdepartmental committees to deal with this problem. We have been meeting regularly this year. We have already, in our department, set up meetings with magistrates and judges. Our staff is meeting with them regularly. We attend their meetings and we discuss the matter of sentencing, and so on, in an in-

formal way with the magistrates, only in an effort to point out to them, to give them an understanding of the kind of institutions we have, so that when they sentence somebody they will know in fact what kind of an institution they are sentencing them to, and some of the other problems involved.

We are having informal discussions with them, I should say at their invitation, but we have arranged it now on an organized basis.

We have arranged for magistrates and judges on an organized basis to visit our institutions, so they will understand exactly what happens to these people.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Will the hon. Minister accept a question, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: What is the question?

Mr. Sargent: This question is that this hon. Minister has been telling us what a great job he is doing in this department and we have been talking about a reform programme for county jails across the province, and here we are three years later still getting promises, but no action yet.

Mr. Chairman: What is the question?

Mr. Sargent: The county jails.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): The question is: are there any new county jails?

Mr. Sargent: But this is getting pretty ridiculous, so what are you doing about it, have you stopped talking about it?

Mr. Chairman: I have to suggest to the member for Grey North, we will deal with any question he may have in the vote.

On vote 1901:

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I did not interrupt the hon. Minister after he completed his short address, I understood I would be entitled to ask him a question.

Mr. Chairman: Is the question something that cannot be asked in the vote?

Mr. Ben: Well, it arose out of his speech.

Mr. Chairman: I think under the circumstances I would prefer you to ask it in the vote.

Mr. Ben: I have a number of questions, the hon. Minister promised I could ask later, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: State your point of order, please.

Mr. S. Lewis: On a point of order, although I know it is probably inadvertent, perhaps the Chairman could indicate the estimate procedure in the various areas so that the members of the House are acquainted with the way it is followed. Perhaps you could just take a moment to explain the procedure.

Mr. Chairman: Each member of the House has a copy of the estimates and they are in front of him. Each item is listed there for the members.

Mr. Thompson: Following this point of order, I understand that the hon. member for Bracondale is asking a question under 1901, under the general estimates—

Mr. Chairman: Under 1901? Yes, I am prepared now to hear the member for Bracondale on vote 1901.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct a number of questions regarding institutions to the hon. Minister.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the general estimates do not cover—

Mr. Ben: Oh no, the general estimates I believe would cover institutions.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think in the interests of the rest of the members, the questions on institutions should come under 1903.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member for Bracondale that if his questions deal with institutions, they will come under vote No. 1903.

Mr. Sargent: A question on 1901, Mr. Chairman. We have 35 county jails in this province and the answer we always get is that this programme is underway. I would like to ask the hon. Minister: what capital programme has he set up in county jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, really I guess I have not had the lack of humility I attributed to myself, because I have spoken so much on the regional detention plan I thought every hon. member really was acquainted with its progress.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant) If you called them jails, the hon. members would understand.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): You do not really believe that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About a year and a half ago, I should say this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: If you want to expedite the work of the House—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, about a year and a half ago I announced in Kingston that this government was prepared to assist financially groups of counties who would get together to provide one combined detention centre. At that time—I am giving you the whole story—at that time I had not had a firm commitment as to how much that would be. I was feeling the question out as it were.

We got some interest from the counties. I then got from my government, my colleagues, the agreement that we would provide 50 per cent of the cost of construction to any group of counties to replace their local county jails with regional detention. We have been very successful with this, because in this period of time, we have already two agreements completely signed, representing seven counties, and their seven jails being replaced by two regional detention centres. Let me finish, please.

Mr. Sargent: I am with you, but will you answer a question on this point?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North should let the Minister finish the question. If you have other questions the Minister will answer them of course.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: And another agreement has been announced between Hamilton and Wentworth, an agreement which will be formally signed shortly.

There are presently going on, discussions with numerous other groups of counties. Now I think this is a fair amount of success. Obviously when you sign an agreement you do not open up a regional detention centre the next day. The hon. member, being a very astute businessman, knows you have to draw up plans, you have to have your architects draw up detailed plans, you decide on a site and then you send out for tenders. This takes a considerable period of time.

So I think we can say we have really got some real action in respect of this programme, which is, we believe, the first of its kind in North America.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, this is a tough department to handle. We will acknowledge that, but the thing is your policy is completely wrong insofar as the solving of this

very important part of penology in this province because we have 35 glaring abscesses on our society here and the hon. Minister knows this. If every hon. member in the 35 areas would spend a weekend in one of those jails, we would change our policy entirely. And I would suggest the hon. Minister should spend a weekend in one of those jails, just to actually see the situation. The point is that you say you are going to share 50 per cent of the cost and I suggest that that is the reason why you are not getting any success with the programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are having success.

Mr. Sargent: That is not success, two agreements in three years. There are no buildings up. At this point, the hon. Minister is just talking. The reason, Mr. Chairman, that you cannot get any co-operation from the counties and cities involved is because of your financing and this is not just because of real estate, it is the cost of jails, county jails. It is the full responsibility of this government to look after this entirely and until you change your policy you will never eradicate 35 of these jails. So I think you must take some steps towards changing your policy, it is completely wrong.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, last week the hon. Minister gave us a list of the people who are on the planning committee for regional detention centres and in his report for 1965 he has pictures of these people and it is a panel which is impressive. Again, I call to the attention of the hon. Minister the problem that he faces, a problem which has been discussed time after time in this House, that he is—

Mr. Chairman: We are on No. 5, the advisory committee.

Mr. Young: I am dealing with the advisory committee. Time after time in this House it has been pointed out that each department seems to be going off on its own and not relating to the other departments.

We are facing a situation in Ontario where regional municipal governments are beginning to emerge. If we are to have genuine regional governments, these must take over the work relating to jails, education, health and all the other facets of municipal governments.

But I would have thought, Mr. Chairman, that when the hon. Minister set up his committee that he would have included on this committee a representative from The Depart-

ment of Municipal Affairs so that that department would have a voice in saying where these regional detention centres are going to be. Because there is no question that if three or four counties at this point decide to get together, those may not be the logical counties which may come together in a regional government at a later time.

Now we do know that regional governments must be centred around perhaps some of the bigger cities and bigger centres in the province, and certainly the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) must have some ideas in this regard. The regional jail or detention centre, call it what you will, should be built in relationship to what seems to be a logical emerging regional municipal unit.

So I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he has given any thought to an additional member on this committee, a member who would represent the thinking of The Department of Municipal Affairs. It seems to me essential and very important that this be done.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, in the first place there are no agreements signed which are not signed with the consideration and advice of The Department of Municipal Affairs. Although I must tell the hon. member also, Mr. Chairman, that really if we were going to wait in The Department of Reform Institutions for any other kinds of plans which are in existence, discussion about perhaps an advance system of probation and bail and all this sort of thing, we would never get anything done. We just go ahead and do our job.

Secondly, the groupings which are approved now by the department are such that they would be viable any other way. I mean, you have to concern yourself with distances travelled by lawyers and this sort of thing and visits by families. All of these things are taken into consideration by the planning committee in deciding on a viable group, so really even outside of the matter of regional governments, these would be the natural groupings for this sort of a programme.

Mr. Young: So you are determining in fact the regional boundaries.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are determining the regional boundaries for this work, for regional detention centres.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think both the hon. member for Grey North and the

hon. member for Yorkview opened up a most important field here.

Dealing first with the remarks of the hon. member for Yorkview, which I think are most pertinent: The hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) has his ideas of regions for educational purposes, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) has his ideas of regions for economic purposes, the hon. Minister of Highways has his ideas for regions for his purposes, and we can run through about ten colleagues of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions and each one has a different idea of what regions are for their own particular purpose.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order; the whole matter of regional organization of this province should not come up under the estimates of the Minister of Reform Institutions. I think it is completely out of order, Mr. Chairman, and I think you should so rule. Reference to The Department of Highways on the estimates of the Minister of Reform Institutions in terms of the broad area of regionalization of course is completely out of order, and I suggest you rule it so.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, this hon. Minister is talking about The Department of Highways, we are not interested in highways yet.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I have heard the point of order by the Minister and I rule the member for Downsview in order.

Mr. Singer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I must protest your ruling. Just briefly, if I may—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, can you, Mr. Chairman, vouchsafe to me the extent to which the regionalization of jails has anything to do with The Department of Highways as proposed by the hon. member for Downsview? Can you tell me that that is in order, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I think the member for Downsview has been pointing out that there are different regions through different departments and he was correlating them altogether.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if I may, in pursuance to my point of order—

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, if I may?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Are you asking me to resume my seat, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: I have made my ruling and I would ask the Minister to resume his seat, please.

An hon. member: Mr. Chairman, obviously we need more reform institutions.

Mr. Chairman: Sit down, please. The member for Downsview.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, as I was saying, I would like to know from the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions the basis on which he determines the regions for these agreements that he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would like the member for Downsview—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Will the Minister state his point of order?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I still submit to you, sir, and to the hon. members of this House that what is being proposed by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions in terms of certain regional concepts has no relationship to any reference to The Department of Highways. That, Mr. Chairman, is my point of order.

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting to the Minister of Highways that the member for Downsview is making a comparison and I have ruled him in order and I have asked him to be relevant.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, if I was not constantly interrupted by points of order, that is exactly the point I am trying to make. My last question was directed to the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. I say how can the hon. Minister, without taking into consideration the regional considerations of all of his colleagues, including the hon. Minister of Highways, determine regions by himself?

I say how can he do that, and I would like to know what mental processes go through

the decision-making in his department in determining these regions?

Does he meet with his other colleagues, does he meet with the Ministers of highways, economics, education, municipal affairs and all these other people in determining these regions? Now, that is point No. 1.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I thought I made my point clear. We do discuss it with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. I think I forgot, or I might have mentioned that we discussed this with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. We do not discuss it, as far as I can recall, with other hon. Ministers.

I tried to make the point at least anyway that there was nothing in the regional detention centre plans which would mitigate against regional governments because you have to take into consideration other considerations such as the proximity to highways and, if possible, proximity to areas from which you can draw treatment staff, and so on.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, the point I am trying to make is, I can understand the considerations the hon. Minister does take into mind, but he is omitting the very important consideration because of the peculiarities of his plan, of the finances and economics of the local area.

He is calling on each of these regions that he determines, or his department determines—I use the “he” collectively—for contribution of 50 per cent of the cost of the particular institution.

What advice does he have that this is an economic possibility? What advice does he have that his various groupings are going to be able to levy the sort of taxes that are going to pay for the 50 per cent of the cost? What advice, what reports, does get from the hon. Minister of Economics? What assessment reports? What taxation revenues? What debt statements does he get from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs?

The point, I think, is crystal clear and I have not yet heard the answer. Perhaps the hon. Minister has a better answer than the one he gave us. What economic analysis does he do before he gets to these regional decisions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They have been very successful in talking to the counties. They consider their own financial position, they discuss this with us, and I say to the hon.

member that generally they are very happy with the 50 per cent contribution and—

Mr. Sargent: Oh, that is not true.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: —and the arrangements we have made with them.

Mr. Chairman: The member—

Mr. Singer: No, I am not through yet.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister said that he has two such agreements that involve seven counties, involve, as I understand it, the placement of seven institutions. How many institutions are there all told, is it—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Thirty-five.

Mr. Singer: Thirty-five. And the hon. Minister has only emerged with two signed agreements. What is the total of the provincial contribution for those agreements, and when is that going to be made?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As soon as the plans are made and the budgets drawn up for their particular institution. Because each grouping requires a different size, depending upon the traffic, if I might use that expression, in that area and the accommodation you have to provide for minimum security, the kind of work the minimum security inmates will do—for instance if it is near a forestry area and that sort of thing.

We have drawn up estimates for each one of these groups and it is on these estimates that they base their decisions. And as I say to the hon. member, it has been very successful, it is progressing much more rapidly than we had hoped. I presume by the end of this year we will probably have two or three more agreements at least involving two, three or four groups of three or four counties.

Now, I think we have as humbly as I can suggest a pretty good grouping.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, the figure which the hon. Minister has in his estimates for county and city jails is the magnificent total of \$520,000. Now, I would imagine that these two agreements would contemplate buildings, what, in the vicinity of a million dollars? How much would each one of these buildings be?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has that confused. The figure he is talking about is our maintenance grants, which have been in existence, are still in existence, 10 per cent.

Mr. Singer: Where do I find the figure?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no figure.

Mr. Singer: There is no figure?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we do not need any figure. There is no figure for it. Just assume as an agreement is signed, the tenders are put out, the money is required, then the money will come from The Department of Public Works for this purpose.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, if there is no figure in here and there are two agreements signed, surely the hon. Minister should be able to stand here and tell us that a certain amount of government money is set aside for this purpose. Now, how much is it? Are you setting aside \$100,000, half a million dollars, \$10 million, for this programme that the hon. Minister tells us is so successful?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Neither of the two groups which has already signed agreements—and it was just a short while ago, if the hon. member has the report in front of him, he will find it was only a very short while ago that these two agreements were signed—they are not ready yet for a definite figure on what the cost is going to be. Because an architect has to draw a plan and then bring in an estimate of what the specific costs are going to be or a pretty close estimate as to what the cost is going to be. It does not make any difference; whatever is approved by the government we will pay 50 per cent of the cost of construction. And the money will be there, coming from The Department of Public Works.

I can presume that there will not be any required between now and the end of the year for that purpose. Obviously, when we have just had two agreements signed. It takes some time for this as the hon. member knows.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister has confirmed my concern about this. A year ago he stood up and said, "Don't ask me about these things because you are going to rock the boat, you might disturb some of our agreements." That was for the year 1965-66.

Now we have the estimates for the year 1966-67, which will take us up to March 31 of 1967. There was not a penny spent a year ago, there is not a penny going to be spent this year and the hon. Minister is unable to point to a penny that he set aside in these estimates to build any of these county or regional jails that he is telling us he has been so successful about.

I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that this whole plan really does not mean anything, because if the hon. Minister was sincere in his approach and if his approach really meant anything he would be able to point with great pride to the fact that the government had set aside "X" dollars for these purposes. He cannot do that.

Now, if he is going to suggest that after a while, when the architects have drawn their plans and when the tenders come in, then the government is going to allocate moneys, then he is doing another thing that we take very serious objection to. He is spending money without the authority of this House.

Surely this is the time, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister contemplates spending any money for these purposes that he should be able to tell us. It should be in his estimates, and he should get the approval of the House to do that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, surely the hon. member is not questioning my sincerity when he said if I were sincere.

An hon. member: Why not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Because I do not think any member's sincerity should be questioned. However, surely the hon. member does not suggest, too, that we have signed agreements with the counties and promise them 50 per cent of the cost of construction and then when the time comes we will not give it to them? Surely he would not suggest that.

Incidentally, on page 111 in The Department of Public Works, he will find: "Vote No. 3, to provide for grants towards the cost of construction of new jail accommodation as may be directed by the Lieutenant-Governor in council, \$250,000."

Mr. Singer: All right, Mr. Chairman. I thank the hon. Minister and I gather the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell) is rising to point that figure out as well. \$250,000 for two apparently large and expensive institutions.

Is the hon. Minister trying to tell us, is this what he means now, that these two jails that are going to replace seven, are going to be built for a cost of no more than \$500,000? Is that what the hon. Minister is trying to tell us?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am telling the hon. member that you put a token figure in the estimates because you do not know what the costs are going to be and the chances are we may not even have to spend that \$250,000

this year. I think he would agree that the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) should not be putting in, say, five or six or seven or ten million dollars in the estimates when there is little likelihood of it being used in this particular—

Mr. Singer: Ah, that is what I wanted. If there is little likelihood, that is fine. Now the hon. Minister had made his admission.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a fact that building these institutions takes time and whenever the money is needed it will be there.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, then to summarize: The hon. Minister has now admitted there is little likelihood of these buildings being built in the fiscal year ending on March 31, 1967? Am I correct on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a great possibility that they will not be advanced to the extent they will be needing government money at that stage.

Mr. Sargent: That is four or five years—

Mr. Singer: All right. That is fine. So we have lost last year, because it was not nice to talk about these things—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We did not lose last year.

Mr. Singer: Oh no, the hon. Minister was warning us. He warned us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We were out selling the programme to the counties—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview has the floor.

Mr. Singer: There is nothing being built this year and there is very little likelihood that there is any one of them going to be built next year, unless you are not going to do it in accordance with the estimates you bring before us, unless you are going to do it by order-in-council, or by Lieutenant-Governor's warrant and you are trying to conceal the figures from the House.

This is the point, Mr. Chairman. If this programme means anything, then I would hope that the hon. Minister would say: "This is my programme, that we are not going to spend any money until the end of the fiscal year 1967." It must mean, it obviously means, that there is not even going to be a brick erected in either one of those institutions until the end of that year. So the hon. Minister is dragging a red herring across the trail. He tells us what a great hero he is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You are dragging the red herring.

Mr. Singer: He has got a new system that is unique in North America and we are making great progress. But there is not even going to be a building, a brick, a wall, a window or even a cell built as a result of this great plan for another year and a half, or two years. That is point number one.

Now point number two that I wanted to make is this, Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister was patting himself on the back in his humble manner, and saying that this plan that we have—this great plan that we have just been talking about—is the greatest in North America. I wonder if he has bothered to read what is being done in New Brunswick, for instance? That is part of North America. New Brunswick has taken over the whole cost of the administration of justice; the whole cost of erecting jails.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): A very forward government.

Mr. Singer: Yes. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are many, many jurisdictions where there has been an acceptance by the provincial or state government of the responsibility for erecting jails. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister again should have a look at the Stewart committee report. It was made in 1954 and it sat on the shelves and gathered dust for all those years; but one of the most important recommendations in that committee report—and it was a good strong committee and several hon. members of this House, several of the hon. Minister's colleagues in the Cabinet were on the committee—was that the government take over the whole cost of erecting jails. I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that these jails are really not going to be built—notwithstanding the speeches we have heard, notwithstanding all of the great path-blazing that we are doing in North America—unless and until the government of the province of Ontario is prepared to finance them.

The burden on municipalities is such—whether they are counties, or cities or anything else—that they just cannot afford, at this stage, to put in 50 per cent of the cost of these buildings. These are not going to be cheap buildings. They are not going to be \$100,000 buildings. I would contemplate that they will run into many millions of dollars. The municipalities just cannot afford it. I would think that the hon. Minister recognizes this because there is nothing

really in his estimates that commits him to any planned programme of expenditure.

The third point I want to make is this: Can the hon. Minister tell us what, if anything, is going to be done for the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto in connection with improving and rehabilitating the Don jail? I have not heard him mention that at all. Is that under your maintenance grants, or is that in the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works? Are you going to do anything about the Don jail up to March 31, 1967?

Mr. Chairman: Does this come in vote 1901?

Mr. Singer: Yes, county jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, talking about New Brunswick and taking something out of context from the New Brunswick scheme is a fruitless sort of discussion. They have taken over everything. They have not just taken over jails. They have taken over everything.

Mr. Singer: Well, what is wrong with that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if your party wants to get up and suggest that we take over the municipalities and everything else, go ahead and do it, but there is no use taking out of context; it is rather ridiculous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Give the Minister the floor, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As far as the municipalities being in a position to do this; apparently they feel they are, because they have signed some of these agreements and they are prepared to do it, and others are discussing it at the present time. As a matter of fact, there are two counties who have built their own jails within the last seven or eight years. Now the suggestion that we are going out and telling them to pay 50 per cent of the cost is putting a completely reverse picture on it. We are telling them that we are going to help them, so they will not have to pay 100 per cent of the cost, as in this case of building seven jails. We provided an economical way of building two instead of seven, and will even then share half the cost. And we are having success. There are 35 counties in the province and we have already looked after nine. Seven already signed the agreement—

Mr. Singer: You have not looked after a thing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. If the hon. member will find some way of first building buildings and giving the money, and then signing the agreements, perhaps we will get it done a little faster.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Braddon.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, in order that I will not be accused of getting out of order, I would draw your attention that under item 1901 there is a little item marked "Minister—RSO 1960, chapter 127, section 3, \$12,000," which I believe should give me a pretty wide field.

Mr. Chairman, before I put a number of questions to the hon. Minister, I have to have a short preamble to all these questions so he will know what I am leading up to.

Mr. Chairman, last year when these estimates were up, the hon. Minister made certain statements which I find rather inconsistent with an answer he gave to my friend, the hon. member for Yorkview. The statement made by the hon. Minister, I believe, was that the department or the Minister is not waiting for reports of plans from others jurisdictions, but is proceeding on his own. I found it rather inconsistent with a statement made by the hon. Minister in April of last year, when his estimates were before this House.

At that time, the hon. Minister was quoted as saying that Canada is not going to forge ahead on penal reform until the federal government creates a separate department to handle reform institutions. He also said several times during the debate on his department's estimates that the department could not form a long-term plan until the federal government decides what it is going to do about the Fauteux report.

Today he states that the department is going ahead. Now, immediately prior to the April 1965 estimates, the advisory committee reporting on conditions in Millbrook also made a statement, stating that:

Under these circumstances we think it doubtful that any provincial government would have been justified in spending public moneys on building projects until it was able to assess its future accommodation requirements.

We understand that this, and this alone, is the reason why the old Mercer building is still in use. That was the statement made,

although mind you, the very next paragraph contradicts this. It says:

However having reviewed the present day Mercer complex we are satisfied that The Department of Reform Institutions while awaiting federal action has not remained indifferent to the need to develop a progressive programme for women offenders in Ontario in keeping with the thinking of the select committee of the Legislature.

Now, Mr. Minister, although the Fauteux report has not been implemented, a new penitentiaries Act did result and one of the provisions in the new penitentiaries Act authorized the Minister of Justice, with approval of the Governor in council, to enter into an agreement with the government of any province for the confinement in federal institutions of persons who are sentenced under the criminal law to less than two years.

Mr. Minister, why has this government not made any overtures to the federal government to implement this particular—Oh, he said they made overtures but I checked in Ottawa thoroughly and no overtures—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would first like to understand the hon. member's question. Is he suggesting that because of the Fauteux report that the hon. Minister of Justice is prepared to make arrangements with the province of Ontario to take over some of our institutions and some of our responsibilities? If so, he is completely wrong.

Mr. Ben: I am saying, Mr. Chairman, that the new penitentiaries Act, 1961, authorized the Minister of Justice, with the approval of the Governor in council, to enter into an agreement with the government of any province where the confinement in federal institutions of persons who are sentenced under the criminal law is less than two years. Does the hon. Minister deny that the penitentiaries Act, 1961, contains such a provision, or does the hon. Minister deny that he has any knowledge that the Act contains such a provision?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am denying that the Minister of Justice has failed to take advantage of that and offers us this proposition. That is all I am telling you.

Mr. Ben: Is the hon. Minister saying that he should continue to wait about having prisoners for short terms and they should come and relieve him of this burden rather than that he go to them saying: "Let us

enter into a contract"? Is that what the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In 1961, I think it was, we passed a bill here, an Act to amend the Fauteux report, and we are waiting for co-operation from the federal government. All the Minister of Justice did, I think, was use that to relieve one of the Maritime provinces of a situation which they could not handle there. We would be quite pleased—and I have spoken to the Minister of Justice—to two Ministers of Justice—to implement the Fauteux report—by mail and I have seen them personally, and they will not do it.

Mr. Ben: I am not speaking about the implementation of the Fauteux report, I am asking the hon. Minister whether he has any record that either he or any of his predecessors in office made overtures to the federal government to implement the provision in the penitentiaries Act which would enable this government and the federal government to enter into a contract whereby the federal government would take over responsibility for prisoners serving less than two years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps this will answer the hon. member. On June 8, 1964 I sent the Hon. Guy Favreau, the Minister of Justice at the time, a letter. I asked when we could expect implementation of three of the recommendations made in the Fauteux report. The recommendations were:

No. 12—The provisions of The Prisons and Reformatories Act that authorize the imposition of determinate plus indeterminate sentences, should be abolished, and the parole boards of Ontario and British Columbia should be abolished.

No. 31—The provincial government should be responsible for the care and treatment in penal institutions of persons sentenced to imprisonment for maximum terms of six months or less; persons sentenced to imprisonment longer than six months, should be confined to penal institutions operated by the federal government.

Does that answer the hon. member's question?

Mr. Ben: The hon. Minister did not touch it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did not touch what?

Mr. Ben: My question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The question was whether we asked the Minister of Justice

to take over these responsibilities. This is what we asked him to do.

Mr. Ben: I did no such thing. I asked the hon. Minister if this government had made any endeavours to enter into a contract—the word is "contract".

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Yes, six months.

Mr. Ben: Would the hon. Minister who is sitting in the back seat and putting his two cents worth in—we still want the necessary information because I say that the hon. Minister is misinforming this House, and I challenge the hon. Minister in the second row to produce one letter that was written—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I submit that the answer I have given and the correspondence and the interviews I have had with the Ministers of Justice along the lines I have quoted here, answer that question.

Mr. Ben: I submit that they do not.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: We know what we are talking about. You are trying to hide your own inefficiency.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, may I just add this: Out of courtesy to the hon. member for Bracondale, if he would formulate a letter that he thinks would ask it better than I have, I will be glad to take that letter, sign it and send it to the Minister of Justice.

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, we are obviously still waiting for word from Ottawa as to whether or not we are going to co-operate in this six months limit or not, so perhaps the hon. member for Bracondale could speak with friends.

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. We cannot hear the member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a short question of the hon. Minister. He indicated tonight in this matter of rehabilitation that he had increased grants to the organizations who are dealing with rehabilitation. As I look at this vote, the Salvation

Army, the John Howard society, Toronto, the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies, Thunder Bay, the Elizabeth Fry society, Toronto and Ottawa sanatoria, and so on, I find no increase in the estimates between last year and this year. The figures are the same. Now the hon. Minister indicated that there had been increases and I fail to see where they are. Perhaps he could explain this. I think it is important if we are going to tackle this problem of rehabilitation. If the government is not going to set up half-way houses and do an expanded job here, the organizations which are concerned with this job should have every possible encouragement and every possible bit of financial help.

The hon. Minister has said that that financial help has been increased. I find no record of it. Would the hon. Minister tell us about it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member asking me whether we have given them an increase this year, or provided for it in these estimates?

Mr. Young: I understood that an increase was provided for this year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. I said we had increased their grants; we increased the grants last year. They get a supplementary grant—I think it was for \$3,000 to the John Howard society last year, and \$5,000, I think it was, to the Salvation Army. They have not asked for any more.

Does the hon. member suggest that we just go out and give money even though they do not ask for it?

Mr. Bryden: That is not what he is suggesting. Why do you not answer the question?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am just trying to get the question clear.

Mr. Bryden: You are just making trouble for yourself.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am trying to get the question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I think the answer is here. The hon. Minister has given me the answer that the reason these estimates are not increased is because the organizations in question have not asked for increased moneys. I do not know why they

have not; perhaps they are not expanding their work—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have increased them over the years.

Mr. Young: But there is no increase between last year's estimate and this year's estimate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Young: The reason is that these organizations have not asked for—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Apparently they feel that the amount they are getting is sufficient.

Mr. Young: Thank you.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the grant set up for city and county—what is the basis for grants? Is it on a per-inmate basis or is it on the cell basis—city jails and county jails? I notice that in Metropolitan Toronto the grant is \$150,000, and in the county of Grey it is \$4,000. What is the basis for a grant?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ten per cent of the actual cost of maintenance.

Mr. Sargent: I would suggest to the hon. Minister that he has made his offer to the municipalities in 35 areas as far as county jails are concerned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is a general offer across the whole of the province.

Mr. Sargent: But have you a policy? Is it going to be area jails or county jails? If you are going to group counties, how are you going to do it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We are going to group county jails.

Mr. Sargent: What are the capital costs involved per jail?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Each one is different.

Mr. Sargent: How much money? A million dollars, two million dollars?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It could be either, one might be a million and the other might be two million.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister should have an idea.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I say one might be a million and another may be two million.

Mr. Thompson: It is not what it might be.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, are you asking for—if the hon. member will ask—

Mr. Sargent: There are two agreements signed. What are the amounts involved in each of the two?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I was going to say that if the hon. member would like to know the estimated costs of the two which have already signed agreements, I would be glad to give those to him.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister told us a little while ago he could not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: About a million each in total.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, my point is this—

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister told us a little while ago that he could not tell us.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say that at all, I told the hon. member that there is no use putting a figure in here until we know specifically. This is a rough estimate. As a matter of fact, the hon. member must know that even in the last three or four months costs have gone up considerably. These are estimates, rough estimates. You do not lay aside money for that until you need it. Now, did I answer the hon. member's question?

Mr. Sargent: No, the hon. Minister has not, Mr. Chairman. The point I am trying to make is that if we have a cost of \$2 million for a jail in an area, sir, this is going to cost the taxpayers out of their real estate taxes, \$1 million. Now I suggest to this House—and every one of us here knows—this fact involved, insofar as the municipalities are concerned, the load on real estate taxes. And I suggest to this House, and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will know I am right, that any municipality in this province which signs that agreement is—I hate to use the word “crazy”—but it is away off base. Anybody who signs a deal on this is away off base.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Can the hon. member show us a fairy god-mother who will do the—

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, the county that I represent happened to sign one of these contracts and I do not think they are crazy.

Mr. Chairman: That is not a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That is a point of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, the point I am making on this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: I would ask the hon. Minister to tell this House the target date for the hon. Minister to eliminate the county jail system in Ontario. Is it five years or ten years? How long is it going to take to do it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In answer to the first question, Mr. Chairman, we are helping the municipal taxpayer in the counties, because of having to build, say, in three counties, three different new jails, as some of them have been contemplating, on their own. We have devised a plan where they will build one, which reduces the cost tremendously and then we will pay half of the cost of that construction. So we are not adding costs to the municipal taxpayers in those areas; we are reducing it considerably for them.

Insofar as a target date is concerned, we have no target date. As a matter of fact, the way the agreements are being signed today, we will have our hands full getting all those built which are coming in. I think, as I say, we are advancing very quickly.

Mr. Sargent: May I suggest that the hon. Minister is selling this House a bill of goods, because he knows his plan is to group areas, not 35. Maybe it is contemplated to group these jails, but the hon. Minister is not telling us the truth. There are not 35 jails they are going to build, they are going to be area jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I said there were 35 county jails today and we are going to reduce those 35 by the fact that we are combining so many of them. There will not be anywhere near 35; of course there will not. If they all go into the plan eventually I presume we may have 12 or 13 regional detention centres.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): On item 4 in vote 1901, I notice that the cost of travelling and other expenses of bailiff and prisoners is \$31,000. The cost of railway fares, and so on, of discharged prisoners is \$34,000. What I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, is this: We have heard and we have read many times of prisoners who have been released from jails and who have had a mere pittance to keep them going until they have been able to pick up the threads of civilian life

again. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister could tell us first of all how much of that \$34,000 is made up of grants to the prisoners to allow them to rehabilitate themselves and what on the average does a prisoner have when he leaves prison?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that this is not included in this item, it comes in another item. It comes under the next figure.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, in that case would the hon. Minister explain what the \$34,000, and so on, is in that item?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Transportation back to their homes.

Mr. Braithwaite: And that is all?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is all this item includes. The figure the hon. member asked for, he will find in vote 1902.

Mr. Braithwaite: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition. The member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) if the other member is not ready.

Mr. Thompson: I was, sir.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): A little slow tonight.

Mr. Thompson: No, I am not slow at all. It is because of so many questions and the confusion that has taken place—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. leader of the Opposition was away all afternoon.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. leader of the Opposition is not consistent, that is the problem.

Mr. Thompson: No, because when you have inconsistency from the other side it is hard for us to have consistency.

As I have listened to this discussion, I heard on the one hand the hon. Minister talking about his long-range plans for regional jails. I assume that it is the money of the taxpayer that the hon. Minister is putting into these long-range plans. They are long-range plans in the sense that you are thinking of grouping 35 municipalities together and building one regional jail. I want to emphasize what the hon. member for Downsview said. It struck me as extremely ironical that this department is doing this on its own, without any consultation with the hon. Provincial Treasurer—

An hon. member: Wrong, dead wrong.

Mr. Thompson: Surely we recognize that The Department of Public Works is important from the point of view that when there is a decline or a depression taking place, those are the times that we should be developing and building these, and it should have been done many years ago, Mr. Chairman.

But apart from that, my concern is this, the hon. Minister says he has regional planning to bring regional jails in. Then on the one hand, where he has a long-term plan, we hear because of the Fauteux report and the fact that he cannot implement it, the fact that he says the Ministers of Justice, two of them, are not permitting him to make implementation here, he is saying he is stymied. Therefore he has short-term plans. I remember the hon. Minister, sir, a couple of years ago claiming that, I presume through the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts), he was going to see that this whole Fauteux report and a study of the co-operation and co-ordination between the federal government and the province on prison reform was going to be brought up in a Dominion-provincial conference—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We tried.

Mr. Thompson: When did you try? Have you got correspondence that you have not tabled before this House? We would like to see the correspondence in answer to the question of the hon. member for Bracondale about the penitentiary Act and the implementation of the province on this.

We would like to see that, sir, and we would like to see your correspondence with respect to the Dominion-provincial conference having on its agenda the co-operation and the implementation of the Fauteux report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place the hon. leader of the Opposition should understand that the Fauteux report only conceives or presupposes that the federal government will look after all those who are sentenced to a year or more, so this has no effect on the county jail system at all. These are all short-term prisoners, they are people awaiting trial and people who are sentenced to very short terms.

That is why we know in this area we can proceed with a certain amount of certainty. Now as to the correspondence, if the hon. leader of the Opposition wants it we can have it all tabled, we will gather it together

and table it. Even the correspondence does not tell the whole story, because I made personal visits to discuss the matter. We have answers here and we will table them all.

Mr. Thompson: May I say in following up the answer of the hon. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I was going to suggest that having in mind the hour that I move the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before making a further motion, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10:40 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, February 25, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Friday, February 25, 1966

Statement re new mining developments in northern Ontario, Mr. Wardrope	903
Tabling report, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman	905
Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, continued, Mr. Grossman	905
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	931

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature this morning, in the east gallery, John Ross Robertson public school, Toronto; and in the west gallery, McKillop public school, Richmond Hill.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Sorry, I recognized the Minister of Municipal Affairs first.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege with reference to an editorial which appeared in yesterday's *Toronto Daily Star*.

—that a letter from the Metro chairman goes unanswered for weeks.

The reference is to myself.

I have communicated this morning with the office of the Metro chairman. He made no such statement and such is not the fact. Letters from the Metro chairman are answered as expeditiously as possible, in the same way as correspondence from any other municipality in this province.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I feel the hon. members will be pleased to know that the Steel Company of Canada Limited has decided to go ahead with the Griffith mine project at Bruce lake in northwestern Ontario. This project will cost over \$60 million, and 400 or more persons will be employed when the project is in operation.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): What has that got to do with the hon. Minister?

Mr. Speaker: Order! The Minister is quite in order. He is making a statement before the orders of the day as Minister of Mines. Will the Minister proceed?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Speaker, I was so pleased with the very kind remark of that class.

Stelco officials have confirmed that a detailed survey of the site has commenced and that arrangements are being made to build a spur line from the main line of the Canadian National Railways near Amesdale to the site at Bruce lake, a distance of approximately 68 miles.

The contract for dredging a portion of Bruce lake has been awarded to the Sceptre Dredging Company and actual dredging will begin almost immediately. The contract for the engineering and construction of the beneficiation and pelletizing plants has been let to Canadian Bechtel Company. Workforces are now being assembled and it is expected, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) said, that the Griffith mine will be in operation by the second quarter of 1968.

The project will have an annual capacity of 1.5 million tons of high-grade ore pellets and will be the largest single source of iron ore for Stelco's blast furnaces in Hamilton. The Griffith mine will be developed and operated for Stelco by Picklands Mather & Co., which manages Stelco's other mining properties.

This means that there is a whole new mining complex developing in northwestern Ontario. Here is what has happened in the last month: A recently completed agreement between Algoma Steel and Steep Rock iron mines will result in the immediate construction of a \$27-million pelletizing plant which will produce 1.1 million tons of iron pellets annually from Algoma Steel.

When market conditions warrant it, development of the Lake St. Joseph property of Steep Rock will be brought into production.

This is thought to be one of the biggest deposits of taconite ore, suitable for pelletizing, in Ontario. It would require a complete mining, concentrating and pelletizing plant on the spot.

Algoma Steel has taken up its option on the Can-Fer property, near Nakina, also in northwestern Ontario, and presumably plans to develop it when the company's requirements dictate.

Recent announcements by the Anaconda Company indicate that new and concentrated efforts are to be made to find a market for the product of the very big iron deposit in the Nakina area which the company owns. Considerable development work has already been done on this property and production should be attained speedily once the decision to proceed is taken.

The Caland Ore Company has completed construction of a multi-million-dollar pelletizing plant at its mine at Steep Rock Lake. Production of 2.5 million tons of ore and pellets annually is planned. In northeastern Ontario at Timagami, the Sherman mine is being developed to produce one million tons of pellets each year. The Jones and Laughlin Adams mine near Kirkland Lake began production of pellets last year at the rate of one million tons annually.

I am very pleased, Mr. Speaker, to bring this most optimistic picture of mining in northwestern Ontario to the hon. members of this House, knowing how interested they all are.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, notice of which was given a few days ago. He was absent from the House and could not answer it.

Could the hon. Minister inform the House whether his department received an application for an amendment to The Territorial Divisions Act which would make illegal "fill," in that part of the village of Long Branch fronting on Lake Ontario, part of the village of Long Branch?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, I wish to advise him that the department has not received any correspondence respecting illegal fill.

Mr. Ben: Will the hon. Minister answer a supplementary question? Has any application been made to amend The Territorial Divisions Act to increase the boundaries of the present village of Long Branch?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, this second question has no relevance to the first. I am sorry; I cannot give the hon. member that advice. I would like him to repeat the question; perhaps I did not understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Ben: Could the hon. Minister inform this House whether his department received an application for an amendment to The Territorial Divisions Act which would increase the size of the village of Long Branch?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any such application. I think that the hon. member has to remember that there are some involvements in this particular case that involve what is known as The Navigable Waters Protection Act—which, of course, is a statute of Canada, not of the province of Ontario.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) asked a question yesterday which I undertook to answer today. The question was: In view of the information which the Minister's department has received from the federal government concerning the extremely dangerous levels of pesticides in milk supplies, particularly in the Newcastle, Hamilton, London and Chatham areas:

(a) Would the Minister inform the House with regard to this situation?

(b) What action does he intend to take concerning it?

(c) What research or inspection staff has the Minister to cope with this growing danger?

Earlier this month the departments of agriculture and health were both informed by the federal authorities that several milk samples from the areas mentioned had been found to contain traces of chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides. The amounts found were well below levels which would be injurious to health.

Action was taken. The Department of Agriculture investigated at the local level; The Department of Health is presently analyzing samples of crops used as cattle food, so that any which may be contaminated can be eliminated from the diet of the livestock.

A continuous watch for residues is maintained by federal and provincial authorities, and any instances of possible contamination are investigated. The Department of Agriculture conducts an active educational

programme with respect to the safe use of pesticides on agricultural crops. The Department of Health maintains toxicological consultant services which are concerned with studies and investigations of pesticides as they may affect health.

I would add, sir, that the research as a rule is not done within the department. Rather it is sponsored by the department. It is usually undertaken by authorities in connection with universities and I have not been able to find out what projects are going on, if there are any.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister has a copy of the statement that I might have?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I take pleasure in tabling the report of The Department of Reform Institutions for the year ending March 31, 1965.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, several days ago I asked the hon. Prime Minister about salaries and expense accounts of certain commissioners. The hon. Prime Minister said he would give an answer later. I am wondering if we could have that information within the next day or so?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Yes, I really felt I would have the information prior to this, but in the rush of other business I have not followed it up. I will check on it and see that it is here first thing next week.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order: House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(continued)

On vote 1901:

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Last night the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) pulled out a little known section of The Penitentiaries Act, quoted it to me, and asked for my comments on it. I must admit that I was somewhat confused and it must have been apparent to the House that I was not familiar with this section of the Act—for a very good reason which, I think, Mr. Chairman, will soon become ob-

vious. I have never had to deal with this and I will explain why.

Section 16 of The Penitentiaries Act reads as follows:

1. The Minister—

referring to the Minister of Justice for Canada, of course:

—The Minister, with a general or special approval of the Governor in council, may on behalf of the government of Canada enter into an agreement with the government of any province for the confinement in penitentiaries or any other institution under the direction or supervision of the service, of persons sentenced or committed under the criminal law of Canada to imprisonment for more than six months but less than two years, but any such agreement shall include provisions whereby such persons shall be confined at the expense of the provincial government concerned.

2. A person who is confined in a penitentiary or other institution pursuant to an agreement made under subsection 1 shall during the term of his sentence or period of committal be deemed to be lawfully confined.

Mr. Chairman, this section was designed by the federal government as a stopgap pending implementation of the Fauteux commission report. Hon. members may not realize that in some provinces reformatories as such simply do not exist. In some of the Maritime provinces the entire system of penal institutions consists simply of old county jails, which house men with sentences up to two years, less a day.

This, of course, is a deplorable situation and as a result the provincial authorities in those jurisdictions made representation to the federal government to bring about legislation in order to make it possible for the federal government to look after prisoners sentenced to provincial institutions with a proviso, of course, that a *per diem* rate would be paid by the province to the federal government.

As the hon. member stated last night, this section of the Act has been in force for almost five years and yet on checking this morning we find that not one province in Canada has been able to take advantage of it.

This is due to the fact that the federal government simply does not have facilities to accommodate any more prisoners than they now have. In speaking to the federal commissioner of penitentiaries this morning, we were advised that the new institution in Springhill, Nova Scotia, will be completed in approximately six months time. Only then

will the federal government be in a position to negotiate an agreement with the province of Nova Scotia in order to alleviate the critical situation which exists in that province.

In summary then, I would emphasize the following points:

1. This section was, as I say, designed as a stopgap pending implementation of the Fauteux commission report.

2. Not one province, even those without reformatories, for which this section was designed, has been able to enter into an agreement with the federal government since federal facilities do not exist.

3. Until the federal government has adequate facilities to adopt a suitable classification system in order to ensure that young unsophisticated offenders with comparatively short sentences are not housed together with the hardened long-term offenders, I am certain that the hon. members of this House would agree that there is no point in even considering such action.

Even if the time should come when the federal government has adequate facilities, this particular section 16 of The Penitentiaries Act has other implications which would have to be considered at that time.

Presumably, according to the statements made recently by the Minister of Justice, if and when the federal government does have these facilities, then the Fauteux report will be implemented, which would make this section of The Penitentiaries Act obsolete.

However, as I say, our discussion with the commissioner of penitentiaries this morning again confirmed that the federal government simply does not have the facilities and is therefore unable to enter into such an agreement even with the smallest province in Canada.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, for years in a row now I have been bringing up the situation of St. Leonard's house, a halfway house for released prisoners in the community of Windsor, which has made a request of the hon. Minister for some type of assistance seeing that the hon. Minister is really concerned with the rehabilitation of the inmate. First I would like to ask: has the report or the research conducted by Dr. Crygier been completed; the research concerning halfway houses?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the answer to that is "no."

Mr. Newman: What size of grant is St. Leonard's house receiving from this department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The grants for halfway houses are not handled by this department; they are handled by The Department of Public Welfare under The Charitable Institutions Act.

Mr. Newman: Does not the hon. Minister then consider the work carried out by St. Leonard's house worthy of financial assistance from this department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I suppose it does not really make any difference to an organization, whether it receives its grants from one department or another.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it does make a lot of difference because St. Leonard's house is attempting to carry on work with inmates who have been released after they have left the custody of the St. Leonard's house. These former inmates come back for counselling. The St. Leonard's association have conducted well over 300 interviews with the group, and it is getting to the point where they find it financially impossible to operate unless some assistance is obtained by them from The Department of Reform Institutions.

They have pressed their case now for well over six months, asking for this help on the out-client group and to date have received no favourable reply from the department. Surely it is time, sir, if the hon. Minister talks so highly of rehabilitation, that an organization such as this, which is doing everything it can to help his department, would receive some type of help from the department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the whole purpose of setting up a department of research is to make certain that the moneys expended are expended in the best possible manner. We are not only anxious to do what we can to bring in new programmes and new policies, but to make sure that the money that is being expended at the present time is producing the results commensurate with the amount of the taxpayers' money which is being spent.

There is a tendency on the part of groups throughout the province, in fact all over the world, who seem to feel that they have something to offer in this field. Actually all of them are very sincere people and they are desirous of doing a good job. Some of them, in fact, are apparently doing a good job.

But a number of groups are springing up without any experience at all. As a matter of fact — and I want to assure the hon. member I am not referring to St. Leonard's

house — there has been in the last year a tendency on the part of a very small number to get into what they call some sort of after-care work which are in fact doing a great deal of harm. Because of this it was decided we had better do some research on the two existing private ones, that is the Harold King farm and St. Leonard's house, which are presently receiving *per diem* grants from The Department of Public Welfare—that research had better be done before we give our approval to expansion of their facilities to make sure that as far as is possible to ascertain they are doing the kind of job that will justify the expenditure of more of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. Newman: The federal department considers that they are doing a job by giving them a substantial grant.

Surely, if the federal department considers such, then this department should look just as favourably upon the association. It is all well and good to say that there are numerous similar organizations cropping up throughout the province.

Mr. Chairman, this organization has already proven its merits. It simply asks for additional financial assistance, so that it can do a continuing and a better job, and it is only a matter of money.

The amount of money that has been requested is not substantial whatsoever and their prime interest is in the out-client portion of their work. They do get assistance from The Department of Public Welfare, but we are asking The Department of Reform Institutions, we are asking for the reform of these people, for the rehabilitation of these people, and I certainly think it behooves the hon. Minister to move with all haste to see that St. Leonard's house does get this financial assistance. And I hope that the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Thrasher) will get up on his feet and support me in this request.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would be very pleased to consider this request, but I would like, if at all possible, to have the hon. member provide me with the information on the so-called substantial grants they are getting from the federal government.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I wanted to follow up my question from last night. May I say that I appreciate that there was considerable excitement perhaps generating in the late hours

last night, and we are taking it in a calm and collected manner.

I would like, sir, just to comment on one remark the hon. Minister made last night, that he felt that we were being critical of—I do not think he said this—of personalities of his staff. In no way were we doing this. We are not critical of the staff. We admire the dedication of your staff and our concern is in trying to encourage you to give every consideration to raising standards of staff and recognition of staff. I am sure you would be in sympathy with the approach which we are taking. Your staff not only has dedication and intelligence, but it has charm and beauty, as I look across there.

I may say, sir—in following with the Fauteux report—I have been interested in your talk of regional jails. Perhaps you did not mean this, but last night—if I caught it correctly—you said that you can go ahead with regional jails because they are not connected with the Fauteux report. Well, I am surprised you say that, sir, because in the Fauteux report, if I could read it, one of the clauses says:

Classification and segregation form the fundamental basis of all reformatory treatment. A sound and wise system of classification makes it easier to deal with the individual problems of the prisoners.

The hon. Minister himself—let me first of all go back. I would say that he had made some progress in recognition of this. In 1960, I am referring to classification, the same hon. Minister said:

Only after careful study is made of the prisoner's case history and he is personally interviewed by the classification committee is a final decision made.

Then when we started to look into who was on the classification committee, we found that there were three. We found there was the superintendent from the—

Mr. Chairman: I assume the leader of the Opposition is talking on item No. 5, advisory committees, on vote 1901?

Mr. Thompson: That is right, vote 1901. The superintendents from the centres at Burch and at Brampton, plus the psychologist at Guelph, made up the classification committee; and yet we found that there were 9,000 men who had gone into the institutions. It seemed to us at that point that the classification committee, no matter how dedicated they were, could not possibly be doing a thorough job of classification.

Well now, coming on—as I understand it,

and I could quote you on this where you are saying in these regional centres there will be classification officers—this is the most important aspect with respect to the rehabilitation of the prisoners.

Perhaps I can quote from your speech. By the way, I congratulate you on this speech of April 1, 1965. You sounded as though you were really going to be moving ahead. May I quote what you said?

I said earlier that all offenders must be evaluated indicating the most effective programme for them at all times and I emphasize the phrase, at all times, because we firmly believe that the period immediately after arrest or sentencing, the first time a man is in jail, the time he spends in the local jail, has a great effect on his future conduct. Those who can be helped should be evaluated and receive that help at that time and this is the area insofar as the local jail is concerned, that has at least at this moment, been completely overlooked.

To me, sir, the regional jail is going to be a very important part in the whole integrated programme of reform. It is going to be tied very much to recommendations of the Fauteux report. You may find, I would think, that your regional jails may be the area in which you have complete responsibility, if the Fauteux report is over six months.

They may take over the other, so that your plans of the regional jails hinge very much with the implications of the Fauteux report; and that is why it is surprising that you said that we can go ahead on the regional jails because, as I say—if I caught you correctly—you said this really had nothing to do with the recommendations of the Fauteux report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is really a play on words. Perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition misunderstood me. The question was raised. "Now you cannot keep using the excuse that you are awaiting the implementation of the Fauteux report and that is why you cannot get on with certain things."

I was pointing out that because the responsibility—even if the Fauteux report is implemented—of those who serve less than six months or a year—although we presume there will not be any sentences between six months and a year—will remain with the province; that we could proceed with a regional detention centre programme, without concerning ourselves that it will be affected insofar as responsibility is concerned.

In other words, I would not think—at the present time—of recommending that my gov-

ernment allow me to have funds to build an adult institution, not knowing whether this was going to be our responsibility or whether it was going to be taken away from us. I should say an adult reformatory. So we are concentrating, insofar as capital investment is concerned, in those areas which, even if the Fauteux report is implemented, will still remain with us; i.e., the regional detention centres, training schools. This is the area where we are making capital expenditures. Of course, everything having to do with corrections will have some implications insofar as the Fauteux report is concerned.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you very much for the clarification. One of the questions I asked yesterday was: Has the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Roberts) gone to the Prime Minister of Canada on any occasion and told him he wants prison reform to be on the Dominion-provincial agenda?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, if my memory serves me correctly, I do not know whether it was the Minister of Justice or the new solicitor-general who has already announced that, within the near future, there will be a Dominion-provincial conference of those involved in the various provinces in correctional work, so we can discuss this. However, there was such a meeting; I think it was in 1958. Now, whether the hon. Prime Minister discussed it, at his level, with the Prime Minister of Canada, I am not too sure. I presume the Prime Minister of Canada, the same as the hon. Prime Minister of this province, feels he has capable Ministers to do this sort of thing, and it should be their responsibility. But the answer to the question specifically is: I do not know whether the hon. Prime Minister has discussed this with the Prime Minister of Canada.

Mr. Thompson: Let me get this straight. I am not referring to the capability of any Minister at either the federal or provincial level. I am simply suggesting that we understand that the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario is looking after the Dominion-provincial relations from the point of view of Ontario and, in view of the obvious need to get some implementation on the Fauteux report for both Ontario as well as for Canada, my question has been: Have you gone to the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario to ask him to put that on a priority of agenda, to be discussed at the Dominion-provincial conference?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, of course, Mr. Chairman, again the answer is no different, except that the hon. leader of the Opposition

will recall that I did say yesterday that I had made personal representation to the two Ministers of Justice.

It has always been handled in this fashion, that the heads of the jurisdictions—various provinces who have within their jurisdictions correctional work—have met and presumably made recommendations to their respective governments.

Mr. Thompson: Could I just add, sir, and this is in connection with the Dominion-provincial conferences: It seems to me that, with the priority and its connection with prison reform that the hon. Minister feels about this and that we in this House feel, there needs to be more liaison and consultation with the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario concerning what he is being urged to put on the agenda as top priority for discussion.

Mr. Chairman: Where does the leader of the Opposition think that this fits into vote 1901?

Mr. Thompson: Because I feel very strongly that the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario should have gone to the Prime Minister of Canada and said: "Look, we have been forced to use as an excuse delay about the Fauteux report and the delay of implementation. We want to see this on the agenda of Dominion-provincial conferences because the Opposition is pressing us hard to get on with some of the reforms and we cannot continue using this as an excuse."

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister would indicate to us something of the interrelationship between the department of criminology at the University of Toronto and his own department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place—as the hon. member knows—we started this centre of criminology off with a grant of \$30,000 from this government, which is now an annual grant. We have a very close connection with the centre of criminology. We have, I think, some of our people lecturing, and there is close relationship. They use our facilities for study and we use theirs. It is working out very well. I do not know what else I can add to that.

Mr. Young: Following that, Mr. Chairman, I think all of us are very keenly interested in this department and its success and growth. Last night I asked a question regarding the grants to other institutions such as the John Howard society. The hon. Minister told me

that no further grants were asked for and therefore he presumed no further grants were needed. Would this also be true of the department of criminology? It seems to me that this is a vital department vis-à-vis the future growth of the whole correction systems in Ontario, it is important for the training of leadership and in research and in the whole field, and so it seems to me that the grant's remaining at \$30,000 seems to be just a bit of "stand-pat-ism." I am wondering if that department is growing as rapidly as it ought to grow and whether the department has other sources of funds so that it does not need any further grant from this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think that first it should be pointed out that the centre of criminology is a Canadian institution and it gets some support, presumably, from the federal government. As far as we are concerned, I have had no request, that I can recall, for further moneys, which does not mean that if we did get a request, it would soon be forthcoming. We get requests from various areas in this work; it is a matter of priority, but the answer to this specific question is that I have had no further request for any additional grants.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, it is to be hoped that some time in the future, all the old jails will be replaced by regional detention centres. I was interested to see in the report that was made available to us today the plan of a possible detention centre with the facilities for segregation. What would be the longest time during which a prisoner would be detained in one of these ideal situations?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, the responsibility of the county jail presently is up to 90 days and this would still remain the responsibility of the regional detention centre. Our plan is that, at this stage, we would be able to pluck from this institution many who should be pulled out of the regional detention centre, presently a county jail—those who appear that something can be done with them—bring them into a reformatory system such as ours, put them into our classification system and help them in that way.

As a matter of fact, this is what we are doing. We generally take out of the county jails anyone who is sentenced to more than a month or two, because we do not think that the county jails, as they exist today, are a healthy place for anyone to remain in for

more than a very few weeks. So this would be extended and—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is, of course, another problem. The hon. member is referring to those people who are on remand or who are awaiting appeal.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Minister, there are other members listed here to speak and I would rather they would direct their questions through the chair.

Mr. Nixon: Further to this, Mr. Chairman, it appears that if we are going to have the facilities for segregation and for meaningful rehabilitation, the hon. Minister might consider keeping certain classes of prisoners in these regional institutions for the full three months, or even longer, if they are built according to the plan that is proposed here. It seems that the facilities would be of a nature that would give some meaningful rehabilitation. Has the hon. Minister any thought that there would be more inmates kept at the local level for a longer time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This may very well be what might develop out of this, but if this did happen, it would be done with agreement between the counties themselves and our department, vis-à-vis financial responsibility and so on. We have to develop this gradually and see what appears to be the best possible way to operate.

Mr. Nixon: Last night we went very thoroughly into how slow the programme is progressing.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Do you agree with that, Mr.—

Mr. Nixon: I think it is going very slowly—too slowly, because I notice in the hon. Minister's report that he has checked certain counties that would indicate that their communities are actively considering the possibility of coming into an agreement with the hon. Minister's department.

I do not know what he calls "active consideration," because in some of these areas, active consideration has been going on a full two years.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Nixon: Well, more than one, then—a year and a half.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, that is—

Mr. Nixon: Can the hon. Minister tell me when active consideration first began in the counties around Brant county?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I cannot give—

Mr. Nixon: I might say, Mr. Chairman, that I discussed it with members of the active consideration committee a year ago last summer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On this I think I said that I started discussing this plan in February, 1964. It took almost a year, travelling around to the counties and speaking to the county councils to sell them on this idea and to explain it in detail. There was a great deal of interest shown six or seven months after the plan was first proposed. Now this takes a considerable amount of time, as I am sure the hon. member will appreciate.

When we talk about active consideration, we are talking about those counties which now are involved in discussions with our department, in detail, as to the amount of the estimates required for the kind of an institution suitable for their particular area, and those who are now, among themselves, discussing an agreement. In other words, those who have not just asked for information and let it sit, even though we have prodded them in many ways. Surely, the hon. member would not suggest—he is a fair man—he would not suggest that a programme of this nature, a county jail system which has existed well over 100 years and which people have been talking about changing for at least half a century, that having proposed this plan less than two years ago, that out of 35 counties, the plan has come to fruition in the past few months? We have, out of the 35, seven counties which have signed agreements. There is a city and another county jail ready to sign an agreement. Mayor Copps is arranging for an official signing. This is fairly good progress.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about "active consideration," and whether or not this would include simply an inquiry from a county.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Nixon: I believe it is true, that in the summer of 1964, an active consideration committee involving the county of Brant, met with the officials of the hon. Minister's department, during which it was talked over in some detail. Now, what I want to know is:

What sort of leadership does the hon. Minister and his department give these active consideration committees? Do they in fact just present a proposal and leave them for some months, or do they augment these proposals with other thoughts as to the location of the new institution; what possible plan might there be?

I would say to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the thing that is holding this up more than anything else is the requirement to meet 50 per cent of the costs of these elaborate buildings at the local level. If he wants to get on with the process of replacing these antiquated century-old jails with what he calls the regional detention centres then he is certainly going to have to pay more of the cost than he presently proposes. The municipal taxpayers and the farmers in the communities of the counties simply cannot afford to build these extensive and expensive buildings, which are in fact going to carry out rehabilitation just as we would all hope they would. This is not a regional responsibility any more, it is the responsibility of the government of the province of Ontario.

Very specifically, then, I would like to know what methods are used by the government under the hon. Minister's direction to urge these groups towards making a decision? How long does he allow the plan to simmer at the local level where all of the difficulties are present, as far as selecting a site among three or four competing counties? Does the hon. Minister and his advisory group actually go out and indicate where they feel the best site would be so that at least there is a definite point around which debate and argument might take place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have two of our top-echelon staff in constant contact with the counties. We always go out and meet with them; or they come and meet with us; we have had various discussions. As I said earlier, we have discussed it with them at open county council meetings. And we try to develop an interest in our plan; some show more interest than others.

We do not even go into a county and say, "This is what the estimate for your regional detention centre is going to be as far as cost is concerned," until they are prepared to say, "Well now, we are ready to talk about the cost of this project." They know what the grant is going to be. Because, as I said in this House last year, we are not putting ourselves in the position of giving the counties any impression that we are forcing them into anything. We said we were going to do this by persuasion; we have been successful so

far in doing it, and there is no reason, in our view, why we should push ourselves.

We give leadership; we give guidance; we give advice; we meet with them; we draw up plans for them; we have a planning committee to discuss a proposed plan with them, and with their architects, when they get to that stage. As far as a site is concerned, they get together themselves to decide on a site which is suitable to them; they present this to the department. If it is suitable to the department, then they proceed from there.

Mr. Nixon: Just one or two more questions on this, Mr. Chairman, because I do not feel the leadership has been effective. Is there no proposal, to begin with, that a certain group of counties might take part?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, there is.

Mr. Nixon: There is a definite proposal?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: Is there a definite proposal as to what a suitable site may be, or what three sites might be suitable?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: There is a definite—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member want to know the one for Brant?

Mr. Nixon: No, I do not want to know that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the answer is "yes"; we do suggest a viable unit for each group. Is the hon. member asking about a site?

Mr. Nixon: No, I do not want to know what site you propose; only if there are definite proposals.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, there are.

Mr. Nixon: When they intend to build the building, do they employ the architect and do all of this planning under the guidance and suggestion of this department? Is that so?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With the help of this department, yes.

Mr. Nixon: I think they should be presented with a plan of buildings which they can then discuss and modify. You people—the Minister himself and his advisors—have the responsibility for detention and rehabilitation. You cannot shift this off onto these regional—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I say that we do present them with a prototype; we do present them with a plan. Unless the hon. member suggests that we, who are only paying half the cost of construction, should appoint the architects—but I am sure he would not suggest that. They appoint their own architect. That architect discusses these plans with our planning committee, on which there is an architect, and we draw up for them, for discussion with their architect, a proposal of the kind of a building we think suitable for that particular area.

Mr. Nixon: Then they have the final choice of the site in the group of counties concerned?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: With our approval.

Mr. Nixon: So you have the final choice of the site?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Nixon: When the hon. Minister is talking about reasonableness in this matter, I feel the reasonable approach is that you should pay all of the cost after consultation with the people concerned. You should select the site, certainly with their consideration; but, as you do, you should have the final decision. You should then pay all the costs and all the architects' fees, and all that goes with it, and erect that particular institution in the region.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I have three questions under item 10, grants. I would be interested in knowing: Is there any grant allowed to any group in Hamilton at the present time; and also, have any groups in Hamilton applied for grants and been refused? My other question is: Could the hon. Minister tell us when they expect to start on the new jail in the Hamilton-Wentworth area?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The last question I will answer first because it is a lot easier. Just recently, a matter of two or three weeks ago as the hon. member will recall, they arranged with the department to be approved as a regional detention centre; so obviously we are not at the stage of saying when we are going to get started to build. We have to go through all the motions the same as anybody does when they are going to build a building. They have not signed their agreement yet, as a matter of fact, and this is expected to be done very shortly.

As to the first question—there was some group in Hamilton, I cannot recall it offhand. I know the hon. member may have it in

mind, we had some discussions with them, but I seem to recollect that a suitable arrangement was made for them, though not through this department. Yes, I think this was a group which came to us; I cannot recall the name of it, perhaps the hon. member could help me—

Mr. Davidson: Could the hon. Minister tell me this? Does the John Howard society in Hamilton get a grant of any kind for this work?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer to that is, "Not specifically." They are dealt with through the provincial grants of the Ontario John Howard society. Incidentally, provincially, that group was given a very substantial grant by The Department of Health, through its drug and alcoholism research foundation.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, just to commence, I want to get into this question of regional jails at much more length. I want to ask the hon. Minister a couple of questions. Am I correct in my understanding that the 50 per cent sharing proposal has nothing to do with the acquisition of land?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is correct.

Mr. Singer: That is correct.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is 50 per cent of the cost of construction.

Mr. Singer: I see. Well, it seems to me to be a very strange anomaly that where the municipal authority pays 100 per cent of the cost of the land, and all of the cost of the servicing of the land, the final choice of the site lies with the Minister. Could he explain the logic in that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Very simply. Mr. Chairman, we have been told here time and again that locations should not be chosen because of political considerations; and this department, in giving its final approval, makes sure that the location chosen is suitable for the requirements of this kind of work.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): That is how you give the approval?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course. The regional detention centre planning committee makes its recommendation—there will be no political considerations in this at all. We have to make sure that the location chosen is suitable. For example, it may have to serve three or four different areas, so we have to make sure it is, perhaps, on a main highway.

We have to make sure it is not so far removed that it is going to be impossible for treatment staff to visit.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I just cannot understand the logic in the hon. Minister's suggestion that there are less politics in his department than there are at the county council level, or the municipal council level. There is no logic at all. Is he better than the people in the county councils? Is he less influenced by political considerations than they are? It just does not make any sense to me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I should point out to the hon. member that, without the 50 per cent grant, every county had to have the approval of this department for its site and for its building of a county jail anyway. The only difference now is that we are going to pay half the cost of construction, which is of great assistance to the municipal taxpayer.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, now that we have sort of cleared the ground, my hon. friend from Grey South tells me that you pay 50 per cent of the cost of the houses of refuge, and they choose their own site. Is there any logic in letting the houses of refuge choose their own site, when you pay 50 per cent of the cost, and county jails and not do the same?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I understand that the site chosen for a house of refuge is subject to the approval of the Minister of Public Welfare.

Mr. Singer: In southern Ontario?

Mr. Chairman: Has the member finished?

Mr. Singer: No, no, I am only starting, Mr. Chairman. In my frank opinion, this whole plan of county and regional jails is producing absolutely nothing. It is surrounded with a great fanfare of publicity, numerous newspaper announcements; big speeches are delivered; but really we are getting very few jails built.

There is a distinction in Ontario between the southern portion and the northern portion. All of the northern portion is dealt with, completely and entirely, at the expense of the government of Ontario. Jails in districts are paid for and are the responsibility of the government of Ontario; but in southern Ontario, no. There is no logic or sense in this at all and I would like an explanation for that.

I propose, Mr. Chairman, for just a few moments, to try to analyze some of the suc-

cess of this programme. A year ago, the hon. Minister was saying, "Do not talk about it because you may rock the boat." In between his rocking-the-boat speeches and now, he tells us with great pride and pleasure that he has evolved two agreements. Those agreements have not been tabled. I am sure the hon. Minister, being the fair man that he is, will provide copies for us before these estimates are over. Am I fair in saying that? Can we have a look at these agreements and see what they actually say?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I can see no objection to that.

Mr. Singer: Thank you. Because, having looked at the agreements, perhaps I will have some more remarks. But the shocking thing, to my mind, Mr. Chairman, is that, going through these estimates last night, and going through the press clippings dealing with these things, I find that we are talking about two buildings worth very roughly \$2.5 million; that is the combined cost. In the hon. Minister's own estimates, and in the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Cecile), there is \$200,000 set aside.

It would seem to me, subject to my reading these agreements, that there is no really firm commitment to get on with these things at all. This is a plan that might happen some time in the future. The hon. Minister has really failed to come to grips with some of the very important county jails where there is no action being produced. The hon. Minister is aware of the situation in London. The Minister is aware that the county of Middlesex is apparently prepared to enter into some sort of an agreement with somebody, to build a courthouse and city and county jail. The city of London says "no." I am interested to see that the London jail was built in 1843. That is 123 years ago, if my arithmetic is correct. There is a crisis in London. Obviously there is a crisis in London. The council of the city of London feel apparently that it should not be their responsibility, that their municipal taxpayers cannot afford the 50 per cent of the cost. How are you going to resolve the problem in the city of London?

Surely this is a very important problem. And if London is bucking the blandishments of the hon. Minister, is there any reason why the people in Cornwall, or the riding of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), should pay 50 per cent, if London is not going to do it? We do not have to travel as far as London. In the area that the hon. Minister and I represent, the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, we

have this building, the Don jail. I asked the hon. Minister about the Don jail last night, and he did not answer me and I am sure it was an oversight in the welter of questions that we threw at him, but the original part of the Don jail was built in 1862. There was an addition to it opened about eight or ten years ago, but the hon. Minister certainly must be as aware as I am of the constant reports of grand juries and investigators and inspectors and societies, on the horrible conditions that exist in the Don jail. Is there anything going to be done about having a proper jail in the province's largest municipality? Is there anything going to be done about having a proper jail in the city of London?

The hon. Minister talks about an agreement that may be signed in the Hamilton region. I notice from these clippings that there has been great concern about what groupings there should be.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All have been resolved.

Mr. Singer: Well, it may all have been resolved, but I would like to know how it is resolved. Should Halton have been in; the north part of Halton or the south part of Halton? Should Peel have been in? Should Wentworth be in, and so on? How do these decisions come to be made, Mr. Chairman? This is the point I was trying to get at last night. How can the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions, on his own, establish regional boundaries, establish regional costs, without knowing what the views of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development are, without knowing what the views of the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) are, without knowing what the views of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) are, without knowing what the views of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) are? How can you have a region just for jail purposes? It just does not make sense if the province is prepared to really go at the whole question of regional government. You are not going to be successful. You are doomed to failure if you are going to have a region just for jail purposes and different regions for other purposes. Surely that makes sense.

This is why, Mr. Chairman, we have been asking the government, year after year, to establish some sort of a system for bringing about regional government, to have some sort of co-ordination. This is why we urged the hon. Prime Minister to take charge of it, but it is obvious as we listen to the explanations from this Minister today, that he is going off on his own. It is obvious, in just dealing

with the Hamilton-Wentworth situation. It is obvious that bargaining went on, as between the various municipal authorities in the Hamilton-Wentworth area, to determine who should share the cost.

There is no mention here of a joint committee going down to see them. There is no mention here that when you have almost resolved it, or you say you have resolved it—this fits in with the thinking of the studies that are being sponsored and conducted by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. There is no mention here at all, Mr. Chairman, that this fits in with the sort of thinking that must be going on in The Department of Economics and Development. The hon. Minister there (Mr. Randall) has certain views on the economic feasibility of these things.

There is no mention at all, Mr. Chairman, that it is going to fit in with the taxing report that we are waiting for. And this is another question we are going to have to get into, when and if we get the taxing report of the Smith committee—if we ever get the one from Ottawa—so that they can read it, and then comment on what Ottawa is going to say about what should happen; then the Smith committee will comment on what Ottawa is going to say. There is no suggestion of this at all. But I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this whole thing is just a big propaganda effort which really is not designed to build any regional jails at all. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we are not going to get down to this until the province is prepared to meet the question of cost realistically.

A few minutes ago when this question was being talked about, the hon. Prime Minister was in this seat and he said "What about taxes"? Certainly the suggestion that is being made has to deal with taxes and if the province is going to pay 100 per cent of the cost of regional jails, the province is going to have to provide more money. Mr. Chairman, in contrast with the burden that is going to have to be placed on local government and on homeowners, who can better afford it? In which way is it more equitable?

Surely the province attempts to collect taxes across the whole area of Ontario, somewhat related to the basis of ability to pay. The fact that we have all these hundred-year-old jails—and look at them, the list of county court jails in Ontario: Barrie, 1843; Belleville, 1838; Brampton, 1867; Brantford, 1852, and on and on and on; the reason that those buildings are that old, that inefficient, that unsatisfactory, is because, Mr. Chairman, the local municipalities have not felt that it

is their responsibility to look after this serious problem. That is number one.

And secondly, even where they have felt some responsibility for it, they have not had the financial ability to do anything about it. What logic can there be, Mr. Chairman, in suggesting that jails or the administration of justice generally is a local community responsibility? Surely it is a province-wide responsibility. If a crime takes place in Ontario and someone has to be punished for it, surely it is the responsibility of all of the people in Ontario.

The hon. member for Simcoe Centre (Mr. Evans) tells a story of an event in his riding which, I think, highlights the real problem that the hon. Minister has to face and this government has to face. He tells the story of a man who came from Toronto, went up to Barrie, committed a murder, was tried, convicted and eventually executed in the county of Simcoe. By mere happenstance, by the accident of the fact that he travelled from Toronto to Barrie to commit the crime, the county of Simcoe had to pay some \$40,000 in legal costs, jail costs, execution costs and all these other things. What sense does that make, Mr. Chairman? What sense does that make at all? Surely the responsibility for the enforcement of law and all of the costs attached to it, punishment, rehabilitation, surely that is a responsibility that should be the responsibility of all the people of Ontario on the basis of ability to pay?

Mr. Chairman, until the hon. Minister is able to tell us how he is going to cope with the big problems in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, city of London, St. Catharines and the Niagara Peninsula there, until he is going to tell us why it is fair to do something in the north that he is not doing in the south, until he is prepared to tell us why he expects that local councils are going to put an additional burden on the homeowners, to pay for this sort of thing, I do not think that he has given us any reasonable explanation as to how he hopes this plan is going to work.

An editorial in the *St. Catharines Standard* on July 19, 1965, says this, and I think it is worthy of real attention:

Regional jails have been strongly advocated by Reform Minister Allan Grossman of Ontario, but present indications are that unless the government offers a greater inducement at present the proposal will fall through.

The first announcement was the province would pay half the cost of the construction of regional jails. Now it is

learned it will pay nothing towards the cost of land acquisition, and service installation, nor will the government pay any part of the operating costs of regional jails.

Another factor concerning regional jails is the whole problem of transportation of prisoners. Wherever located some county forming part of the regional jail complex will face heavy transportation costs. In this area both the Welland county and Lincoln county jails have outlived their usefulness. They need to be replaced by modern structures.

The Welland county jail was built in 1856 and the Lincoln county jail was built in—I cannot find that one, but I would not imagine it was much more modern than the Welland county jail.

A regional jail on the surface would be a good move but not if the costs of the land, for services, for operation and transportation added up to a sum which would make such a move too costly. Required from the provincial government is a new look at what they are offering to promote the construction of regional jails.

The province should pay its share of the land and services costs, it should aid in meeting the cost of operation and transportation as well as paying half the construction cost of the new building. Otherwise, there is a growing doubt of the advantage to be reaped by regional jails.

Very simply, Mr. Chairman, in summary, unless the province is prepared to take a realistic look at how this horrendous problem of cost is going to be handled; unless the province is prepared to assume that the administration of justice, the provision of regional jails and so on is truly really logically and sensibly a provincial responsibility, this plan of the hon. Minister—notwithstanding the propaganda, notwithstanding the speeches, notwithstanding the so-called agreement—is doomed to failure.

I do not know whether these things have been put before the Cabinet. I would suspect that the hon. Minister in all his studies of this thing has come to the realization that he is probably now being put in the very invidious position of having to defend a decision made by the Cabinet which perhaps he does not agree with, and I do not envy him that task.

But I say, Mr. Chairman, there is only one way that we are going to get these old ancient, decrepit, shameful buildings removed from the scene of the administration

of justice, the treatment of prisoners and the rehabilitation, in the province of Ontario. That is if the government of Ontario assumes its proper role and recognizes that this is a responsibility of all the people of Ontario; and all the people of Ontario—not just the homeowners in particular regions—are going to pay the cost.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I fully concur with the hon. member for Downsview. I feel that regardless of how sincere this very charming man is—in this picture here he looks like a very sincere, honest man—

Mr. Chairman: What—

Mr. Sargent: I am speaking on county jails, Mr. Chairman. Regardless of the hon. Minister's sincerity, in the three years that we have been talking about this I think he recognizes that our present system in county jails is a punitive system. Does the hon. Minister agree with that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not our system.

Mr. Sargent: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not our system; it is the county jail system. The one that the hon. member was mayor of and did not do anything about.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister agrees it is a punitive system we have and yet he allows this thing to continue. In three years he has not built a single jail bed under this programme. Regardless of how he may have these plans—the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is sitting there and I would ask him if he speaks for government insofar as municipalities are concerned: Is this a just tax against real estate—jails?

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Well, of course, that is the system under which we operate. If the hon. member wants that answered, that is the answer he gets. Remember that we are paying grants for these expenditures—

Mr. Sargent: You have changed your spots, down in the front row there.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, they do not pay any different from what they pay in Grey county or Huron, or whatever county he comes from.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, why this formula will not work for county jails is because the municipalities cannot afford to pay

50 per cent, or five per cent, or one per cent towards jails under their real estate taxes. This is factual. And that is why the formula is not working. I think the government should make a stand on this and tell the people that they have to spend \$50 million this year on this programme, out of their real estate taxes.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Where?

Mr. Sargent: Well, you ask them to pay half the costs.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, where does the hon. member get the \$50 million?

Mr. Sargent: Well, if you had an intelligent programme it would cost you \$50 million. If you are going to do these things it will cost you that. So let us face facts; if the programme is going to work, you have to have the co-operation of the municipalities. And they are not going to come in, I can tell you that. Now, we asked the hon. Minister last night: "You have two agreements signed, how much money is involved?" He does not know. He has no idea. I think it is a sad commentary when we have a great idea, this great area of our people who are involved, their first impression on breaking the law. They go into a system that was punitive 100 years ago and here in this dynamic Ontario we have a government which brags about progress and they are only kidding the troops; they are not kidding anybody. We have here the lowest paid group of people in the province in these jails and here we have a budget on this first vote, 1901, which has jumped 66 per cent in salaries.

An hon. member: A nice increase.

Mr. Sargent: It is all right if the right people are getting it. \$502,000 to \$837,000, that is correct. Fifty-six per cent. Now, Mr. Minister, I would like to ask you, do you plan to increase the schedule for the lower grades in your department in the county jails?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that is quite a list of questions to be thrown at me. I will do the best I can.

Actually, the hon. member for Downsview made quite a pitch about how this will not work until we take over the jails completely. It is the old story about arguing about the Ontario government taking over the complete cost of the administration of justice. Now if he wants to make that argument, that is the argument he should make, not just pick on the county jails.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Where do you stand on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I stand with the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will say this: The hon. member has suggested that this is all propaganda. In the first place I do not think this will be appreciated by the many—and I do not want to sound melodramatic on this—hard-working county councils who went to work on this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it is the truth. These people spent countless hours in discussions and negotiations and they will not like to be told that they were only engaging in a propaganda pitch. They are quite happy with the 50 per cent.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I listened quite attentively. Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and not bother answering the questions.

Mr. Chairman: Will the members now listen to the Minister, please?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. members want the answers I will give them to them, as far as I can give them, if they will only listen.

The fact is they did spend a considerable amount of time—a tremendous amount of time—they put a tremendous amount of work in this, and it was in areas where they found great difficulty. But it was the 50-per-cent grant that encouraged them, and it is being successful. It is being successful. On the one hand the argument is that we are not being successful fast enough, and on the other hand they argue, "You should not go ahead with this," which is in fact what the hon. member said: "Do not go ahead with it, until you have settled the matter of the cost of the administration of justice across the whole spectrum of Ontario; do not go ahead with it until you get the complete plan for regional development in the whole of the province." There was another reason for the delay—I just cannot remember what it was. Yes—"Let us wait for the Ontario taxing report and for the federal tax report."

Well, I could imagine the hon. member getting up if I said, "We cannot do anything about the county jails because we have to

wait for a decision on this, we will wait for a decision on that, we will wait for a decision on so and so." And I can just imagine the hon. member getting up and saying, "No wonder you have got nothing done, you keep waiting." We are forging ahead in this plan, and it is working.

Actually, the hon. member is suggesting that we either take over the complete cost of the administration of justice or, as an alternative, go into these areas and force the counties to build new jails. This is what he is saying. Well, we are very successful by conferring with these people, showing them the need, discussing it with them. And they are voluntarily coming in on the plan. Why should we force people to do it, when they are voluntarily coming into the plan?

Mr. Sargent: They are not coming in.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are coming in. Now, let us talk about Owen Sound. I think the hon. member runs a newspaper there. I take it that it is not the Owen Sound *Herald*?

Mr. Sargent: It is the Owen Sound *Herald*.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is it, or is it not?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, it is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You run the Owen Sound *Herald*? Well, let us find out what the Owen Sound *Herald* says: "If we are not getting any place—"

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, speaking for the record, it is not a controlled press.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know how much of a staff the hon. member has on this great newspaper, but if he had nothing to do with it, and he does not agree with it, we can only say he has staff in whom he has very little confidence, or he disagrees with their judgment. Here is what they said:

THE BEGINNING OF THE END FOR
OLD JAILS LIKE OWEN SOUND

An agreement signed last week between the Ontario government and officials from four counties in eastern Ontario marked the beginning of the end of Ontario's dungeon jails. Owen Sound's old jail which has been a disgrace to the city for a long time, and which was the centre of an inquiry last year, will be in line for demolition, one of the 37 jails marked in Ontario. Just how soon it will happen is

up in the air. Reforms Minister Allan Grossman took the occasion last week to pledge his government to a pervasive re-vamping of the entire archaic county-jail system, and referred to the multi-county deal in first-ever superlatives. In fact other provinces, such as Alberta, have never had county jails to get rid of. Nevertheless, the Ontario move is a forward step in penology.

And let us listen to this:

With the province paying 50 per cent of the cost and ten per cent of the maintenance of the regional centres built to its master plan, it will be hard for local authorities of Ontario to refuse replacements for disgraceful jails. Mr. Grossman is pushing rebuilding and expects three or four new regional centres to be agreed to in the next year.

I will not plague the hon. member with the balance of it, except the last paragraph, which his very able staff wrote in this editorial:

In fact it seems that the movie-set dungeon is at last on its way out and it will not be missed.

So, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member in his own newspaper has said that we are moving ahead, and I would hope the hon. members would help me in this and not give, as they say they did, encouragement to those who will say, let us wait for all these other things and never do anything about it. That would actually be the effect of what the hon. member is saying.

Now, he had some specific questions. He said "What about London?" I was out at London last week. London is a difficult situation, because it has a very, shall we say, independent mayor, who has some of his own ideas. He is attempting to make, as the hon. member for Downsview is attempting to make, the county jail system a focal point for the need, as he calls it, for the Ontario government to take over the complete cost of the administration of justice.

Mr. Singer: It is not a question of waiting, but of action.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are a lot of other things that could make a good argument for the Ontario government's taking over. On the one hand, hon. members will argue for the autonomy of the local councils. I could, and the hon. member, I am sure, could—he is a very able man—I am sure he could put up a good argument for taking over practically everything, except garbage collection, and there would not be any muni-

cipalities. As a matter of fact, as I did mention in London, the provincial government could take over the garbage collection too, by the mere process of having a regional board do this, or a regional group.

Mr. Chairman, he also mentioned in his argument, "Why should a particular county pay if a criminal comes into its county and has to be incarcerated there; why should they keep him?" This is a good theoretical argument. But the argument can also be employed in this respect: Why should the province of Ontario pay \$50 a week to keep criminals when they have come from another province? Why should not the federal government take that over? Some man committed a crime some place else, he has ten or 15 crimes against him, they are waiting for him there, he comes into the province of Ontario, he commits a crime here, he happens to be caught here and he is incarcerated in our jail. Why should he, because he got one day less in his sentence, be a cost to the province of Ontario? Shall we tell the federal government to take over the whole of the cost of this system?

Mr. Singer: Yes, but in the meantime we should do our job fairly.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member wants to help us in this argument, we would welcome his assistance. In the meantime, let us get back to rebuilding regional detention centres, and that is what we are doing.

There are other facts he brought out about selling the land, and this sort of thing. Actually, most counties will be able to recoup the cost of their share of buying the new land by selling the land on which the present old county jail sits. In many cases, that jail is sitting on very valuable land and, in many instances, they will be ahead of the game insofar as that is concerned.

Anyway, all I can finish with is that, in spite of the fact that there are arguments that it will not work, it is working and at least Ontario is doing something about it—two in the last few months; seven jails, nine jails, being replaced by three. That is not bad for a few months, for jails you have waited for more than 150 years. Give us a hand, and by the end of the year we will have a much bigger job done.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Downsview asked me about the Don jail. It is in no different position from any other. The Don jail is a combined city and county jail. They had the same offer as any other county and if some of those eastern counties

—some of the other counties and the city of Hamilton—see fit to come into this new plan with the same arrangements—a 50 per cent grant—there is no reason for the city of Toronto not doing the same thing.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, I feel I must say that I concur with the remarks of the hon. member for Downsview in connection with the Don jail, in spite of what the hon. Minister has said just now. It does not matter how you look at it—when you have circumstances as deplorable as you find in places like the Don jail, I think the government should take over the cost, the complete cost, of justice in cases such as this.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Braithwaite: And I must say that as I sit here and listen while the hon. Minister tries his best to drag a red herring across it, I become more certain that this is the responsibility of the government.

I want to get on to the Harold King farm. Earlier the hon. Minister mentioned that some of these associations that were trying to do a good job, were thought by him to be doing harm.

I notice on page 45 of his report, that the Harold King farm is mentioned; I notice that he is paying tribute to it and other foundations. What I want to ask, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member if that comes under the grants—No. 10?

Mr. Braithwaite: It comes under the grants.

What I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, is this: I do not see under No. 10, any provision for the Harold King farm and I would like to know if the farm has made any requests for money and has been turned down. If it has, then how much money has the hon. Minister in mind for the year 1967 for the Harold King farm? If I remember correctly, this institution was trying to raise money by public subscription not long ago. I wonder if the hon. Minister can bring us up to date in that regard?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, let say without any hesitation that I think the Harold King farm is doing a wonderful job. I have been out there a couple of times, I think, and I have watched their operations. They are doing a wonderful job and are getting grants. They are getting their grants from The Department of Public Welfare

under The Charitable Institutions Act. They get a *per diem* grant.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if he has seen fit to pay tribute to them in his report, would they not be entitled to money under his department? I should think that the work they are doing is directly related to the hon. Minister's department.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the difference to the Harold King farm, whether they get it from The Department of Public Welfare or from this department? They are not going to get it from both departments, I can tell the hon. member that. This is something that the government has decided as a matter of policy and these things are going to be reviewed—whether it should be under The Department of Public Welfare institution grants system or whether it should be ours, is a matter of opinion, but it really would not make any difference.

Now, so far as any further grants or any further assistance is concerned, all this is going to be subject to the result of the research that is being done in this whole field of half-way houses.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I must say that I disagree with the hon. Minister as far as he says that it makes no difference. He has not said how much money the farm is getting—this I would like to know.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Ask Public Welfare when the estimates come up.

Mr. Braithwaite: I should think that this is the responsibility of the hon. Minister. He should be able to answer that question.

The other thing is that if they are getting enough money and getting along well, why is it that they have to have public subscriptions? I think this is the responsibility of the hon. Minister's department.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has indicated that you can ask The Department of Public Welfare in their estimates, regarding those circumstances.

Mr. Braithwaite: I just wanted to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we are discussing The Department of Reform Institutions and we are discussing grants and we are discussing—

Mr. Chairman: In the circumstances then, I must ask the member to stay with The Department of Reform Institutions.

Mr. Braithwaite: With respect, sir.

Mr. Bryden: I just want to make a comment on this particular point, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale is listed next. Is there something in this particular point—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I am trying to take them as I see them and I am going to ask that the member for Bracondale be now recognized.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, first of all I should state that I regret that it was necessary for our hon. leader, (Mr. Thompson) to get up and more or less have to—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1901.

Mr. Ben: We are on vote 1901—and apologize lest there be some thought that the attacks being made by the Opposition were in any way directed personally at members of the staff. To me it was falling for an old ploy of the hon. Minister. First, he accused me of making a personal attack on him, then that I was making a personal attack on his department.

Mr. Chairman: Please, vote 1901; this a statute for a salary, under 1901.

Mr. Ben: All the Opposition members here were again accused of demoralizing the staff; that we were responsible for demoralizing them.

In the—I do not know the date of the newspaper—but the Reverend West was accused of making a personal attack, you might say, on—

Mr. Chairman: Come back to 1901. I insist that the member stay with vote 1901.

Mr. Ben: I am staying with vote 1901. Can we then deal with "Staff training and development"? All right?

Mr. Chairman: There is nothing to prevent you from doing so.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said by the hon. Minister about what wonderful training the staff of reform institutions get and I could not help noticing, Mr. Chairman, that in the public accounts—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me, the member for Bracondale, this has nothing to do with the staff, as I understand it, for the reforma-

ories. This is the staff for the main office. Is that what you want to talk about?

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, as I started to say, I was going to refer to public accounts in the province of Ontario for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1965. I would refer you, Mr. Chairman, to page F-6 which deals with "Main office staff training and development." Captions: "Staff training school, Guelph"; "Salaries"; "Training expenses," and so on. How can you say, Mr. Chairman, that this does not deal with staff training?

Mr. Chairman: I think the member will find—is this right, Mr. Minister? I think the member will find under 1903 that the salaries will come under Guelph?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think this is quite in order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Now, in the public accounts to which I was referring, I note that the amount appropriated for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965, was \$56,000. As I pointed out on an earlier occasion, of that amount only \$21,000 was spent for staff training. As a matter of fact, only half the amount appropriated; \$28,000 was spent. I am sorry, \$22,000 was spent for what you might call "training courses." There were training fellowships of \$6,000, which would make it \$28,000.

In the estimates before us, \$75,000 is being asked. I asked the hon. Minister—he can make a note and answer it on a later occasion—why for the fiscal year ending 1965, did he only spend \$22,000 for staff training, and why this year they are asking for \$75,000? Why the sudden increase when they were not spending in previous years what was appropriated?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. member like an answer to that now?

Mr. Ben: I had suggested that the hon. Minister make a note of it and give it all at once but I will yield the floor to the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will do it the way the hon. member wishes.

Mr. Chairman: Candidly, Mr. Minister, I would just as soon have the member have his questions answered all at once.

Mr. Ben: I yield the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is all right; go ahead. I am guided by the Chairman.

Mr. Ben: Then there is another item that comes under main office, Mr. Chairman. It can be confirmed by looking at page F-6 in the public accounts—training fellowships for students in psychology and social work.

What I cannot understand are the amounts allocated in this regard, such picayune amounts when there is such a crying need for trained psychologists and psychiatrists and social workers in the reform institutions. When Millbrook was opened, Mr. Chairman, they had a supervising psychologist, two full-time psychologists, two full-time social workers, one part-time psychiatrist who gave eight consecutive days a month, one part-time psychiatrist who gave a half a day a week. The last time they had a comparable staff was three years ago. They now only have one full-time psychologist who was hired, I believe, a year ago September; one part time on the average of three times a month, giving one to one and a half days at a time; and they recently appointed a new psychiatrist, but at the time I made inquiries they did not know how much time that he would be devoting.

Incidentally, I might point out that this is the progress that is being made. Three years ago—rather, when the prison opened about ten years ago, they had one supervising psychologist, two full-time psychologists, two full-time social workers, and two part-time psychiatrists; now they are down to one full-time psychologist and two part-time psychiatrists. That is progress in the reform institutions.

I ask, if there is such a shortage of these people, why are not the grants larger to get more trained personnel into these prisons?

The hon. Minister last night started to give some figures to rebut some statements made by this side of the House to the effect that it is our opinion that the inmates in Millbrook and Guelph have a higher educational level than his correctional staff. He started to deny that it was so. He got up and he started to read figures saying that they had checked 8,000 people who had passed through the institution but he never finished, because he knew we were going to get the point out that that was not the question we asked. We wanted to know the educational levels of the people who were in Millbrook and Guelph at the time he got the statistics on the educational level of the correctional officers in those two institutions, and he started mentioning a figure of 8,000 inmates.

Now one of the things we did applaud the hon. Minister for was the effort he was making with the child-training centres. I would

suggest to the hon. Minister, if he has got all these experts here, let them take the educational level of all the inmates but subtract those that are in child-training institutes because they are all minors.

Mr. Chairman: The member is getting away from the vote now.

Mr. Ben: They are all—I should not say minors—juveniles; most of them are under the age of 16. Take away their educational level from the figures and I am willing to wager, with the hon. Minister, \$100 payable to the Red Cross that the inmates in Millbrook and Guelph have attained higher educational level than the correctional officers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is that to me or to a charitable institution? Is the hon. member offering to give \$100 to a charitable institution?

Mr. Ben: A charitable institution; the hon. Minister has too much money now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member is going to be \$100 poorer.

Mr. Ben: I am new in the House, Mr. Chairman, and I cannot understand why the hon. Minister was talking about things that I did not think of as being in the main office vote, and I cannot rebut, but perhaps I will have to wait. He may—

Mr. Chairman: I should explain to the member; it is a general statement that the Minister makes in advance and then we deal vote by vote.

Mr. Ben: Well, there has been a lot said here about these district or county jails and I cannot help thinking to myself what wonderful progress has been made when I look through my notes here and I find out that in March of 1947, the then Minister of Reform Institutions, Mr. Dunbar, replied to a question that was asked; that when the government's long-term programme—and I have in my note how long—is completed there will be no such institutions as the Don jail but in their place would be county industrial farms. This is in 1947. In 1948, on April 1—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I question if this is on the vote.

Mr. Ben: County jails.

Mr. Chairman: I know, but in 1947 and 1948. We have had considerable discussion in connection with county jails and the cost of the county jails. Now if you want to deal with the cost of the county in repetition, you may do so; 50 per cent of its share.

Mr. Ben: I am discussing it with you—

Mr. Chairman: I think it has been covered.

Mr. Ben: I would just point out that it has certainly been covered because on April 1, 1949, the then member for York East, the late Agnes Macphail, discussed not only the—sorry, it is with reference to Mercer. I will have to go over to 1949, July the 16th, the then member for Wellington South, Mr. Hamilton, sworn in as the Minister of Reform Institutions succeeding Mr. Dunbar, and the Premier at that time, hon. Mr. Frost, stated under the previous Minister, Mr. Dunbar, an entirely new concept of reform had been brought into effect—known as the Ontario plan. He went on to say that it was Dunbar who had initiated the plan which would eventually replace the outmoded county jail with industrial farms where prisoners could be kept busy and taught work that would be of use to them upon their discharge.

I mention this because the hon. member for Grey North, Mr. Chairman, had been accusing the hon. Minister of making no progress. This idea is not new. It has been in existence since at least 1947. Now the government brags about what progress it has made and to this day it cannot show one existing district or regional detention centre and it is almost 20 years—and that is progress. Sorry progress, I should say; yes, it is a sorry, sorry progress.

I will now resume my seat, Mr. Chairman, but I am looking to the hon. Minister for an answer to that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, first I would like to table a copy of the agreements which the hon. member asked for regarding the agreements with respect to the regional detention centres. Those two which have already been signed. I think there are three or four copies of each.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in respect to the matter raised by the hon. member for Bracondale regarding staff training, he has pointed out that we have not expended the money we had allotted to us for this purpose, and attempts to make the point that apparently we are not doing in staff training what we should because we have not used the

money. I think the figure he used was \$22,915. Actually \$28,915 was spent out of a figure of \$58,000 shown in the estimates for that year. The figure of \$28,915.16 is a net figure after deducting \$9,250.95, which was recovered from the government of Canada. Our actual expenditures therefore were \$38,166.

During 1964-65 we were without a director of staff development. Thus his salary was unexpended. If this had been included, our expenditures two years ago would have been \$47,166.01. The balance of this appropriation was unused training fellowships and provision for the second and third years of the course in corrections to be conducted by Queen's University, but which was discontinued. Apparently Queen's University did not have a sufficient number of students for this course and discontinued it. Since then we, of course, have arranged this with McMaster University, and it is a very expanded programme.

As far as the \$100 that the hon. member was going to donate to a charitable organization, I hope he will allow me to name the organization. He said that he would donate this \$100 if I established that the academic education of the inmates in Millbrook was in fact lower than the staff. I tell him now that it is lower than the staff; it is lower than grade 8.

Mr. Ben: Millbrook and Guelph?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have already given you the figures, which included Guelph. And incidentally, they did not include training schools at all. These are only for adult institutions. The hon. member had better go out and make that \$100 fast.

Mr. Ben: Send the figures over and I will make a cheque out.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wentworth East was going to get the floor.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would like the hon. Minister to just briefly outline items 7 and 8 under 1901, the workmen's compensation board awards, and also number 8, which sets out compassionate allowances to permanently handicapped inmates or wards.

What is the relationship, first, with the workmen's compensation? Does this refer to staff coverage, or the inmate coverage? And is it paid on the same basis as industrial assessment is paid, or is there a special arrangement covering your compensation problems?

Also, could we have some idea of what the experience is in the various institutions in regard to injury while they are performing an occupational work?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, item No. 7 has to do with staff. In item No. 8, under the heading "compassionate allowances," there is an arrangement made whereby when an inmate is injured doing work in the institution, we put it in the hands of the workmen's compensation board and have them process it on the same basis as they would if the inmate were out of the institution. According to their decision, we provide a compassionate allowance to the inmate.

Mr. Gisborn: Just one little point further on that: the amount for workmen's compensation board. Is the department assessed on the same basis as any other industry for payroll?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told, yes, exactly the same.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like just for a moment to bring us back to the regional detention centres. I think that the discussion we have had so far has been centred on the financial problem, based upon the small municipalities that we have today.

I would like to bring this matter into another focus. Last night I talked and tried to discuss with this House, the division of authority in this whole correctional field. One of the problems we face is because of that division of authority. We do not have the same Minister when it comes to probation and parole. We do not have the same supervision when it comes to the matter of younger people, children and their correction.

Now we come to the same problem here. The hon. Minister is going to get his people coming into his institutions from these regional detention centres, but he does not have control of the regional detention centres under the setup proposed. This is going to be done by the regional boards. He is going to give some grants for the expenses. But there is no co-ordination here. It seems to me that the fundamental problem in this whole matter is the problem of genuine co-ordination, of unification of the whole system of correction. Whether that unification can be brought about by one department, right through the whole gambit, or whether it can

be done by greater co-ordination, I do not know at this point. It seems to me that this whole field must be assessed and studied very carefully. We are dealing here with human beings. We are dealing here with corrections. When boys and girls go wrong and become emotionally disturbed, that is the place where we ought to start the correction procedure. When a young person is brought into the county jail or into the correction centre, as he will be later on, then that is the place where the rehabilitative procedure ought to begin.

And yet, sir, we are going to have a problem of staff, different standards in different areas, unless the hon. Minister is going to set those standards and make sure that proper salaries are paid. Different standards of training cannot possibly be unified, except under one authority.

So it seems to me that while the financial problem might be solved to some extent, if we had regional government of the kind that we have long been advocating, this would then pale into greater insignificance than it does today, but the fundamental thing is unification in the corrections programme and the corrections procedure. This is why, it seems to me, that the province ought to be now assuming responsibility for these regional classification and detention centres. Finance is important, yes, but it is the wellbeing of the young people that are going to be brought in there, the correction procedure that should start at that moment, a correction procedure which should be unified from that moment until that person is restored to a self-respecting place in society.

I think the hon. Minister ought to look at this carefully not so much from the financial point of view, as from a human point of view. There is no question, Mr. Chairman, that if there was real urgency in the mind of the hon. Minister and the government of this province, regarding these new centres, they would be built. We would have them much faster than the process is producing them today. I think it is a matter of real urgency.

In a wartime situation, it is amazing what we can do. This is a war on crime, Mr. Chairman, a war on the kind of emotional disturbance which results in later criminal acts and in this kind of liability to society. So if we regarded it this way, if the hon. Minister and his Cabinet would think of it in these terms, and think of the human values at stake, then I think we would have not only speed, but we would have a real attempt to unify the whole correction procedure in this province.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think you should have some side-view mirrors set up on that table there, so that you can see this end of the House.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1901.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, earlier in the morning I brought up the position of St. Leonard's house. I had hoped to be able to follow through with it and was interrupted by other speakers and never had a chance to get back on it. I would like to follow through at this time.

Less than one half hour ago, the hon. Minister had mentioned the fact that he was not going to wait for the Ontario tax report nor the federal tax report, in dealing with the building of the regional jails. Now, when it comes to assistance for the halfway houses, he is waiting for the report.

Why is he waiting for this one report and refuses to wait for another report? The Grygier report may not be down for six months, a year, maybe two years, who knows? It depends on the amount of effort and time that Dr. Grygier has to give to the report. In the meantime, St. Leonard's house which is being assisted by The Department of Public Welfare, is receiving only \$1,400 a year in assistance. In a budget of well over \$25,000, \$1,400 is very, very minor, when you consider that of all the men being released from prison this year, four out of five are going to find trouble; they are going to be right back in prison.

And when you look at the fact that it costs ten times more to keep a man in prison than to administer some type of probation, we find that St. Leonard's house is now reversing that trend—has reversed the trend, so that rather than four out of five returning to an institution, we have only one out of five persons who use St. Leonard's house return to an institution. Despite this, and the fact that the federal government in 1965 gave the house a grant of \$4,500, the grant from this department was nil. The grant received by St. Leonard's house was \$1,436.41 from the provincial Department of Public Welfare. If this hon. Minister is going to talk about rehabilitating, I think he should put up. He has an opportunity to show that he is interested in the work of this association by giving them, or assisting them, in the grant that they have requested.

This talking and waiting for a report is not good enough for the people back in my com-

munity. They have waited long enough for this assistance and they are deserving of this assistance.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, we have completed another of the many circles we have been describing in discussing these estimates and it happens to bring us back to a point on which I want to make a brief comment.

Before I do so, sir, I would like to make an observation for your consideration as to the method with which we are dealing with the estimates. It is always an extremely difficult matter to deal with an estimate covering a wide subject matter in a coherent and rational way, but it would seem to me that the sensible and logical way, when we are dealing with a vote such as 1901, is to take a point at a time and as far as possible, complete it before going on to another point.

I know that this is by no means entirely in your hands. It requires a lot of co-operation from the members but I can assure any hon. member who wants to go on to a new point that he does not have to worry. If he waits a few minutes, he will get his chance. On the other hand, if we work on the principle that we are going to develop lists, I would suggest, sir, that it is going to create a rigidity in the discussion of estimates which is quite undesirable.

We will be jumping all over the lot from one point to another, because the person who happens to get your eye and get on your list as next in line, may have a totally different point. Things would be much more satisfactory for the Minister, for the House and for everybody, if by reasonable forbearance on the part of everybody, we could work out a system where we deal with a point at a time.

With that preamble, I want to make one observation on a point that was before the committee a little while ago: the question of grants to certain halfway houses. The hon. Minister said that those grants were paid out of the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare and you quite properly ruled that, that being so, we could not go into a discussion of a specific grant at this time. I do not believe that you had any option but to rule that.

I would, however, like to say to the hon. Minister that this is rather an undesirable way of doing it. It seems to me, from my knowledge of the matter, that these halfway houses relate directly to his rehabilitation programme, yet the members who are interested get an opportunity to ask questions

about them only in a totally different context where they do not fit.

This is the time when they should be discussed because this is the time when we are discussing the total programme to which they relate. I suggest to the hon. Minister that he might have a discussion with his colleague in Public Welfare with a view to developing a more rational procedure under which subjects can be discussed when it is most appropriate to discuss them.

Mr. Chairman: Just before I call on the next one, I would like to say to the member for Woodbine that I concur with his viewpoint and I understand that at one time this was the practice of the House—to call them item by item under the vote—and if it is the wish of the House, I would prefer to do it this way.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on this. I think it would be most helpful to concentrate on one item at a time. I think it must cause confusion to the hon. Minister as well as to the members of the Opposition, who perhaps feel that they are arriving at a clarification and then suddenly find themselves off in another area.

Mr. Chairman: We are practically finished, I assume, with vote 1901, but on our next vote we can consider it.

Mr. Nixon: I have one short question. When we were discussing regional detention centres a few moments ago, the hon. Minister offered to give me some information as to the location of a proposed detention centre in the Brant area. I wonder if he could now give me that information?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, Mr. Chairman, if I gave that impression. I had no intention of doing that. We will not give any opinion as to where a location should be until it has been discussed with the counties concerned and a decision made, because we do not want to enter into any public controversy, if we possibly can in conferences with—

Mr. Nixon: I was under the impression that a decision had been made and the hon. Minister was ready to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. I was referring to the grouping.

Mr. C. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I do not know where to start here be-

cause you have narrowed down the rules of the game from time to time on different individuals. Yet I think, perhaps, I should speak on behalf of these hard-working county councillors to whom the hon. Minister made reference. I sat on county council for some ten years as the member for Welland, trying to maintain an obsolete old jail and spent many, many thousands of dollars in taxpayers' money on these old county buildings. And we still have an old county building right in the heart of the city.

I do believe that it is time that this government paid some attention to the requests of its mayors and reeves and Ontario municipal associations. I am very sorry that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs has left. For a moment he showed a spark of life this morning when he interjected in the comments of my good friend, the hon. member for Grey North.

In 1950 or 1951 there was a convention in that city of his, to discuss these very problems and I would like to say to you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs of the present day is the past president of this great organization of the mayors and reeves. At that time we worked on problems together, trying to persuade this government to concede to us at least one fact, and that is that to bear the cost of administration of justice in the municipalities was not a fair burden on the shoulders of a man who owns a bit of property. So we sat together on many occasions trying to persuade your executive body here to give us this concession—to give us more grants.

I know that money does not grow on trees and I also know that the mayors and reeves association represents—

An hon. member: What does not grow on trees?

Mr. Bukator: I sometimes would like to find out. I would go and pick some—

Mr. Young: Gooseberry bushes, George.

Mr. Bukator: And that comes from a reverend gentleman of the cloth. A very fitting comment.

The mayors and reeves association represents 522 municipalities. They speak on behalf of more than five million people in the province of Ontario and they have come to this government annually with their brief asking them to pick up the added burden that they must pick up from year to year as the taxes go up, and put the cost in the right area. I do believe that it is from the

provincial and federal governments that they should find these dollars. I know that the same people will pay the money but it would be a lot more equitable if they would do that.

I was amazed when I read the resolution to find exactly what the municipalities had to pay for. And I found two—and I would like to be corrected if I am wrong at this point, by the hon. Minister, if he will.

He said last night, if I recall rightly, that only ten per cent of the maintenance costs of these county jails is borne by the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say "only"; I said ten per cent.

Mr. Bukator: Well, we will delete the word "only." Ten per cent of the maintenance cost is paid for by the province, is that right? Then it is only ten per cent in my book. Is there nothing paid to the cities or the counties for the construction costs of their buildings as at the present date? The capital costs of new construction? The only portion of administration of justice that is borne by this province, then, is ten per cent of the maintenance costs.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. Do you want me to interject here, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, I would.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The cost of administration of justice covers a multiplicity of things, not just county jails. This is just one aspect of it—

Mr. Bukator: I will read through this resolution what they actually add their ten per cent to.

Whereas under existing legislation, local municipalities are required to provide the jails and lock-up facilities and to pay the salaries of the jail guards; to pay for court-houses for the county and the supreme court; to pay coroners, pathologists, post-mortem and inquest fees; to pay for witnesses and jurors, to provide accommodations for division courts, magistrates' courts; to pay for magistrates and for their staff; to provide accommodation to the legal law library for lawyers; to provide for transportation of prisoners and administration and accommodation for juvenile and family courts, and other expenses related to the administration of justice.

Now, all of these things the county pays for, for the county buildings and the city buildings. You bear ten per cent of these?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. No, Mr. Chairman, let us get that clear. There is a general grant for the administration of justice to all municipalities. This is an additional ten per cent by this department to help towards the cost of the administration of county jails.

Mr. Bukator: Then, not to belabour this point, I would like very much for the hon. Minister to send me at his convenience the breakdown of exactly what is paid for by the province and how the percentages work out. I suppose he has this in his records and he can send it to me rather than take the time of the House at this time.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): A good idea.

Mr. Bukator: The hon. member representing the Hydro commission says it is a good idea. Did I get the hon. Minister's nod that he will send me this information?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Why, precisely, does the hon. member want the information of what we pay the ten per cent on?

Mr. Bukator: I would like to know how much the hon. Minister bears of the administration of justice costs for any municipality in the province.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We pay ten per cent of the cost of the maintenance of the county jails. That seems to cover everything the hon. member needs to know in answer to that question.

Mr. Bukator: Well, that is what I said at the very beginning.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: But I was trying to point out, the hon. member was giving the impression that this ten per cent is all that a municipality gets towards the cost of administration of justice generally, and that is not the case. This is only insofar as the county jail is concerned. It is an additional grant by our department, ten per cent of the cost of the administration of that particular jail, over and above the government's regular grants to the municipalities for the administration of justice.

Mr. Bukator: And that comes from The Department of the Attorney-General, does it? I am asking, I do not know. This would be a very good place to get some information; someone surely could give it to us. You have Ministers in every department of government, all I am asking is the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have given the hon. member the answer to the question so far as

it relates to my department. If he wants to find out how much his particular municipality gets as far as grants for the administration of justice generally, obviously I would not have these figures here.

Mr. Bukator: Then my next question, Mr. Chairman, is: What particular department will provide these figures for us?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I imagine Municipal Affairs, either Municipal Affairs or The Department of the Attorney-General; I am not sure.

Mr. Bukator: Then when these estimates come before the House, we will inquire again. I would like to clear up this particular point.

But let me follow up with the end of the resolution of the mayors and reeves of this particular province of ours who, I said before, represent over five million of your taxpayers. They wind up by saying:

Therefore, be it resolved that the Ontario government be urged to carefully note the inequalities in this situation and to take whatever steps it considers necessary to assist the municipalities by removing these costs from the list of municipal financial obligations and to assume the entire cost of the administration of justice, including the cost of buildings, maintaining courthouses and jails.

It is as simple as that. Now this request has been made on many occasions by people who are elected to these county councils, elected to municipalities, who have sat with the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who at one time was the president of this group and also made these requests.

My time takes me back to 1950 when we came to the Attorney-General of that time, the Hon. Dana Porter, and said that this is not fair, the people should not bear this cost on the piece of land that they own—especially the pensioners and those on fixed incomes. And it is about time that this department took another look at this particular cost and bore at least—he said 50 per cent when they build new ones, if they build new ones; but that does not appear to be in the near future.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the hon. Minister for so quickly making available to me a copy of the agreement between the county of Peterborough, the county of Victoria, and the united counties of—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, before the hon. member goes ahead, I thought that I had

them both. They have just come off the Xerox machine; they are essentially the same.

Mr. Singer: I have been able to spend a few minutes going over this, presuming in essence they are substantially the same. May I say, Mr. Chairman, that these agreements confirm my foreboding about this whole situation. This agreement is nothing more than a declaration of intention. I do not think it really requires anyone steeped in the law to read this agreement through and to find that there is no commitment.

There is no positive commitment at all on the part of the parties to this agreement—interestingly enough the province is not a party to this agreement, only the municipal organizations are—and there is no commitment by them that they will build a centre. There is no commitment at all that there will be built a regional jail. There are methods established whereby they can continue to investigate; there are methods established whereby they can begin to look at land sites; and there are methods established whereby, once they agree, that the whole matter can go to arbitration.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I would turn again to the original theme I was making. The great achievement of having arrived at two agreements really is not the great achievement that the hon. Minister seemed to impress me with. It really does not mean that today or next week or next year, or even within a foreseeable target date, that we are going to have a regional detention centre that will involve the county of Peterborough, the county of Victoria and the united counties of Northumberland and Durham.

This is an evidence of goodwill on behalf of the councils of these municipalities that they are going to sit down and think about it further and talk about it further. And if this is true, Mr. Chairman—and I say reading this that this is the way it impresses me—where is our programme for regional jails? It is just non-existent.

Mr. Sargent: Before you close this vote, Mr. Chairman, this 1901—this at the best is a trying ordeal for the hon. Minister on the hot seat—I think it has come to the point where we have these \$2 billion worth of estimates and we have everything corralled into this one book one inch thick and, progressively, we have to nit-pick the information from the hon. Minister. I see the hon. Prime Minister is not in his seat, but it becomes someone on that side of the House to furnish us with the information we should

have before us; as in any sense of business. In the estimates of the Prime Minister there was "other salaries, \$49,000"; "other salaries, \$133,000." What are they? The hon. Prime Minister tells us that they are all people under \$8,000.

Mr. Chairman: That was on another vote.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Now we are back to this vote. Progressively, Mr. Chairman, we are going through every vote. We are going to ask you what those other salaries are, and we have a right to know them. And for once, let me establish some sense of intelligence. This book should be five times as thick as it is now to carry the information we want. Behind the Speaker's desk you could have a complete compilation of all these facts we need, an addendum or something to give us this information. And somewhere along the line, let us give the Opposition what they need to fight this with. How can we ask intelligent questions—

An hon. member: That is hard to do.

Another hon. member: That kind of equipment cannot be printed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Sargent: Well, it is tough at any time, but if you do not have the facts, how can you? I think, Mr. Chairman, we asked the hon. Prime Minister to give us some ground rules, but he did not say anything. I asked for these breakdowns and we have not had them. But every vote that comes up we are going to ask for them, so let us get on with it and start moving.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1901 carried? No, the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: This is why I said, Mr. Chairman, you should have side-view mirrors there. There are other members in the House other than those who are in front of you.

Mr. Chairman: I say to the member for Windsor-Walkerville that, if he will rise in his place and call "Mr. Chairman," I will recognize him. If I cannot see him, I will hear him.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have done this all morning and I got no attention from you.

Now, Mr. Chairman, under item 5, the advisory committee, would the hon. Minister

please advise me how often this committee meets and what *per diem* allowances do they receive?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which committee is the hon. member referring to?

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister's advisory committee on the treatment of the offender, page 7 of his report.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The regular meetings are twice a month.

Mr. Newman: Twice a month. And what are their *per diem* allowances?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At present it is \$30 a day; I am sorry, \$20.

Mr. Thompson: Following on this question, is there any member of the advisory committee who had not been present for a committee meeting for six months?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I might be corrected if I am wrong. I will advise the hon. leader of the Opposition I would doubt that there is such a member on the committee.

Mr. Thompson: You would notice their absence. Do you not take their advice?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not sit on the committee; I rarely sit on the committee.

Mr. Thompson: But it comes to you with advice.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but I would not necessarily know everybody who was in attendance at that committee. I do know that there was an extended absence on the part of a previous member who finally realized that he could not attend, and he is not on the committee now; but I would doubt if there is anybody on the committee now who has not attended a meeting for that period of time. They are fairly regular.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you, Mr. Minister. I notice that, on the voluntary agencies that get grants in comparison with The Department of Health and a number of other organizations, yours are very small. Are there voluntary agencies that have applied to you to receive grants and which have been turned down and, if so, which voluntary agencies?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. leader of the Opposition mean any and all people who have applied for some financial assistance?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am referring to voluntary agencies.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Any and all voluntary agencies? Regardless of work?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There was the halfway house the hon. member for Hamilton East referred to, but they were directed towards the drug and alcoholic addiction research; St. Leonard's house has asked for some money, which we have not granted, except for what they are getting *per diem*. I cannot recall any other agency at the moment.

Mr. Thompson: The King farm did not apply to you?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I think they applied for a capital grant. They were going to expand at the time. As a matter of fact, it was on my advice. I am very familiar with Harold King, he is an old friend of mine. I advised that in my opinion it was advisable not to start expanding at this stage, but to make sure that his existing organization was well integrated and proved a success for over a period of time, before he decided to expand. Then as a matter of fact, because we were doing research on both his organization and St. Leonard's we would not look favourably on giving any additional grants at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 1901 carried?

Vote 1901 agreed to.

On vote 1902:

Mr. Chairman: Item No. 1, please, under vote 1902, is this what we agreed upon?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. The discussion that has led you to call for item one—are we to understand that if you declare item one passed, it can then no longer be referred to, or is this just to bring some order out of the discussion, so that before the final vote is passed we can return to—

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member for Brant that once the item is passed, it is passed.

Mr. Nixon: I would object to that, Mr. Chairman. I would say on the point of order that some more order could be brought to our discussion if we restricted our comments to the items as they occur one after the other,

but that before the final vote is passed we have the opportunity to discuss all the items in general.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I just follow up what my hon. friend from Brant has said? I think this is a case where we have to find a reasonable harmony between flexibility and order. I would suggest to you that you treat the item as a guide for the discussion but have votes only on the actual votes. There is not only the point that my hon. friend from Brant mentioned, that a member may think of something after the discussion on the specific item. I think that is legitimate. After all, we cannot have everything in our minds all at one time.

But there is also the problem of matters relating to the vote as a whole, that do not clearly fall within any specific item. They may cut across items. I would think such more comprehensive matters could be considered perhaps at the end. So I would suggest to you, sir, that we use the items as a guide but actually vote only on the complete vote.

Mr. Chairman: If it is on the point of order?

Mr. Sargent: No, it is on this vote. 1902.

Mr. Chairman: No, we have not started with this particular vote yet. Before calling on the next member, I would suggest that we follow through with this, with a certain amount of flexibility, but we use it as a guide from No. 1 to whatever items are on there, and we deal with the entire vote. And now we will deal with 1902, item No. one.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I have the same question that the hon. member for Grey North had in mind. He is quite concerned about a particular matter about which I am concerned, too. I am going to ask the hon. Minister for a breakdown of item one of vote 1902, which is the item for salaries and which represents a total of little over half a million dollars. I would like to say to him that I am not interested in the salaries of individuals but in the classifications covered. In other words, if he would indicate that there are so many people in such and such a classification receiving total salaries of so and so, I think that would meet my requirements.

One further observation I would like to make along the lines of what the hon. member for Grey North has said on a number of occasions: I do not see why that information and information of that type cannot be given

in this book. I was looking at the BC estimates not long ago, and such information is regularly given in the BC book. It is admittedly a much bigger book than this. It is more about this size. But I do not think we are so hard up in this province that we cannot afford a little more paper to provide some of this basic information. It saves asking a lot of questions, and in addition to that, it is easier for a member to absorb information, especially if it involves figures, when it is right in front of him, rather than having to listen to it.

Nothing can be done about this problem this year. I am going to raise it again with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) when we come to the provincial auditor's estimates, but I would ask the government to bear that in mind for another year. In the meantime I would ask this breakdown for item one of 1902—and I assume from what the hon. member for Grey North has said, that the hon. Minister and other hon. Ministers can get ready to give it on every vote as it comes up.

Mr. Chairman: Is this information available at the present time, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to get it for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North.

Mr. Sargent: I thank the hon. member for Woodbine for his—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1902.

Mr. Sargent: On vote 1902, Mr. Chairman, let us talk about the parole programme of this department. I would like to ask the hon. Minister, how much does it cost to keep a man in jail for a year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are various costs, depending on the jail.

Mr. Sargent: Well, an average unit cost of one man per year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member talking about reformatories, or is he talking about jails? Even then, within these categories, there are various costs. For instance, the small county jail—

Mr. Sargent: Give it to us right down the line, the whole line.

Mr. Chairman: I suppose we can pass No. 1. For your information, this does not speci-

fically come under No. 1; but it does come under parole.

Mr. Sargent: I think the hon. Minister is tired. What is your rate then of repeaters in Ontario, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The rate of recidivism?

Mr. Sargent: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: For the reformatories? There are no such figures available. And there are no such legitimate figures available in any jurisdiction in the world that we know of that can be depended upon.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are some figures in the annual report which give you some rundown of particular rates which have been calculated for certain institutions. I refer the hon. member, for example, to page 16 where there is what we have been able to find out regarding prisoners in Millbrook and some of the other institutions. The problem is, until there is a proper federal system set up, co-ordinated with all of the provinces, which is what is being attempted at the present time, it is very difficult, because you can only take fingerprints of those people who have been convicted of indictable offences. Therefore a person who has not been convicted of an indictable offence, if he is convicted either in our own jurisdiction under an assumed name or in another jurisdiction under an assumed name, we could not really tell. And then, of course, recidivism has very different terminology, too.

You cannot include those people who are still doing all sorts of illegal things but have not been caught. But insofar as we are able to establish, the hon. member will find within the annual report those rates which we have been able to establish fairly well—and I would not like to give the hon. member the impression that these could be backed up scientifically in the manner in which researchers insist that this be done.

Mr. Sargent: Is the hon. Minister aware there is a programme in the United States, a sponsorship programme—in other words your experience is possibly that 85 per cent of the people now in prison return some time along the line? Would the hon. Minister agree with that in some areas, right or wrong?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, I would doubt this very much.

Mr. Sargent: That is a figure that is used pretty generally in penology.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have never heard of it.

Mr. Sargent: Well, what does the hon. Minister figure? He must have figured it some way. Does he have a figure?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, for example, I pointed out that the hon. member can take a look at page 16 in the report.

Mr. Sargent: I am asking a question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: I am asking a question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am saying that if the hon. member will follow it with the chart—I am just trying to be of some assistance to the hon. member. Maybe it is easier to follow it with the chart. There appears to be, for example, from those first 200 prisoners admitted between 1950 and 1959 and 1960 inclusively, about 40.5 per cent were not reconvicted.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you. That is the answer.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will proceed with these estimates in the afternoon and the Throne debate in the evening session.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves adjournment of the House.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Before the motion is put, Mr. Speaker, what is the tentative lineup for estimates after this?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: The Department of Highways will follow this and then we will go to the Lieutenant-Governor's office, then the provincial auditor and then The Department of Tourism and Information.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Are there three night sittings, Mr. Speaker?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Yes; Monday, Tuesday and Thursday.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, February 28, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Monday, February 28, 1966

Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. MacDonald, first reading	935
Municipal Act, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, first reading	935
Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act, bill to amend, Mr. Renwick, first reading	935
Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued	938
Recess, 6 o'clock	970
Erratum	970

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the west gallery, students from St. George's college, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE MUNICIPALITY OF METROPOLITAN TORONTO ACT

Mr. Renwick moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, just a word of explanation, if I may. These bills were introduced last year and were not called. I am reintroducing them this year to provide that the power of the metropolitan board of commissioners of police, and the power of the boards of commissioners of police generally, to pass bylaws regulating parades be removed, and that such power be conferred on the councils of cities and towns

and on the metropolitan council, in the case of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) before the orders of the day, notice of which has been given.

The question is in two parts:

1. Would the hon. Minister inform this House if he approved the course of action taken by the Ontario farm products marketing board before the takeover of the Ontario bean growers marketing board?

2. How many police and security officers were used by the Ontario farm products marketing board in the takeover on February 24, in London?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the first question, the answer is "yes".

In reply to the second question, the answer is: None by the Ontario farm products marketing board. Any security officers were used by the auditors as a precaution in protecting the property and the records of the company and the board, in the interests of the bean growers of Ontario, under the authority provided by the new bean marketing board.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit another question? With the controversy that has developed over the last year in regard to the bean marketing board's operation, would the hon. Minister set up a public inquiry into every segment of the bean industry in the province of Ontario and clear the character or the reputation of every member of the bean board?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question along the same line. Perhaps we could get them all in at the same time.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member for York South and the member for Huron-Bruce (Mr. Gaunt) would both give their questions next in order to the Minister, as they are on the same subject.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is in three parts:

1. Under what authority has the government dismissed the Ontario bean growers marketing board?

2. What were the reasons for this drastic action?

3. For how long will the government-appointed board replace the producer-elected board?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, my question is much the same as that submitted by the hon. member for York South. I would ask the hon. Minister, in view of the farm products marketing board's unprecedented action in removing and replacing the elected representatives on the bean growers marketing board, what were the facts that led the government to do this and what plans does the government have to restore the autonomy of the bean growers marketing board?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the questions asked by the hon. members for York South and Huron-Bruce concerning the action taken, I would say that it was taken under the authority of The Farm Products Marketing Act, section 6, subsections 1 (a) and 1 (g).

As far as the reasons for this action are concerned, anyone who has followed—as I am sure the hon. members of this House who have been interested in this matter have done—the discussions and controversy that has pertained toward bean marketing in the province of Ontario for the last year will realize that there has been a lot left to be desired between the relations of the farm products marketing board and the bean growers marketing board. Agreement—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Hon. Mr. Stewart: If my hon. friend would keep his mouth shut long enough to give his ears a chance to work he would find out the answer.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that with the unfortunate misunderstandings that have pertained, and with the fact that there has been an agreement apparently drafted and reached which we felt was satisfactory to all concerned, and with the non-compliance with that agreement that was so evident lately, there was no other action that could be taken. But that action had to be taken, if we were to maintain the confidence of the various mar-

keting boards across this province in The Farm Products Marketing Act; and in particular, the confidence of the people who are concerned with what happens to farm products. I think this is what we have to be concerned with. We have to be concerned with all of the aspects of marketing, so this was the only action we felt we could take.

Having said this, I want to make it abundantly clear here in this House that the bean marketing plan, as it operates in the province of Ontario under The Farm Products Marketing Act, will continue in operation; and that the plan will be kept open at London to serve the interests of the bean growers of that area. This, to me, is the only thing that can be done. And as far as the date the plan will be turned back to the growers is concerned, I would say that it will be turned back to the growers as soon as it is deemed advisable. No government wants to be in the field of operating a marketing plan. We have not, in any other plan except this.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. Minister a supplementary question? Why was there all the secrecy surrounding the meeting? Why were the members of the board not notified that this was the purpose of the meeting in London?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Oh, I do not think there is any particular reason why they were not notified of the meeting in London. There seems to be a very great lack of communication between the bean growers board and the farm products marketing board, with the former making decisions that were not referred in any way, shape or form to the farm products marketing board at all.

This is the problem. There was no communication. There was a very obvious lack of communication between them and the farm products marketing board, and I think that very obviously it had to be done this way.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett). I do not know whether he has arranged to have an answer or not.

Would the hon. Minister comment on the charge made by Thomas W. Kierans that the United States Public Law 89-298 may have the effect of cutting water levels on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River, resulting in damage to Canada's downstream interests?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a second question of the hon. Prime Minister

(Mr. Roberts). In view of the assertion by Mr. Justice Campbell Grant on page 112, of the report of the FAME inquiry that Mr. Gunner would be obliged to place the Fearman plant shares for sale, what action does the government intend to take in face of Mr. Gunner's recent statement that the plant is not for sale?

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Gunner's statement was made on his own responsibility and I have no knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the statement or really why these remarks were made. As I understand it, he was speaking about the plant itself. On looking at Mr. Justice Grant's statement, I want to make it very clear that this is one sentence out of 114 pages of the report, so the full ramification of the statement might require study of more than just the one sentence. But he, as I understand it, is referring to the offering of shares for sale.

Now as I say, I do not know why Gunner made this statement, but reading a little further it does appear to me to refer to a relationship existing between FAME and Gunner in their private capacities. There was a buyer and there was a seller and they reached an agreement for sale. The shares are hypothecated for certain purposes that are in the agreement between these two parties. It is a private agreement and I do not see that this government is in any way involved in the transaction to which this question refers and to which Gunner's statement apparently refers.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I would like to direct the following questions to the hon. Prime Minister.

Is it true, as reported in the press, that Ontario's centennial project will not be ready in time for the centennial celebrations?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, certainly tenders for the project have been received. They were received last week and are presently under very close analysis and review. Upon looking at those tenders and various other factors it does appear that the project will not be completed in its entirety in 1967.

There are various factors involved, some of which are referred to in the tenders, such as rising costs, and these of course are obvious in the budgeting we have done for this project. As I think we are all aware, building projects all over this province are presently being slowed down as a result of a shortage of labour. At the moment I would

say that this centre of science and technology will not be changed in its designation or in its ultimate function, but the whole question of the amount it will cost and what portion of it can be completed by any fixed date in 1967 is presently under consideration as a result of these factors I have mentioned and as a result of what is revealed to us in the tenders which we now have.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question. In view of the uncertainty of the fate of this project, I would say an uncertainty amounting to almost a certainty that it will not be completed in time, will the hon. Prime Minister consider as an alternative centennial project the implementation in Ontario, by July 1, 1967, of a comprehensive, universal medical care insurance programme as a real centennial for the people of Ontario?

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture, notice of which has been given. Could the hon. Minister inform this House as to whether he has been in contact with the federal agriculture Minister in the last few days with respect to the \$4 per hundred-weight milk price asked by the manufactured milk producers? If so, what were the results?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say the answer is yes, with promising results.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Were the promising results such that the agreement was reached that the \$4 per hundredweight for manufactured milk can be given within the next—let us say within the foreseeable future?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I would say that with the magnificent communication that I know exists between my hon. friend from Huron-Bruce and the federal Minister of Agriculture he might be able to provide a better answer to that question than I. Let me say that I am doing everything I can from this side of the House to assist the federal Minister in trying to arrive at that happy solution to the problem, which all dairy farmers really seek at this moment. We are in constant touch with him and I am very pleased with our relationship. I know that if he adds his weight to the cause on his side of the House I think it will greatly assist the federal government to make the decision that we hope will be made as a happy solution to the problem.

Mr. Gaunt: I will be glad.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). What steps if any are being taken to remedy the acute parking situation in the Kensington market area of Toronto caused by the fact that the provincial institute of trades on Nassau street has no parking facilities at all? I think it has none at all; it certainly does not have adequate facilities, in any case.

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the question of parking facilities at the provincial institute of trades on Nassau street in Toronto is under study but no final decision has as yet been reached.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. Minister in any position to say when he may be able to make a more definite statement in this matter?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am working on it.

Mr. Bryden: It is urgent, does the hon. Minister realize that?

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order. House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS (continued)

On vote 1902:

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): On this vote, parole and rehabilitation services, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions would the policy with regard to sponsorship programmes come under this vote? Under parole?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, I do not understand what the hon. member is referring to when he refers to sponsorship programmes.

Mr. Sargent: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is part of the parole system in the United States penology and it is a forward step in parole systems and I asked the hon. Minister last week what was his experience of returns to prison and he did not have a figure. My hon. friend and myself have talked this matter over quite often, but I am wondering if

his department is in charge of the sponsorship programmes and, if not, why not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I asked the hon. member to explain to me what he means by sponsored programmes. I am afraid he has not clarified that—at least, not so that I can understand it. Incidentally, I do not think I ever stated to this House that I could not give the hon. member the figures for the success of those on parole; that is, completion of parole. He may have been confusing the matter of how many people who have been on parole had been convicted at some future date, which are two entirely different things. If the hon. member would care to clarify his question, I would be very pleased to answer.

Mr. Sargent: My only point, Mr. Chairman, is that I feel that if the hon. Minister has no knowledge of return to prison of the people in there now, there is a great laxity in the programme they are doing. Quoting an experience in the United States, with regard to what Warden Duffy is doing, it says:

The warden and I both feel, and it has long been our belief and our convictions are shared by nearly every leading penologist, that the basic premise used in most prisons is false. Society, its judges and its prisons seem to think only about the punishment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sargent: It may be out of order, but I want to establish the fact that the hon. Minister has no concrete programme for modern treatment of parolees in this province. And he has no knowledge about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it would be worthwhile putting on the record the statistics which are already in the annual report in the hope that this will clarify it for the hon. member. Page 43 of the report, which I hope the hon. member has before him, shows the number appearing before the parole board for consideration, both men and women, for the fiscal year covered by the annual report was 1,764; the number of parolees affected during that time were 976; the number who had successfully completed parole were 814, or 83.4 per cent. In other words, of those who had been put on parole, those who did not breach their parole requirements were 83.4 per cent. I hope this answers the hon. member's question. Aside from that, I do not know what other information he seeks.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to flog this point, but what is the experience of the hon. Minister of the return to prison?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, that is an entirely different matter from parole. There are thousands of people who have been convicted and have been in and out of penal institutions, but this bears no relationship to parole as such. There are many who are in the institutions, I imagine, who are recidivists—who have been in institutions before and have been on parole. I rather imagine that most of them have successfully completed parole. Perhaps this is as good a time as any, Mr. Chairman, to try to clarify some of the confusion which exists in the minds of many people when reading statistics from other sources about success on parole and confusing this with successful rehabilitation of an offender. They are entirely two different things. Most people who come back to institutions—I say “most” qualifiedly; there may be a smaller or larger percentage—are recidivists and have been in and out of institutions before. They have, at one stage or other, successfully completed a parole, which means that the parole as such had no effect on their subsequent actions.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, we are getting to what I want to get across, and that is the fact that the experience in most jurisdictions is that the ones who return are 85 per cent of the people now in prisons. In a new phase in the United States, now being practised through a sponsorship programme, they have a 90 per cent record of those who do not return after they get through this sponsorship programme.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is ridiculous; utterly ridiculous. Mr. Chairman, there is no place in the world, no jurisdiction in the world, where they even claim 90 per cent success.

Mr. Sargent: In this book, “My Shadow Ran Fast” by Bill Sands—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have met the gentleman.

Mr. Sargent: Then the hon. Minister knows what I am talking about. This is an actual happening in the United States. This man says, in starting a sponsorship programme:

Under the existing laws, men have to have jobs before being released on parole. And frequently men were still in prison, trying to get jobs, months and even years after the parole board has pronounced

them fit to be free. The longest wait for any I knew personally was 34 months. He had spent more time trying to get a job after he had been paroled than some men spend in prison altogether. And many men I knew had waited as long as a year to 18 months.

Under the sponsorship programme, I interested some Kansas City businessmen in taking men out and financing them until they could get jobs. The terms of this sponsorship require that the man repay his businessman sponsor before the latter could take another man. The laws remain the same, but we have obtained official permission for this programme, thus freeing parolees to compete for jobs by presenting themselves for interviews instead of sending applications from prison. With maintenance of a man in prison costing more than \$1,500 a year, dollar savings were noted almost immediately.

Six months after the programme started, only one man who had a serious drinking problem had failed to repay his sponsors and none of the approximately 100 men who had gone through the class had returned to prison.

That was the score at the time this book had gone to press. This is a forward-looking programme. It is so new that I think it is time someone in Canada took a look at it. This department, I would say, would be a good place to start.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I would not underestimate the so-called sponsorship programme, although I have not read Mr. Sands' book, I have heard him speak. I do not know what this particular sponsorship programme is about, but I would not want there to be any confusion as to what this really means when the hon. member is quoting statistics.

In fact, what he is saying is that a volunteer group has undertaken the choosing—we must remember that—of a selected group who appear to be well-motivated, trying to help them become rehabilitated in society, get them work and so on. From this 100 they have established, to their satisfaction, that X percentage has not been reconvicted.

In fact, our department—the department of rehabilitation service—does this, except that we choose a much larger group. As a matter of fact, the programme that the hon. member is speaking of could be one compared to perhaps the Harold King farm, in which they choose, from all our releasees, those who say: “I would like to be helped,

not by your rehabilitation service, or by X rehabilitation service; I would like to go to the Harold King farm." They therefore, with the guidance and assistance of our department—our rehabilitation officers—make application to the Harold King farm. The Harold King farm then goes over the applications and takes the few it thinks it could help the most; and from this few are chosen those they will accept. Obviously, their rate of success eventually must be a lot greater than the rate of success we can claim, because we have to take anyone who appears, in the view of our rehabilitation officers, to have any likelihood whatsoever of success.

I hope that I have made myself clear to the hon. member. The more programmes there are, of the nature he suggests, by qualified—and I want to repeat the word "qualified"—after-care agencies, people who are qualified in the work, the happier we will be.

I should point out to the hon. member, too, that the John Howard society and the Elizabeth Fry society and the Salvation Army—among other groups—have been doing this work for years very quietly, without any fanfare, and have been doing a wonderful job.

Of course, they probably will not claim these tremendous rates of success. As a matter of fact, the kind of claims made by people like Mr. Sands make them subject to some concern by people in corrections work all over the world—because it has not been done over a long enough period to establish that, in fact, these people have been rehabilitated. The fact that a man has not been reconvicted in a year, or two years, does not mean that he has been rehabilitated. You would have to follow through for a great number of years.

For example, as we did, between the years 1955 and 1960, I think it was, or somewhere thereabouts, at our Brampton training centre. We chose those who were considered the most likely to succeed among first offenders. Through our rate of success for that period we were able to establish an actual rate of recidivism. Through the co-operation of the RCMP, the offenders were followed through for five years and we found the rate of success—where it could be claimed to be success—was in the neighbourhood of about 66 per cent.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister tell me if interested groups could have access to prisons to talk to people in this regard; if there was a firm programme along this line?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All the recognized after-care agencies presently operating in Ontario have access. In fact, they come in and discuss matters with our rehabilitation officers. They all work together because there are some inmates who, after they have been released, refuse to have anything to do with officialdom which, in the first place, they take as having been responsible for their being convicted and kept in an institution. These people quite often will choose anyone but a government agent. So this is the reason why organizations like the John Howard and Elizabeth Fry societies are very valuable in our work. Of course, they work in close co-operation with our people.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, apropos to what the hon. Minister has just said, it seems to me that he is begging an issue here, in that the types of institutions we have in Guelph and other places are bound to generate this kind of hostility toward the establishment. So people there—a certain number of them—are bound to resent or resist the continuation of governmental supervision. I think the solution to this matter is to get smaller institutions with a different kind of emphasis.

A question I would like to direct to the hon. Minister is one in regard to the rehabilitation staff. Last year he did give me a list of the staff members—their qualifications, education and so on, and also their caseload. I wonder if the hon. Minister would let us know if any significant improvement has taken place over the past 12 months in respect to this. We had some rather high caseloads; and the various qualification standards could be improved, although many of these people are struggling to improve the qualifications they now have. Would the hon. Minister tell us what the picture is at the present time and what improvement has taken place?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that the caseload is just about the same. The hon. member will note in the estimates that sufficient is allowed for an increase in this complement. In the meantime, many of these have been upgraded in at least academic qualifications. They have taken courses at McMaster, and other such courses available for them.

Mr. Young: Would the hon. Minister tell us what changes—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know whether I mentioned that the average caseload is about 40.

Mr. Young: Forty-five last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is now 40, so that is a slight improvement.

Mr. Young: Does this mean then that we have a larger staff?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The staff at this present moment is 59, as against 56 last year. There are still seven vacancies, but in spite of the vacancies we have allowed for 13 additional ones in the estimates for the coming year because of additional responsibilities.

Mr. Young: A total of 20.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, obviously, from the hon. Minister's remarks, the caseload for the rehabilitation worker is a little heavier than he would like to have; and he would like to decrease it substantially were it possible to do so overnight. Has the hon. Minister considered purchasing rehabilitation services from organizations?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have considered this. We have not gone into it in the detail we would have liked to have done by this time, but this is part and parcel of the research we are hoping to get completed, insofar as after-care agencies are concerned. We have to know just what we are going to be spending our money on. It may very well be that we may go into halfway houses ourselves, or it may very well be that we might find that purchasing these halfway houses and after-care services—we already have services from existing agencies—may be the answer to it. This is what we are hoping to discover with research.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my repeating this is not becoming offensive to hon. members; but I must say that we have said, as a statement of policy, that what we are doing now and what we intend to do in the future will be based on research. We want to make sure that we are spending our money, time and effort where the money, time and effort should be spent. Therefore, there is no use going into another programme of this nature without undertaking the proper research, which we hope will be completed within a reasonable time.

Mr. Newman: May I put a question directly to the hon. Minister? Does he think that St. Leonard's house is performing a satisfactory service?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say it is performing a satisfactory service, yes.

Mr. Newman: If it is performing a satisfactory service, then why does not the hon. Minister's department give it recognition for those services?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In what way would the hon. member suggest we give it recognition?

Mr. Newman: By way of financial assistance in grants. The only department of this government that considers it as doing something is The Department of Public Welfare. In other words, the hon. Minister is assuming that these people who are being rehabilitated are only fit for welfare, rather than rehabilitation services.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, really; we went into this the other day. I do not know but I suppose you could say it really can be spilled over into this vote. The reason it comes there is really a matter of difference of opinion in philosophy, if the hon. member would like to call it that. I do not know any other way to explain it. The hon. member for Yorkview, for example, suggested that there must be something wrong with our institutions if the inmates resent officialdom and will not accept our help.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): He said that there is something wrong with a place like Guelph, and that is why they refuse rehabilitation services.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is what I thought I was making clear: He does not suggest what you are saying; he is making a statement.

The fact is if any of the hon. members in this House are so naive as to believe that at any time in the foreseeable future inmates of penal institutions are not going to resent authority, then they have a great deal more optimism than I. There are many of these who will never do anything but resent authority and I think this is a logical conclusion. There is a feeling on the part of some in this work that when a man gets assistance after he has been released he should not get it from a governmental agency, at least directly. The feeling was, at the time, that it might be better, in view of the fact that these people had served their terms, that they do not get financial assistance from The Department of Reform Institutions, that we might find more response from them if it could be stated that in fact the money was not coming from the department which was responsible for them while they were incarcerated.

Now this is a difference in philosophy and we have argued and debated this at various correctional conventions that I have attended and you really cannot come to any conclusion. This was an experiment in that direction. If the hon. member is trying to make the point that really they should be getting grants from both departments, I think he could then quite properly accuse us of having the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing. If they are going to get grants from the government they should get them from one source. At the moment they are getting it from The Department of Public Welfare. If the hon. member thinks it would be better put into The Department of Reform Institutions, I would be very glad to take that under advisement.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, there is a certain principle involved in here, and that is the principle of rehabilitation not the principle of welfare. I think that this is the thing that disturbs St. Leonard's house, that they are not being recognized as performing rehabilitation services, they are just another organization that is being provided public welfare for those they are attempting to rehabilitate. I think it behooves the hon. Minister to consider that assistance should be coming from this department rather, really, than from The Department of Public Welfare. I will drop that for the time being and go to another topic.

Last year the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) brought up the question of the possibility of using inmates as farm labourers. Did the department experiment with this at all during the past year?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is one of the matters which is going to be investigated by the new advisory committee which was announced in the Speech from the Throne and the personnel of which I hope to be able to announce to this House in a very short while, the trades and industry advisory committee. They are to go into all of these matters to find out just exactly what field there is for the training of some of our inmates for farm work. It appears obvious that some of them could only be suited for this sort of work. This is one of the terms of reference, this is included in the terms of reference of that advisory committee.

Mr. Newman: May I then suggest to the hon. Minister that he also consider an apprenticeship programme for some of the younger inmates so that they could be sent out to industry to work for a period of time and then simply be incarcerated during their

sleeping hours in the institution? This, I think, would rehabilitate them much quicker than simply putting in time in the institutions and not picking up any type of trade.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact we do have a programme in existence now in our institutions—I thought I had announced it last year—whereby we have made arrangements for those taking trades training in our institutions so that they get credit towards their apprenticeship papers for the time spent on this work.

Mr. Newman: Does the hon. Minister allow inmates to attend schools, secondary schools or schools in which technical training is provided? Does he allow the inmates to attend these?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, we provide them with this training right in the institutions.

Mr. Newman: Well, in the department the hon. Minister probably does not have sufficient skilled craftsmen, skilled teachers, to be able to teach certain types of skills; whereas if those inmates were to attend, say, Ryerson institute where they qualified, and return to some institution at the end of the day, I think the hon. Minister would be providing a real service to them.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We do provide a training, whether it is sufficient or not or whether it can be improved upon is, of course, as I said to the hon. member, a matter for the study of this committee which is going to be set up. What the hon. member is referring to now is, I suppose, some aspect of what is known as a work release programme.

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course you would have to choose them pretty carefully for this sort of thing. This is all going to be within the ambit of the terms of reference for this committee. We recognize that there are a great number of vocations and trades which perhaps could not be taught within our institutions, there are so many trades and occupations it would almost be impossible. This is a thing that is to be studied by this committee and whatever its recommendations are we will give them the most serious consideration.

Mr. Newman: One final question, Mr. Chairman: How long will it be before we can expect a report from that committee?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, in view of the fact it has not yet been set up, Mr. Chairman, I could not say.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, on Friday just at adjournment time I asked the hon. Minister to break down item 1 of vote 1902. I do not think he had the figures with him at the time but I have no doubt that over the weekend he has been able to dig them up.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just by classifications—the parole and rehabilitation services?

Mr. Bryden: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member prefer I read it out or shall I send it over?

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps it would be better, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. Minister read it out so it would be on the record.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right. One chairman of the parole board—did the hon. member ask for salary range as well?

Mr. Bryden: Yes. I think what I asked for was the total amount of money in salaries in each case, but if as an alternative the hon. Minister could give the wage range for the classification, I think—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will give the hon. member what I have here. His salary range is \$9,000 to \$11,000.

Four members of the parole board, a range of \$7,800 to \$9,500; two rehabilitation officers, class four, \$6,900 to \$8,200; seven rehabilitation officers, class three, \$5,500 to \$6,600; 69 rehabilitation officers, those in number two category, \$4,800 to \$5,750; number one category, \$4,200 to \$4,800—am I going too fast for the hon. member?

Mr. Bryden: How many are in the number one category?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have 69 for both.

Mr. Bryden: For the two of them?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: I take it the rest of the staff would be clerical?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: I am not interested in that, Mr. Chairman. This gives rise to a problem we have had before us on many occasions. The hon. Minister says that right now he has seven vacancies for rehabilitation officers

and yet he has hopefully added another 13 positions in this year's estimates. How does he expect to fill them on these salaries? There are seven of the rehabilitation officers all told who make \$5,500 a year or better, as far as I could determine from quickly jotting down the figures he gave us. There are 69 who are in categories one or two, the lowest categories, which range from \$4,200 to \$5,700. These are hardly better than sweeper's rates and I assume that the hon. Minister expects them to be better qualified than sweepers. How does he expect he is going to fill these vacancies with these wages?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the salaries of this particular category are under review at the present time and being the optimistic man I am I provided for additional staff in the hope that with the increase in salary we will be able to attract others.

Mr. Bryden: I take it you have recognized that your difficulty in getting staff up to now have been very much related to the wages that have been paid?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I would not say that it is very much related. I do not know. There is a shortage of skilled people and qualified people in practically every branch of the government and industry. We must presume that salary may have some bearing on it. I am hoping that if the salaries are upgraded we will be more successful, but as I say I am not going to by any means suggest that the ones we have are not qualified people merely because they are not getting more money.

Mr. Bryden: Well no, I do not want to suggest that either, Mr. Chairman. I know that can always be implicit in a suggestion that wage rates should be increased, but I long ago learned not to let that be an inhibition when I wanted to suggest that wage rates be increased. I found even the people concerned do not object when you suggest their wages be increased. I have no doubt that the people you have are quite well qualified.

What I am more concerned about is that you should get more of them. There are always a certain number of people who have a devotion to a job that will lead them to accept it even though the wages are inadequate. But you could be reaching a diminishing return in exploiting that sort of devotion. I am not quite as sanguine as the hon. Minister appears to be with regard to the fact that these classifications are now under review. I would like to put before the hon.

Minister and the government a proposition. This type of occupation in the government occurs in other departments; for example, The Department of Public Welfare—it is not identical work, but it is work with many characteristics in common—and right across the board the rates are too low. The trouble with these wage reviews is that they go according to norm. Everybody gets some increase, perhaps \$200 or \$300 a year or something like that. I think the trouble we are up against, not only in this department but in other departments, is that these categories simply have been misclassified by the civil service commission in relation to the overall picture. There should be a special increase, and I would say a substantial one, for people in this classification.

I am putting this to the hon. Minister. I know that he is very much concerned about his staff. I am sure that he would be happy to see them get an increase in pay where he thinks it is merited, and I am sure he thinks it is here. I would suggest to him and to the government generally that they ought to take a look at the relative position of this type of occupation in the general structure of the civil service.

Just before I leave the matter, Mr. Chairman, may I ask what educational qualifications are required of the grade one and two officers? I presume officer number one is a sort of probationary position, and that usually an employee would move into two. What are the qualifications required?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Grade 13, with some experience in related work; or grade 12 education with two years of varied relevant experience in an institution, involving considerable personal contact with inmates; successful completion of the civil service commission examinations, designed to select suitable staff based on their knowledge of, and aptitude for rehabilitation work; ability to win the confidence and co-operation of persons with anti-social attitudes; patience, tact and good judgment; willingness to travel and to work unscheduled hours when required; ability to drive a car; and personal suitability. I know what your answer is going to be to that, sir; that we expect quite a bit.

Mr. Bryden: You also expect quite a bit, I think, from grade 12 and 13 graduates. As far as the scholastic requirements are concerned, does your department believe that is sufficient? It would seem to me that the type of person you are asking for is, in this day and age, the type of person who would have more than grade 13 education. I do not want

to rub any open sores, and I know that there are many people with limited formal education who show a lot more savvy and intelligence than people who have. But that is getting to be less and less true. The opportunities for education have expanded greatly. I think it is true to say that the type of qualifications in the second part of the statement, other than driving a car, would be the sort of thing you would look for in graduates from schools of social work, or at any rate, in graduates from the special courses that an institute like Ryerson might put on. I think that you will not find those qualifications, by and large, in a person who nowadays is content with grade 13 education.

Has any consideration ever been given to increasing the qualifications? Have the qualifications been determined in relation to the amount of money the government is willing to pay, rather than determining what the qualifications should be and then determining the amount of money that should be attached to those qualifications?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I cannot speak for the civil service commission and how it arrives at the salary schedule. I am sure the hon. member will appreciate that it is most difficult in discussing salary schedules, which he admits generally overlap into other departments, to expect a particular Minister to speak for his particular branch. This is a matter that has to be discussed on the general basis across government generally. The dilemma we would be in, of course, if we did what the hon. member suggests—insist on a higher education level—would mean that it is going to be more difficult than ever to recruit already hard-to-get staff. The hon. member will recall that, very regrettably, I went before the select committee on youth and actually appealed for a relaxation of the academic requirements, because there are times when you are able to recruit someone who appears to have a lot of good common sense and would fit the category. The hon. member has admitted there are such people, but we are not able to hire them because they do not meet these particular qualifications. In view of the shortage of the kind of people we are looking for today, and there is a shortage, as the hon. member will admit, I am sure, across the country for people who have qualifications for particular types of work, we are trying to upgrade our present staff. And a great deal of effort and work is being put into it.

Most of our staff have been through our own staff-training programme, and several have passed the three-year McMaster certificate course in corrections; others are pres-

ently taking this course. Rehabilitation officers attend extension courses and seminars conducted by universities and other agencies and services. Regular conferences are held and arrangements are now being completed, as a matter of fact, for this year's conference. We are continually working with the civil service commission and other departments employing similar staff to create upgrading of courses for the existing staff.

Aside from that, the matter of requiring higher academic qualifications is, as I say, the dilemma we would be in. If we raised them, it would only make it more difficult to at least fill the vacancies we presently have.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I make a suggestion to the hon. Minister? It is possible to do a little bit of both by using the different gradings within your classification system. The hon. Minister says that a number of people currently on staff have improved their qualifications in a number of ways—for example, by taking the McMaster course, which, no doubt, is of great benefit to them in the department.

What incentive do those people have? Would they be moved, say, from number two to number three? I notice there are only seven people in classification number three—69 in one and two, and seven in three. Maybe people could even be introduced at number three level. Mind you, it seems to me the wages for three and four are pretty low, especially three. I think that rate should go considerably higher. This is the point where you might introduce people who already have higher qualifications. Grades one and two could be used for people who appear to have the potential. They could be given an incentive for improving their qualifications, if they could see that they would move up to three as soon as they did so.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member's suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is a very good one and this is precisely what we are engaged in discussing now, the possibility of instituting the sort of plan the hon. member has suggested.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I fully understand the upgrading of the staff. It seems to me that in the parole system the real key to the whole situation is going to be the decisions made by the parole board. I am sure that, in the appointments to the parole board, the hon. Minister has thought very carefully about the background of the members who

are going to be part of the board, and has looked at their backgrounds to see that they have a knowledge of our background in penology and social work, and our many other areas of boys work.

I am looking at the hon. Minister's report on the Ontario plan of correction. I am not well acquainted with these gentlemen, except for two. I am acquainted with them because they belong to the Conservative Party; I am sure that there must be some other reason why they were placed on the parole board. Let me say that they were both outstanding men within the Conservative Party. As I look at one of them, I realize that I defeated him in my own riding; the other one is, I think, secretary of your own association—the Spadina association, or else the St. Andrew association.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who is that?

Mr. Thompson: A very fine person—Dr. George Nagy—a very fine outstanding citizen, but I am particularly—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: He is not an officer in my association at all.

Mr. Thompson: Was he?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Was he what?

Mr. Thompson: Was he part of your association?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes! Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. Thompson: What is the reason that these two gentlemen are on the board? What is their background in this kind of work?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I make no apologies for people being Conservatives. If you are going across this whole province looking for people, because there happen to be more Conservatives, your chance of choosing a Conservative is going to be a lot greater.

Mr. Thompson: Defeated candidates only.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, there must be more, because more people vote for this party.

Mr. Thompson: But these are unsuccessful; these are losers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think that the hon. leader of the Opposition would suggest that Dr. Nagy is not a suitable person for this job. He has quite a background.

Mr. Thompson: I would say, sir, with all respect to Dr. Nagy, that I am wondering—when we learn that the hon. Minister is talking about training workers and upgrading workers, and that this parole board is going to be making the decisions—if we could have the hon. Minister's explanation of why he chose these two men. I would be the last one to suggest that it was because they are Progressive-Conservatives—who have been either in the hon. Minister's riding or a defeated candidate—that they are getting a soft position. Certainly, they are honourable men, but I wonder what is in their background that qualifies them above many others to be on the parole board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I did not go into the background of those people who are on the parole board when I took this post. I have appointed exactly one person, and that is Dr. Nagy. I am convinced, because of my personal association with him, that he is a very intelligent man; and this is, in my view, all that is needed on the parole board. I am very happy with the work he is doing now and I know he is a most qualified man for the job.

I think there is confusion among some people about the operations of the parole board and its purpose. The purpose of the parole board—one of its main objectives—is to make sure that the particular inmate they are considering for parole can be let out on supervision prior to the termination of his sentence. The difference between a person going out on a parole and serving his sentence completely in the institution, is that if he goes on parole, say, two months before the completion of his sentence, his activities can be supervised and he can be helped to become oriented and rehabilitated in society. If he is not put on parole, he is going to be out in a month or two anyway and then we do not have to pay any attention to supervision at all.

This generally just requires good common sense, and I do not see anything wrong with any of the members of this board. The fact that they have provided such a good record—I think I mentioned it a few moments ago—of about an 84 per cent success ratio regarding those who have completed their parole successfully, is a sign that the right ones must have been chosen for parole. It speaks well of the good common sense of the board members.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I am not saying that there is anything wrong with them. I am asking: What was the basis for

selecting them and what were their qualifications? What were the qualifications of the Rev. David Kerr. Why was he selected?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not have his qualifications here. If the hon. leader of the Opposition had given me notice that he was going to ask this I—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I would say this: For the period of time that he has been on the parole board, the reports I have on his work are very commendable. I think that it ill behooves any member of this Legislature to feel worried merely because a person happens to be a defeated member, having served in this House. If there is anything wrong with that, I would hope that someone considering any member who has served in this House—whether he be defeated or had retired voluntarily—that someone considering him for an important post would think that this experience was an advantage, that this would mean that he had a little more than the average common sense. There is nothing wrong with it at all!

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I want to get this clear to this House. If the shoe pinches and the hon. Minister suggests that it "ill behooves" any member to suggest that there is something wrong with them—I sat here when the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) talked and the hon. Minister tried to switch it around then as though it was a constant castigation of his staff, personal remarks about his staff.

With respect to the two people who are on the parole board, I simply asked him to justify what background—not background in the Conservative Party—they needed to be on the board. The hon. Minister became extremely sensitive, Mr. Chairman, and suggested that it "ill behooves" a member to be critical of these people.

I am not being critical of them; I have a great respect for Dr. Nagy, and I have great respect for Rev. David Kerr—I ran against him—but I know there must have been other reasons than political ones for the hon. Minister to have chosen those two men. That is the question I want an answer to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I answered this question previously. I said that all they needed was good common sense. As far as I am concerned, this is all they need—good common sense. And I think they have good common sense.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister does not need to be sensitive about it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was the hon. leader of the Opposition who suggested it. He need not try to do all this sort of—

Mr. Thompson: I am not trying to do anything. I just—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It was not an implication; the hon. leader of the Opposition practically made a charge that they were appointed merely because they were Tories!

Mr. Thompson: I simply asked for clarification so that that would not be substantiated, and I appreciate it.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I understand that the hon. member for York South wishes to say a word on this particular point. I want to revert to the rehabilitation department and I would concede to the hon. member for York South.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister stated that a man who has experience in this House might be better qualified to take an appointment such as he has made in this instance. Has the hon. Minister ever appointed a defeated candidate from the Opposition side of the House?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has said he only made one appointment.

Mr. MacDonald: My question is: Has the hon. Minister ever in any one of his committees, including this committee, made an appointment from that wealth of experience that may be found of a defeated candidate on this side of the House?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member can recommend such a person to me and there is an opening and everything else being equal, I would say that is in his favour, and I would be very glad to consider it.

Mr. MacDonald: I will bear it in mind, Mr. Chairman. I can recall sitting in a committee with the Rev. David Kerr and he on one occasion cited one of his qualifications that he attended the wrestling matches at Maple Leaf Gardens every Wednesday night.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not think that was one of the—

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps that is one of the qualifications that could be considered meritorious for this committee.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): That is hardly a commendable observation from the hon. member; it is hardly commendable.

Mr. MacDonald: It was hardly commendable in the first instance.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of The Department of Reform Institutions in answering a question posed by the hon. member for Woodbine, regarding the number of rehabilitation officers on the board, and I think the total came to 78 in the classification 2769. Then, when I look at the report which shows the number of paroles effected during the fiscal year, and I take it that would be 1964-1965, it is a total 976. Now assuming that the 78 rehabilitation officers were working in the field of supervision of the parolees and probationaries, this would give them a caseload of about 12.5, or 12½, if I can put it that way, per man. I notice in reading some material regarding the state of Florida, which I believe is comparable in population to Ontario within a few hundred thousand, that they have been trying for years to reach the objective of 50 probationaries or parolees per man. They have this year, I believe, reached the maximum of 70 and they find this is greatly increasing the intent and objective of their work.

My question is with the case in Ontario being about 12 per rehabilitation officer. Would the hon. Minister inform the House as to whether or not the department has an objective of maximum caseloads for the rehabilitation officers, and if they are working towards that maximum?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know. Quite frankly, I was trying to get an answer to the earlier part of the question, when the hon. member was asking the latter part. I am told that the total caseload is 2,083, and the number of parole officers in relation to this gives them a caseload of 54—I am sorry, 40. The number of officers involved is 54, giving them a caseload of 40, the figure I mentioned earlier. They have a caseload of 40.

Mr. Gisborn: Then there must be a great many more than 78 rehabilitation officers.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Seventy-eight included the vacancies we have now and the number included in the estimates, which will be added in this coming year. That is where the figure 78 comes in. The caseload presently is 40.

Mr. Gisborn: Then what is the total number of rehabilitation officers on staff?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Fifty-nine.

Mr. Gisborn: And what was the number that are now under supervision?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Two thousand and eighty-three. I have not divided that, but I take it my staff is sufficiently competent and they tell me it is 40.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, just one question, following up what the hon. member for Woodbine had to say. The loss in staff last year, the number of people who did leave the rehabilitation staff, was seven and we are hoping to have 20, including them, by the end of this year. I am wondering how many actually left the service last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that one left last year.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the selection of members to the advisory council, the hon. Minister spread his advisers over all parts of Ontario. Why did the hon. Minister, when selecting the members to the board of parole, stay only within the Metro area?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I think essentially the same question is asked about why do you not put your institutions near those large centres where professional staff is available. Generally speaking, in the Metro area, most of this kind of person is available. Secondly, the cost of operating and the expenses of the advisory board would go up in direct proportion to the amount of distance they have to travel for the number of meetings they have to attend. If the hon. member has any qualified person he thinks might be helpful to our board we would give him very serious consideration.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Minister, I would expect—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They would not be chosen on a geographical basis at all.

Mr. Newman: I would expect the hon. Minister would want to get an overall picture from all parts of the province and an opinion from all parts of the province in selection of personnel to a parole board. I think it would be advisable to have a thing like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry. I thought the hon. member started off by asking about the advisory council.

Mr. Newman: I mentioned that the advisory board—the advisory council—the personnel of that council were selected from all parts of the province, but when it came to the board of parole they were concentrated from the Metro area.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The reason for that is they must work out of Toronto where the files are kept. They review the files before and after having visited all of the institutions. The decision is then made after they come back, at head office they view the files again and then arrive at their decision.

Mr. Newman: Well, how often would they work?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Daily. It is a full-time job.

Mr. Newman: I thought possibly it was only once a week or something like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh no.

Mr. Newman: Well, that is quite all right.

On the topic of parole, quite often the individual who is paroled has to return to his community and he too often has a tendency to fall back into his evil ways. Now one of the reasons for it sometimes is the home conditions to which he has to return. Does the parole officer investigate home conditions and make recommendations at all?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course, this is the work of the rehabilitation officer. Quite often, in fact I suppose in every instance where it is possible, he visits the home, if the inmate has a home, to prepare for his return. Of course, while he is on parole he is under direct supervision. They do everything possible to see if they can get him rehabilitated.

Mr. Newman: Does he suggest to the parolee that it would be better for him to find other accommodations rather than return home?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes, in many instances. In many instances it is not the home condition. In many instances it would be better if he did go home. In other instances not. We do everything possible and even help him find accommodation, sometimes help pay for the accommodation if it appears advisable in that particular instance.

Mr. Newman: In the instance where he finds that returning to his own home might be harmful to him, to the inmate or to the parolee, does the parole officer suggest to some social service organization in the community that that family could stand some type of guidance so that the parolee could eventually return to his home?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I am told that generally the original contact with the home is made with the co-operation of the agency which is working with that home, if there is an agency involved. In many of these instances, of course, that does happen and they keep in contact with him. Aside from that I do not know what else we can expect the rehabilitation officer to do; he has a pretty heavy caseload now.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Minister, there may be younger members of the family and unless something is done with the home conditions there will be other members of the family following the first member who came to an institution, were the parole officer to suggest to some association or organization in the community that guidance would be an advantage to that family, that guidance or counselling would possibly prevent other members of the family from eventually ending up in an institution. This would be a real asset.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This, Mr. Chairman, in fact, is done in many instances.

Mr. Newman: It is done?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, apropos what was being said about the probation officers, I noted that 14 years ago a bill was introduced to increase the size of the parole board from six to nine members. Now we have five. The hon. Minister introduced a bill to increase it by two more. Could he first tell us what happened in the interim, why we only have five, while at one time we had six? And, second, were the present members of the board appointed as a result of an advertised civil service position, and were the positions written for in the way of a civil service examination and, if so, how many people wrote the examination? Third, will these two present posts that will be created by the bill which the hon. Min-

ister introduced be advertised, and will they be competed for in a civil service examination?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that these positions do not require writing a civil service examination. Insofar as the first question is concerned, the hon. member used the word "probation"; I presume he means "parole."

Mr. Ben: Sorry, parole, yes; the parole board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes. I am told that, prior to the five-man board, they were all part-time members. At that time it was felt advisable to bring in a permanent parole board on which there are, in fact, civil servants. So there are presently five members on the board—three full time and two part time. The intention is to add, as the hon. member knows, two more full-time members so that we will have two teams operating at the same time, and we can extend our training centres and not confine them to those areas which can only be covered by one group.

Mr. Ben: Well, Mr. Chairman, what happened to the nine members of the parole board that was created by a bill in 1952?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that two were kept on—two ladies who were part-time members; one has since passed away.

Mr. Ben: The question is, Mr. Chairman: When was the board reduced from nine to five?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: 1960.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, a question for the hon. Minister in connection with the advisory committee. I understood the other day that he said the *per diem* was \$30?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: \$20.

Mr. Young: \$20. And the *per diem* for a similar advisory committee in The Department of Education is a good deal higher than that. I wonder whether there is any real reason for this, or is this whole situation under review?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is allowance in the estimates now to raise that to \$35 a day.

Mr. Young: \$35. Will that bring it up to par with education?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do not know, I could not tell the hon. member. Perhaps he might

ask that during the estimates of The Department of Education.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, to clarify things in my mind: Is there a plan of qualifications for people on the parole board? Are they trained for this type of work?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I think I made it quite clear earlier, Mr. Chairman, that all this job really requires is intelligence, good common sense, and the ability to be able to judge human nature and the character of the people to whom you are talking. For example, I think the hon. member would make a good member of the parole board. I think I would make a good member of the parole board, and I have not the qualifications required for some of the lesser jobs.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I think it is important in these estimates debates that we know at all times who the advisors to the hon. Minister are. I think this is important—the names of the people who are advising the hon. Minister. He may have Warden Duffy there trying to make the Minister look good, but I do not know. Who are we talking to in front of the hon. Minister there? We should have the names of these people. I think he should introduce his staff to the House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have a lot of staff here; would the hon. member like me to name them all?

Mr. Sargent: I think his key people should be introduced to the House, yes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, this is an unusual request but I have no objection to it. I have with me the Deputy Minister, Mr. Hackl; I have with me the director of library services and information branch, Mr. Nuttall; and the chairman of the parole and rehabilitation service, Mr. Mason.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think that is important because they must be able people to make the hon. Minister look so good.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am glad the hon. member says I am looking good.

Mr. Sargent: At times. But I do say that I have tried to put before the House the fact that there is a new trend in penology of which this department is not too aware, and it is not being taken advantage of. The hon. Minister says any person with common sense can be a good member of a parole board. This authority says—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which authority is the hon. member quoting?

Mr. Sargent: A very successful penologist, Bill Sands.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Sands' qualification as a penologist is that he served time with a life sentence.

Mr. Sargent: He was a lifer in San Quentin.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, all right!

I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, there is anything wrong with the man, but to suggest he is a penologist is really an insult to those people who have gone in for penology as a career.

Mr. Sargent: This is typical, Mr. Chairman, of this whole sneering from the front bench, that a person cannot come back. This man is acclaimed in the United States as a top man in penology.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: By whom?

Mr. Sargent: By everyone, the press and everyone. The results speak for themselves.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who has claimed him as a great penologist?

Mr. Sargent: It just shows the hon. Minister does not know what he is talking about.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have met the man, he is a very fine and able man but to call him a penologist is a bit of an exaggeration, that is all I am telling the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I am going to suggest to the members of the House that we avoid the crossfire.

Mr. Sargent: I would like to get to my point.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I have 6,000 people in my institutions, all of whom claim they are penologists.

Mr. Sargent: Well, they have had a good saturation with the conditions in those institutions.

The point is that this man who was sentenced to a life term and now is keeping people from going back into prison at the rate of 90 per cent of those he assists, he said that he would instal on these parole boards, in the places of the men now on parole boards, an MD, a psychiatrist, a polygraph man—that is a lie detector—men skilled in the use of sodium pentothal, hypnotism and every other technological advance that

probes the human mind. This is an actual bible of modern penology; and this man, who professes to be doing a job in this, scoffs at it when the results are fantastic. I suggest that it takes more than an ordinary person, more than my qualifications—I thank the hon. Minister for the compliment—to be a good parole officer. I think he should pull up his socks and get people on the board who are qualified.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, as the hon. member suggested I will ask the head of the penitentiary services in Ottawa to recommend to me seven people who have served life sentences and consider them for the parole board.

Mr. Sargent: That is about the intelligence of the hon. Minister right there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is what the hon. member is suggesting.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister is being a little facetious here. I am amazed—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course I am.

Mr. Ben: —at his attitude in replying to the hon. member for Grey North.

Mr. Chairman: Stay with the vote, please, we are on 1902.

Mr. Ben: That is exactly what I am dealing with, the parole board. Thank you. I think if you had the courtesy, Mr. Chairman, to listen out the question you would see I was within the item under discussion before this House.

We are dealing with parole officers and I was going to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that although I cannot state that anybody who has served a life sentence can be qualified, I am very much shaken by the hon. Minister getting up and saying: “Good God,” when you suggest that you have a doctor, a psychiatrist, a hypnotist. As a matter of fact, “The Rebel Without A Cause” is quite an interesting book on the use of hypnosis in rehabilitation. I am not a psychiatrist, I cannot pass on it one way or the other, but the fact is it does make interesting reading and I do not think the hon. Minister should discount anything.

On the other hand, I would point out that the hon. Minister must be extremely naive when he is going to suggest that perhaps people who get all their training out of a book have learned nothing from a fellow who has spent a lifetime in a prison and

studied, you might say, the psychology end of psychiatry behind people being in prison.

Now a lot of research has been done with the use of the polygraph and sodium pentothal right in this city with money supplied by this government. This government bought a lie detector. Why did they spend their money buying a lie detector if this hon. Minister thinks it is such a ridiculous contraption?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, is the hon. member talking about the parole board?

Mr. Ben: I am talking about the parole board. The hon. member for Grey North suggested who should be on a parole board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Are you sure the hon. member was not confusing a parole board with rehabilitation staff, because they are two different things.

Mr. Ben: I can see the sense that the hon. member was making with reference to the polygraph and sodium pentothal—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a parole board?

Mr. Ben: Every prisoner says: “I am going to reform, I am going to walk the straight and narrow—”

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Is the hon. member on the parole board?

Mr. Ben: Parole! What would be wrong with having a doctor, psychiatrist and somebody who operates a polygraph and gives sodium pentothal to interview the prisoners who are seeking parole? What would be wrong with it? Perhaps you might have a better average. Perhaps the hon. Minister would not have to get up in this House and say 90 per cent is a fantastic amount. Maybe if you tried it that way you would get 90 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member mind my interrupting this way?

Mr. Ben: Sure, please! I enjoy interruptions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I wonder how many under these circumstances—it shows you the confusion there is here; I think we are talking about two different things; one the parole board; the other, rehabilitation setup. I wonder, under the circumstances the hon. member is suggesting, how many inmates would appear for parole if they had to undergo what the hon. member is suggesting? Would they undergo a shot of sodium

pentothal, or any of these other things; how many of these people do you think would apply for parole?

Mr. Ben: Well, I will tell the hon. Minister one thing. Your inmates are offering to take a polygraph test and sodium pentothal to convince me that what they have been saying about Millbrook is true, so why should they not do the same thing to get out?

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister did not answer my question about how many qualified for those positions on the parole board. He stated that they do not have to write a civil service examination. I want to know was the position advertised, if so how many people applied for it and on what particular qualifications were these particular individuals chosen as against the others that applied; and what are the ages of these people, what background do they have in penology?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We did not advertise. We had one vacancy on the board and I was looking around for a good man and this man was recommended to me amongst half a dozen others and in my view he was the best qualified.

Vote 1902 agreed to.

On vote 1903:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I see in this vote we have an amount on page 115 of the—

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the member for Grey North, before you get started you might bear in mind what this committee has decided upon was that we would try to deal with the vote and then with the sub-headings.

Mr. Sargent: Yes, I agree, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Would the member like to start then with vote 1903, sub-heading one?

Mr. Sargent: How are you going to do it? That is what I am trying to say. You have got to have two books in your hand, like a juggler. Why do you not make some system by which we can talk intelligently?

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North will remember that rather than go from point to point in connection with this, we would prefer to follow through with a sequence. If it is possible, we would like to do it this way.

Mr. Sargent: I want to talk about institutions insofar as maintenance and repairs

are concerned. That goes on to item No. 4 in this section.

Mr. Chairman: Item No. 3 under this section.

I suggest that there is someone who wishes to speak in advance on No. 1 of that vote.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member does not wish to ask any questions nor make any comments with regard to item one, I would like to ask the hon. Minister to give the same sort of breakdown of the salaries under this vote as he did under vote 1902. I suggested to him on Friday that he might as well get that information while he was getting it for 1902; perhaps he has it now.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have it for the hon. member. It is a very lengthy list. I wonder if he would be satisfied if I send it over to him or tabled it, so that—

Mr. Bryden: That is acceptable to me, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps you would permit me, after I have had a chance to study it, to ask some questions, even if we have passed item number one?

Mr. Chairman: I think we agreed that we would return to number one; at the same time we would like to have a sequence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Suppose I send that right over to the hon. member now?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may we ask the hon. Minister what the lowest wage category is there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The beginning is correctional officer one.

Mr. Newman: The lowest salary—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It starts as a correctional officer one. It presently starts at \$3,900 and shortly will be \$4,050 at the beginning of April. After being a year with the department, he becomes correctional officer three, with a salary range of \$4,600 to \$5,000.

Mr. Newman: Right.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: On this item one?

Mr. Sargent: No, I am getting on. I do not see anyone talking on these first two, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on number one?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Where will you allow some observations on institutions in general terms, rather than specific?

Mr. Chairman You say general terms, general discussion?

Mr. S. Lewis: Yes, without singling out any individual institution; some general observations.

Mr. Chairman: This could be decided upon by the members of this House now. We have six adult institutions. We can do them either separately or group them together, and then we have the industrial farms, the jails and the training groups.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Two groups, Mr. Chairman; the juvenile and the adult.

Mr. Chairman: Right. I think it might be better if we were to do it with the groups.

Mr. S. Lewis: Right.

Mr. Chairman: Anything on item two, 1903? Then 1903, section three.

Mr. Sargent: On 1903, section three, someone has said that we should build our jails because we might have to use them ourselves. The fact is that we discussed county jails on Friday. I doubt very much if this programme is ever going to be consummated; I talked to some people over the weekend, not far away, insofar as county and city interest in these regional jails. As long as the municipalities are going to have to put up 50 per cent—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there is nothing of that in this vote.

Mr. Sargent: I am talking on repairs to institutions, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It has nothing to do with this.

Mr. Sargent: This certainly has. I am suggesting to the House that repairs to buildings—

Mr. Chairman: Perhaps on number four, repairs and maintenance to buildings—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member, I understand, is talking about county jails—

Mr. Sargent: Would the hon. Minister tell me, then, to cut this off? Where are the repairs to county jails in this estimate?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we discussed that in 1901 in ten, maintenance to county jails.

Mr. Sargent: All right. We will talk about repairs to jails in Ontario, not county jails.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the only jails we have anything to do with are district jails. It has nothing to do with the county jails at all.

Mr. Sargent: I am making reference to the new development in Cowansville the hon. Minister may know about. They opened, last week, the new federal jail at Cowansville. This new institution—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me. Is this a federal jail?

Mr. Sargent: Yes, sir.

Mr. Chairman: I do not think that is before us.

Mr. Sargent: Come on; I am trying to talk repairs to institutions. That is my subject here.

Mr. Chairman: But you said something about a federal jail in Cowansville.

Mr. Sargent: Here we have a budget of \$731,000 for repairs to jails in Ontario. What is your programme for upgrading the jails, other than repairs?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What number is this on, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Under number four. I would take it the member for Grey North is talking about number four, 1903?

Mr. Sargent: Right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, the hon. member, even if he is talking about item four, is talking about repairs to our own institutions, reformatories and so on. It does not have anything to do with jails at all.

Mr. Sargent: I am trying to let the House and your staff know the awareness of the Opposition as far as inadequacy in modern penology is concerned.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the hon. member made his point there—once or twice.

Mr. Sargent: All right. Now this new jail built at Cowansville—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Where is this?

Mr. Sargent: At Cowansville. There is a new federal prison there. The hon. Minister should know about that, too. I will quote to the House—

Mr. Chairman: I do not think so, member for Grey North. I do not think that the federal jail at Cowansville properly comes under this vote.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to show the House how far off base this department is on modern jails.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry; I cannot permit it at this time.

Mr. Thompson: What is the basis of tender for the repair work? May we start with that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Either we do the work ourselves or it is let out by The Department of Public Works.

Mr. Thompson: It is The Department of Public Works—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Either we do it ourselves, or it is let out by tender—

Mr. Thompson: The department would not do electrical plants, would not have men to do that, would it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, we would have some of that done. Where we cannot do it, The Department of Public Works handles it through tender.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in the public accounts, we have an item for "Sundry persons—maintenance of boys in foster homes," \$92,945-odd; and likewise for "Girls in foster homes," \$44,338-odd. On what basis are these foster homes—

Mr. Chairman: Where is this?

Mr. Newman: Page S-9 of the public accounts, under "General maintenance"—about 12 lines from the top of the page.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the—I am sorry—

Mr. Newman: I want to know on what basis the item of \$92,000 for maintenance of boys in foster homes is arrived at, and likewise the \$44,000 for the maintenance of girls in foster homes.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This is, of course, where the training schools advisory board recommends that a youngster be put in placement in a foster home.

Mr. Newman: Is that home generally in his own community, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is wherever the training schools advisory board feels is the wisest place to put the child. In most instances, I would imagine that it is back in his own home; in other instances, it is not.

Mr. Newman: What is the *per diem* rate of pay for these individuals? Approximately?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: \$2.25 per day.

Mr. Newman: \$2.25 per day? Who selects the homes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Our rehabilitation staff.

Mr. Newman: Do they have difficulty in getting homes?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suppose they could use more homes.

Mr. Newman: There is another item in the public accounts, and that is a sum of \$367,000 to the Ontario reformatory, Guelph—industry. What does that mean, Mr. Chairman? Line 4 at the top of the page.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That would be to provide materials for the operation of the industries within the institution.

Mr. Newman: Would that not come under "repairs" instead?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. This is for stock and materials required for the industries themselves.

Mr. Newman: Then, under this item, you would have the manufacturing of the licence plates, would you not?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but not in this particular item. It would be for Millbrook.

Mr. Newman: But under "General maintenance."

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No. "General maintenance" refers to those things required to keep it in proper repair and so on—the same as in a home.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the provision of the facilities for academic education that comes under item 3 of vote 1903. I would like to ask the hon. Minister what association he would have with the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis), or the education officials, in the pro-

vision of a properly supervised curriculum for the young people in these institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The Department of Education sets the curriculum and the school is inspected by the school inspectors the same as any other school.

Mr. Nixon: Would your staff be properly certificated, as any other teacher would be?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes. As the hon. member knows, we started hiring teachers this year under contract and we compete for them with all other boards of education. We have, in effect, under the contract system, practically a board of education for this purpose.

Mr. Nixon: Would your institutions offer the three basic streams then, so that when the boys or girls get out they would then be able to continue without any restrictions in the general academic pattern?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, we do.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister: Taking item 5, is this the purchase of materials and machinery, and so on?

Mr. Chairman: Under item 5? Does the leader of the Opposition mind if we just find out if there are any further questions on item 3?

Mr. Newman: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The gratuities to inmates—how far down the ladder does that go? Does that include individuals leaving the training schools?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: These are for adult institutions.

Mr. Newman: Adults only?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We provide some of the youngsters with cash at the training schools, but this particular item refers to gratuities for adults.

Mr. Newman: What will a youngster leaving the training school get from the department if he goes back to his community and into a home that is economically depressed?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The same thing applies to the youngsters as applies to the adults, insofar as assistance is concerned. There is no fixed figure. The department will do everything possible if it appears that it is necessary to make some expenditures by way of cash; or, in the case of adults, buying tools for them—or anything of that

nature, if it appears necessary to provide them.

Mr. Newman: The youngster may have to go on welfare when he arrives at his community, will he not? Or will the department take care of him for an interim period?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We would take care of him as long as the rehabilitation officer deems it advisable for us to do so.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I take it that they are not paid a fixed rate of pay per day?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Who?

Mr. Sargent: The inmates, on leaving the reformatories, are not given a rate of pay per day?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is a gratuity which amounts to about \$2 a day, but this has no significance at all.

Mr. Sargent: Two dollars a day for the time they have been there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Two dollars per month.

Mr. Sargent: Two dollars per month?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, but this has no significance really, because—

Mr. Sargent: It certainly has not!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will wait until I am finished, I will be glad to explain.

Mr. Sargent: It is a shocking thing that you allow this to happen.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All right, you got that “shocking” in there. Let me tell you how shocking it is. When an inmate is released and he appears to be well motivated, and the rehabilitation officer thinks that he needs assistance—I just finished saying this—he will get all the assistance he needs, either by way of cash, tools, help to pay rent until he gets a job.

Mr. Sargent: How much will he get?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no limit.

Mr. Sargent: There must be a limit somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, we would not give him \$10,000, if that is what the hon. member is referring to. We do whatever is necessary to help them out. If it appears that money is the thing to help them out then,

under the supervision of our rehabilitation officers—

Mr. Sargent: What figure did he give you there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Pardon?

Mr. Sargent: What is the figure he gave you—how much money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no such thing as a set payment. Are you suggesting—

Mr. Sargent: If that is the way you draw up your budget—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: You mean the note that was passed to me? Is that what you are suggesting?

Mr. Sargent: There should be a figure somewhere.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no figure. The total is there.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, how much can an individual receive from the hon. Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As much as is necessary to help him become rehabilitated. If it appears advisable on the part of our rehabilitation people that this man needs this kind of assistance, he will get it.

Mr. Newman: What is the largest amount that you have given in the past?

Mr. MacDonald: What is the range?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no range.

An hon. member: Do you give him \$500,000?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, the precise amount is the \$2 a month to which he is entitled. If he spends ten months in an institution, he gets \$20—even though you know that, two hours after he is out, he may have used up that \$20 on alcohol. This he gets anyway. The ones we are helping get all the kinds of help they need from the department, and there is no fixed range.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I understood the hon. Minister to say there was no range. There must be a range.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, there is no range.

Mr. MacDonald: Presumably the range runs from \$2 a month—that is the minimum—up to some level.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no "up to any level." Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is suggesting that it would be unlimited, of course we would not give unlimited assistance. I am talking about something reasonable.

Mr. MacDonald: We are asking what it is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Perhaps I can give the hon. member an example. This young man, the young man concerned in this case, is 22 years of age and was sentenced here in Toronto. He was transferred to Guelph and the selection committee recommended him for training at Brampton. In due course he appeared before the Ontario board of parole and was granted parole, to be effective the early part of this month.

He came from a poor home in the Maritimes and had been in Ontario only a short time prior to his arrest. He did not wish to return home and expressed his desire to become established in the Toronto area. He showed an interest and possessed some ability in the field of radio announcing and some preliminary contacts were made by our rehabilitation staff here in Toronto.

On his release he reported to our Toronto office and a supervisor arranged a boarding home, paying a week's room and board. He was supplied with sufficient money for carfare and other necessities. During the following two weeks arrangements were made for auditions and, as a result, he was successful in obtaining a position in a radio station. He required suitable clothing for the job and this was purchased for him in addition to making arrangements for his room and board until he receives his first pay. There will be a total expenditure of between \$75 and \$100 in this case. However, with continued help and guidance from his supervisor, we are hopeful that this young man can take his place in society and not become involved in further illegal behaviour.

This is an example. When you find a person who appears to not only want help but appears to be able to benefit by it, he gets all the help we can possibly give him. When you talk about a range, it is not a specific range.

Mr. Chairman: Are there further questions on item No. 3?

Mr. Thompson: I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us the most that was given last year to any individual?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I could find that out for the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I think the interesting thing is how far the hon. Minister would go.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information for the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if this is a standard offer to all graduates.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: An inmate who shows signs at all of being able to be helped, is properly motivated, and is prepared to accept the help and guidance of our department, is helped in this fashion.

Mr. Chairman: Are there any other questions on item No. 3?

Item No. 3 agreed to.

Item No. 4 agreed to.

On item No. 5:

Mr. Chairman: I recognize the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question about tenders on purchase of material. Is it the practice that there is open tender on the purchase of materials for the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: Is there any exclusion of open tender?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Has the hon. leader of the Opposition anything particular in mind?

Mr. Thompson: No, I am interested to know if there are any exclusions from the principle of open tender and, if so, what they are and why.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not to my knowledge at the moment. There may be some instances where there may be invitation tender; I do not know. If the hon. leader of the Opposition has any particular item in mind I will gladly give him the details.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister would table to the House anything which is done by tender by invitation. Does the hon. Minister have no knowledge of any tender by invitation at this time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Not at this time.

Mr. Thompson: Would the hon. Minister undertake to table, or to supply the information for us?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, I will look into it. If there are any invitation tenders, are these the items the hon. leader of the Opposition would like to know about?

Mr. Thompson: As I understand it, the principle of the hon. Minister is that he has open tender.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Generally, yes.

Mr. Thompson: I am interested in knowing if there is any exception to that and, if so, why.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are exceptions, for example, in areas where there might be small items in particular locations where you would not want to open the tenders wide. You would only have them in that particular area; something of that nature.

Mr. Thompson: I would be interested.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get them.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman: Any other questions on item No. 5?

Mr. Newman: On item No. 5, I want to pick out a specific item here, Mr. Minister, and that is the Wabasso Cotton Company Limited, \$163,000. Was that open tender or invitation tender?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was the name?

Mr. Newman: Wabasso Cotton Company tender; \$10 in the public accounts.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What is the name of the firm?

Mr. Newman: Wabasso Cotton Company. It is the only substantial cotton tender, or cotton supplier.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will get that information for the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further on item No. 5?

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? In the institution we are talking about, has he any planned programme for upgrading them or modernizing them? At least, the cells?

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure under what question the point the member has raised comes.

Mr. Sargent: He would not know, anyway. We are talking about—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We passed that two votes ago.

Mr. Sargent: —putting the materials in. I would ask the hon. Minister if he has any planned programme for modernizing the cells in these institutions? Mr. Chairman, I take exception to this hon. Minister sneering at my remarks. He has no right to sit there and sneer at my questions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not sneer at the hon. member's question.

Mr. Sargent: I speak for 40,000 people concerned about the rights of small people. Give us the answer.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what the hon. member means by sneering. If I am showing puzzlement in my face—

Mr. Sargent: Well, show some intelligence.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The other hon. members of this House are as puzzled as I am about what the hon. member means when he asks the question.

Mr. Bryden: It was a straightforward question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What was the straightforward question?

Mr. Bryden: He asked if the hon. Minister had any plans to modernize the cells in his institutions.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: What does he mean, modernize our cells? Which cells is he referring to? We try to keep all our institutions as modern as possible. In the first place, it was not even under the right item.

Mr. Thompson: Does that mean the hon. Minister is satisfied with the cells?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I did not say I was satisfied. I said we do our best to keep our institutions as modern as possible.

Mr. Thompson: Well, has the hon. Minister got plans to modernize the ones he is not satisfied with?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We put some money into some of the institutions every year.

Mr. Thompson: The question that probably the hon. member is after is which ones is the hon. Minister planning to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In this coming year?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: In answering this, I wonder if the Minister will bear in mind that this comes under industries in item No. 5 for the purchase of materials for certain jails. Right?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, in line with our agreement about flexibility, could we consider that we are now under item number four? I think that is the proper item under which to discuss the matter.

Mr. Thompson: We are asking which cells the hon. Minister is going to modernize.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Which cells?

Mr. Thompson: Yes. The hon. Minister says he is constantly trying to bring them up to date; therefore, we are asking which ones this year is he going to try to bring up to date.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have no programme for bringing cells as such up to date. We are doing our best to bring up every institution we have, to keep it up as well as possible and to bring it up to modern conditions as much as possible, having regard for the fact that we do not know how long these institutions are going to be ours.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, may I make it easy for the hon. Minister? The latest, most modern prison in North America today was built in Cowansville and opened last month. It is a federal prison. They say it is the most modern prison on the continent. Each of the pastel-coloured cells will house one man. He will have a cot with a foam-rubber mattress, private toilet facilities for himself, a metal desk, a doorless clothes closet, and an intercom system.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Grey North, I am not trying to curtail discussion on it.

Mr. Sargent: I hope he knows what I am talking about when I say upgrading the cells.

Mr. Chairman: What the member is trying to do is find out if they have any methods or any projects for any improvements in mind.

Mr. Sargent: Thank you very much.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I mentioned before that we are adding a training centre at the Rideau industrial farm

where there will be no cells. We have a new clinic planned at Mimico, we have a new training centre just being completed at Fort William, and we are providing for a new training centre and new recreation hall at Burwash. We have a constant programme every year of asking for so much money so that we will be able to modernize certain aspects of the institutions. If the hon. member wants some specific ones, I will have to go into detail with my staff.

Mr. Sargent: But the hon. Minister does have a programme?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When the hon. member talks about cells, and the implication is that we should go into an institution and modernize a cell I would have to ask which institution the hon. member refers to where the cells need modernizing. If the hon. member can show me which ones, I will be able to give the answer as to whether they were in the programme.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am not applying that at all. As a matter of fact, there are a number of institutions which I would like to completely replace, but there are certain priorities and they have to be watched. Within this framework, we do what we can. We are doing what we can to build new institutions to replace many of the old ones. As I mentioned, we are gradually reducing the size of Guelph; it is already reduced to where it accommodates 200 less than last year. We are doing it with these new training centres and modernizing some of our other institutions. But as for the specific question about modernizing cells, I do not know how to answer it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. Minister in which institutions the licence plates are manufactured?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Millbrook.

Mr. Newman: And what is the cost per plate to manufacture?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We charge The Department of Transport around 14 or 15 cents a plate.

Mr. Newman: So it must cost a lot less to manufacture because you would not—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, not necessarily; it would not cost much less.

Mr. Newman: Has the department been approached with the possibility of manufacturing reflectorized licence plates?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We would carry out the requirements as directed by The Department of Transport, and The Department of Transport has not asked us to go into the matter of—

Mr. Newman: The department has not asked your department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No.

Mr. Chairman: Number 5; number 6.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the hon. Minister if he would break down this item for us in terms of individual schools. Before I do that I would like to ask whether that cannot be done as a matter of course; it is customary in most of the estimates to itemize grants. I realize these are probably not in the same category as some other types of grants, but I see no reason why we could not, as a regular course, have a breakdown of item 6.

I understand from the report of the department, and the hon. Minister may also have mentioned it in his introductory remarks, there has been a considerable change in the policy of payments with regard to training schools; does that mean a significant increase in the amount of item 6?

I have asked the hon. Minister two things, and perhaps I should just review them. First of all: What schools are getting what amounts and what increases do those amounts represent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The three private training schools are those operated by Roman Catholic religious orders and up to this year they have been paid on a fixed arbitrary *per diem* grant, which was most unsatisfactory because some of them are having a great deal of difficulty operating on a fixed *per diem* grant.

As I announced about a year ago, sir, this government has decided to pick up the complete operating costs, and so this is the estimate that will be required for picking up the complete operating costs of the three private training schools.

Mr. Bryden: Now is this the first year, the first complete year, that that policy has been in effect; or was it in effect last year, too?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think this is the first year.

Mr. Bryden: What difference, in terms of money, does that make according to the estimates over your previous experience?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think this is the first year that we have finished up paying the complete costs of the private training schools.

Mr. Bryden: What difference in cost is anticipated?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I cannot give the hon. member an estimate. I will be glad to get that for the hon. member. I imagine it is rather considerable.

Mr. Bryden: Now the one other question, Mr. Chairman: How is the expenditure controlled? The entire tab is being picked up for the operation of these schools. I am not complaining about the policy, but I would like to know what system of financial control the hon. Minister has to make sure that reasonable economy is exercised without essential services being reduced.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, of course. As soon as this policy was established, the religious orders involved agreed with us to a certain scrutiny of their books, and any expenditures of any substantial amounts must be approved by our department before they are undertaken. So we have pretty good control of the amount of expenditures.

Mr. Bryden: Do they submit budgets to the Minister in advance on the basis of which the Minister approves their operations, or how is this determined? How does the hon. Minister give them an idea of how much money they are going to get?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is done exactly as we now do with our own schools. They present a budget and the budget is considered by our department. If there is anything in the budget which we think should be questioned, this is discussed with them. We have pretty good control and it is improving all the time. The hon. member will appreciate it has been in effect only a very short while. But I must say too that the religious orders involved were very happy with the arrangement and are quite prepared to carry out any of these requirements for keeping control of the expenditures.

Mr. Newman: The *per diem* cost per capita at Bowmanville is \$8.26, whereas at Cobourg it is \$5.27; yet the number in attendance at

the two institutions compares favourably. Why would there be such a big difference in *per diem* costs between Bowmanville and Cobourg?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: In Cobourg they are in smaller groups and naturally this would raise the cost. In other words, staff to student ratio would be higher and other costs would be higher. Obviously the more you have under the same roof the lower the *per diem* cost generally is.

Mr. Newman: At Cobourg there is a smaller group you say, is that it?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Newman: Well, according to the figures here, Bowmanville has 258 and Cobourg has 203, it is the reverse really. The smaller group has a lower *per diem* cost than the larger group.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There are smaller groups within Cobourg; this is what I am—

Mr. Newman: I think you just do not have it right there, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: What I think the Minister meant is they are broken down into smaller groups.

Mr. Newman: It still does not answer the fact that it is \$8.26 per day for 258 at Bowmanville, if you use that term, as against \$5.27 for 203 at Cobourg.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They say they are smaller boys; but really I cannot see why that should cost any more at the moment, but there may be a good reason. This is information I can get for the hon. member.

Mr. Newman: Well, the *per diem* costs of the three institutions—St. Mary's, St. John's and St. Joseph's—are all roughly under five dollars a day. Are these *per diem* costs supplemented at the end of the year when they find themselves operating at a deficit?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This has no relationship to the grants. It is only statistical information, accumulated at the end of the year to find out what the cost *per diem* is for each pupil, but they bear no relationship to the grants because now the grant system is on the basis of picking up the complete cost of the operation, as I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Ottawa East.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could answer part of the question by the hon. member for Woodbine regarding overall costs. I think I know something about the operation of the training schools because I have been very closely associated with the St. Joseph school at Alfred. In connection with the question of my hon. friend from Windsor-Walkerville I would say that in the past few years St. Joseph's had a substantial deficit ranging from \$40,000 to \$50,000 a year; and naturally perhaps this year the cost of operating that school and the other two schools will be much higher. But looking at the public accounts of 1965, the total expenditures for those three schools was \$845,743.35, whereas this year's estimate for the three schools is roughly \$1,110,000. So that should cover the cost of the difference between the operating costs and the amounts paid by the government.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Minister regarding the operating of those schools. I think he did make a statement in his introductory remarks. I would like to find out whether the new system is operating satisfactorily at this time, and whether he is satisfied with the changes that have taken place? I think it is a reasonable question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We find at the moment it is operating quite well.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on page 52 of his annual report, we notice that there is designed accommodation for St. John's training school, St. Joseph's training school, the Ontario training school for girls at Galt, the Ontario training school for boys at Bowmanville and the Ontario training school for boys at Cobourg. Their designed accommodation is less than their actual attendance. Is there some plan on the part of this department to overcome the fact that they have more in attendance than they were designed for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: We have two schools opening at Hagersville, as the hon. member knows, and the new training school which is to be built in northern Ontario, at Sudbury.

Mr. Newman: This will take care of this problem then, will it, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Considerably, yes.

Mr. Newman: All right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West had earlier asked me at

what point we would consider dealing in generalities with institutions. I suppose what should be said is that we did deal with it originally with the Minister and with the lead-off speakers; but I should judge at this particular time, if it is the wish of the committee, that we should deal with it now under the two headings, the adult and the juvenile institutions. So as to allow some flexibility in connection with it, we can deal with the adult section now and take in both pages of this estimate right around to district jails on page 117, if it is the wish of the committee.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I just want to remind you that at some point in the proceedings I would like to revert to the matter of salaries. I am quite willing to do it whenever you say.

Mr. Chairman: I think we should do that before we start into the institutions at this point. The member is dealing with vote 1903, point one?

Mr. Bryden: Yes.

The hon. Minister was kind enough to give me a quite detailed statement of the classifications of employees employed in the institutions, and of the wage rates applicable to those classifications. I would say at the outset that they reveal the same penurious attitude the government usually takes. I notice people with pay as low as \$2,760 a year—just one person I think in that category, but several in the category that starts at \$2,880 a year. Generally, there are some real starvation wages that should be eliminated entirely.

However, I know what the hon. Minister is going to say to me. He is going to say that he does not control this, that this is a matter for the civil service commission and the negotiating machinery, such as it is, within the government. I will accept that answer in advance, without even putting him to the trouble of giving it. I will have something more to say about some of these starvation wages of the government at a later time.

However, I continue to be concerned about categories that relate particularly to his type of work and which undoubtedly have an effect on his operations generally. For example, I notice one category in which there is one employee. The category is "inmate counsellor" and the salary range is described—I would call it rather wage range—\$4,050 to \$4,800 a year. What does an inmate counsellor do for this tremendous amount of money?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, it is not a usual position; it is a position kept open especially for a particular person who is doing a job in that particular institution, helping to counsel inmates, and this is the salary—

Mr. Bryden: I hope it is not another defeated Tory candidate.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, it may be, but I do not think so. It might be a defeated NDP candidate; I do not know.

Mr. Bryden: Not likely.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is one thing about it. You cannot tell their politics once they pass beyond the doors of the institution.

Mr. Bryden: Oh, you know all about their politics before they are taken in?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I hope the hon. member will understand what I am trying to say.

Mr. Bryden: Well, all right; this is a unique classification. It really does not fit into the pattern at all, so I will forget about it. I would like to know: What are the duties of a maintenance superintendent, grade 2? Admittedly this is not a classification peculiar to the hon. Minister's institutions; but good maintenance, I would think, is rather important to him. I would like to know what qualifications are required of a person paid between \$5,000 and \$5,500 a year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: If the hon. member will ask me the next one, I will wait for some information on the maintenance superintendent.

Mr. Bryden: I see that you have social workers, twelve of them, whose wages range from \$4,600 to \$6,900, over two classes. That is rather a wide range and I am just wondering how many are in the category of \$4,600 to \$5,500; and how many are in category 2, which provides \$5,750 to \$6,900.

What I am particularly concerned about here, Mr. Chairman, is the social worker category 1, which is \$4,600 to \$5,500. Is that regarded as the hiring rate? And then the social worker category 2, \$5,750 to \$6,900; is that regarded as, shall we say, the category for the experienced worker? If that is the approach, I think it is most unfortunate. I think your hiring rate is too far below the general rate you are paying for that category; and the danger is you will not be as competitive as you should be in this field where, we

can all agree, I think, there is a tremendous shortage of qualified people.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that the salary depends upon the qualifications. The only answer I can give the hon. member in respect to this particular question is the same as I did with respect to the other. This is a matter of the general policy of the commission, and that is the level at which it would have to be changed. It cannot be changed in one particular department.

Mr. Bryden: What would the qualifications be for a social worker 1?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: While I am waiting for that one, Mr. Chairman, I can give the hon. member the answer to the question about the maintenance superintendent 2; he is supervisor of the maintenance crew, not necessarily a qualified tradesman. I hope that tells the hon. member what he wants to know.

Mr. Bryden: This all depends on what the maintenance crew does. Well, I suppose, the superintendent of maintenance, if he is not superintending qualified tradesmen—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I suppose this would also differ, depending upon the institution. Some would require a larger maintenance crew than others. I suppose this would have something to do with it.

Mr. Bryden: Does not all maintenance require a certain number of skilled people? I would think a maintenance superintendent would have to be a qualified electrician, and then paid substantially above what electricians are paid, if you are going to get a proper person.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The requirements for social worker 1 is bachelor of social work; he should have a bachelor of social work degree.

Mr. Bryden: A bachelor of social work, I think, is a person with two years university training beyond the BA level; am I not right on that? It is just incredible to me that the government or anyone else should think that they can continue to attract people into this most important profession for that sort of wage. No wonder we have a shortage of social workers.

The hon. Minister may say I should take this up under the estimates of the civil service commission; the only trouble is that the civil service commission clearly is just not with it. They are living in a dream world as far as people trained in the social sciences are concerned, particularly those trained in

what may, in many respects, be the most important phase of the social sciences—the people whose task is to help people who have fallen along the way to get back on their feet again.

We pay these absolutely ridiculous wages. In fact, I would say that \$4,600 should be something close to the minimum wage for any type of work in the government; but \$4,600 for a person with a bachelor of social work! I do not know if you have any actually in that category, but they certainly show more devotion to their job than common sense if they continue to work for those wages.

I am now interested in another classification—one that has been referred to previously under these estimates—I think it is worth referring to it again. That is the category of correctional officers. I notice that there are 982 correctional officers in grades 1, 2 and 3; and the total range of those three grades is \$4,050 to \$5,000 per year.

I will not go through some of the arguments that were raised in the introductory remarks. My hon. friend from Bracondale made some comments and I agreed with the spirit of them, if not necessarily with the particular way he put them. The people who are now employed in these classifications have quite low educational qualifications. I want to make it clear that I am not suggesting that is any criticism of them at all. And I agree with what the hon. Minister said, in replying to the hon. member for Bracondale, that there are people with not very impressive formal educational qualifications who, nevertheless, can do very good work in the field in which they have chosen to work. We can agree with all that.

But the fact still remains that the objective of the department should be, over a period of time, to increase the qualifications of the people in this very important field of work and one starts that by increasing the qualifications at recruitment. Because, by and large, and there are always exceptions to all rules, but by and large, a person is able to absorb further training depending on the training he now has. The further he has gone in school, the more likely he is to be able to benefit from further training. When I heard the hon. Minister giving his answer to the hon. member for Bracondale in the introductory statement of these estimates, I thought he was going to carry his remarks to the point where he would say that people did not need any education at all. I said something to the effect—I doubt if it was recorded in *Hansard*—that his argument was

a masterpiece of sophistry, or something like that.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, you would not say that.

Mr. Bryden: I would indeed. I think, as a matter of fact, if you go back and read over the argument you made, you would agree that it was a masterpiece of sophistry; it was obviously an evasion of the problem. There surely is no justification at all for a situation in which the average level of educational attainment is about grade nine for people in this kind of work. Again, I am not criticizing the people who are now there. I admire them for carrying on this important work at the rotten wages they are getting. But I think that you should start jacking these wages up. I would say at least 20 or 25 per cent to begin with. These rates are so completely unrealistic that I do not know how the hon. Minister can feel that he can carry on adequately. It is not so much the existing staff I am concerned about as the future. The present employees are going to move on through the working span, as all of us do, and how is the hon. Minister going to recruit new people? What is his experience now in getting replacements for this exalted level of correctional officer—grade one, drawing a salary of \$4,050 to \$4,200 a year? I take it that is the recruitment classification. What sort of educational qualifications is he able to ask for, recruiting at that level?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: At least 8, preferably 10. I must point out something to the hon. member again. I tried to make the point before; perhaps this is what the hon. member was referring to as sophistry. I hope not.

I am saying that even with this level of educational requirement, there is difficulty in recruiting sufficient staff.

Mr. Bryden: Of course, it is difficult, I imagine, to recruit sufficient staff for this kind of work, which is far from easy work. I think we will all agree that at this kind of wages, and even with the educational qualifications at a point which are simply ridiculous, he still cannot get people. I think another thing the hon. Minister should bear in mind is that in this day and age, when the pressure on all young people is, quite properly, to stay in school, you are not going to get the kind of people you want from school dropouts. You might as well face it; anybody who leaves at grade 8 is a school dropout. And yet the hon. Minister is willing to take that person on. There are

many useful types of employment that school dropouts can do, and I would hope that they will be trained, their needs will be taken into account and everything possible will be done to adjust them to society so that they can make a useful contribution. But I really do not think that a correctional officer is the role for a school dropout. I am suggesting to the hon. Minister that he should not think in terms of anything less than grade 13 for this type of work, with the idea that further training will be given to move recruits further up the scale and make them even more useful. The type of qualifications needed for this type of work certainly will not be found among the people who dropped out at grade 8.

The hon. Minister waves his hands with resignation. I do not know if that indicates he is doing the best he can, but the civil service commission is making things impossible for him. I am sure he would not say that, but I will say it. I think that if these are the wages that the civil service commission is establishing for the type of work involved here, even allowing for the possibility there may be some increase, then there is something radically wrong with the civil service commission. I think they ought to be made to face reality, made to face the kind of work that ought to be done here. These rates are heritages of an ancient time when people who looked after prisoners in institutions were not considered to be performing a very important work of society. I think that now they are performing an extremely important work. But the civil service commission is obviously living somewhere in the remote past.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that he cannot possibly carry on on those wage scales, and that something has to be done to raise them.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, listening to the remarks of my hon. friend from Woodbine, I heard, and perhaps the hon. Minister would comment, that the job description calls for a grade 10 education and that the hon. Minister, being unable to recruit people with a grade 10 education, has been recruiting them with less than a grade 10 education and has requested that the job description be amended to provide that he can hire them at grade 8 education, and that the civil service is objecting to this on the part of the hon. Minister.

This is what I have heard. I would appreciate very much receiving the hon. Minister's comments, in view of what the hon. member for Woodbine has had to say.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview. It may be that the Minister will have something to say in connection with all three members.

Mr. Young: I rose, Mr. Chairman, to say almost the same thing as the hon. member for Bracondale. Two years ago the hon. Minister set the standard at grade 10. The statement he just made to this House is rather startling. Because as I understood it, a couple of years ago the standard had been raised to 10 and at that point recruitment was taking place. Have we dropped the standard because it is impossible to get men?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, in answer to the hon. member for Yorkview, the standard was raised to 10 for training schools. It remains at 10. But we are permitted to recruit them at 8 for the—

Mr. Young: But from what we were discussing at that time, Mr. Chairman, I understood that the Guelph institution and similar institutions were going to establish grade 10 as the minimum!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think that we were probably talking about what was preferable—what we were looking for: If the hon. member will go back in the record—I do not know, I cannot recall that discussion—

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister what the job description calls for?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think I went into that earlier today—

Mr. Ben: In the way of education, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: What does your job description call for for a correctional officer number one?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I shall get that for the hon. member shortly.

Mr. Bryden: While the hon. Minister is getting that, Mr. Chairman, there is another category here called "training school supervisor," and there are six classes of that. Two hundred and sixty-two of the people involved are in classes one, two and three. Training school supervisors seem to be considered by the civil service commission to perform much

the same duties as correctional officers, because they get exactly the same pay. In other words, the bottom of the scale for grade one is \$4,050 a year and the top of the scale, for grade three, is \$5,000 a year. What do training school supervisors do? Whom do they supervise? Do they supervise children in the—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: And they are considered to have the same sort of duties as correctional officers?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are not the same duties, of course, and the handling of children is an entirely different thing. In the first place the correctional officer's job involves a great deal more danger in his job, and there is more of a custodial aspect in an adult institution than there is in a training school. It is not the same.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, does the hon. Minister feel that there is a direct correlation between the salaries paid and his problem of staffing the institutions?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think it would be underestimating any hon. member's intelligence if I suggested that salary does not play some part in the recruitment of staff or the holding of staff. Of course, salary has something to do with it.

Mr. S. Lewis: Then what does the hon. Minister intend to do? If he feels that, as Minister of this variety of institutions, one of the inhibiting factors in staff recruitment is salary level, what will he, as a Minister of the Crown, do?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I do what I can within the framework of the way a government is operated, within the limits of the money available. The Treasury board has to decide how far that money can go, and I do the best I can for my department, to get as much money as I can for my employees, the same as every other Minister does. I suppose that is the reason, essentially, why we have one policy—and certain requirements and certain complements and certain salary schedules across the board. I have to abide by that the same as any other Minister. It is a matter for general government policy. It has nothing to do, really, with my specific department, except the effect that it has on its work—the same effect it may have on other departments.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, if I may just finish? If the hon. member for Yorkview will please excuse me.

Of course, we are now in the position where really—and I hope that the hon. member will not think that I am saying something to suggest that he has no right to discuss these things—I do not mean that, really. These things are all subject for negotiation.

It is a difficult position I am in. Even when my own staff wants me to discuss salaries with them, I cannot discuss salaries with them. Obviously, I cannot discuss salaries with them. I would destroy the value and the function and the strength of their own association, if I went over their own association and discussed these matters with them. They are subject to negotiation between the civil service commission and the civil service association; they are representatives of the employees, and we must abide with whatever the decision is as a result of those negotiations.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I think that I can quote the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions on this matter. In his own report, July 29, 1965—his statement on Millbrook reformatory—he says this:

At no time was the security of the institution in jeopardy and the superintendent and the staff were in complete control.

In the past 18 months, since January, 1964, 22 people have resigned; 13 to take up better-paid positions—

This, it seems to me, is the answer which the hon. Minister himself is giving—that more than half the people who resigned from that institution, over that period of time, resigned to take up better-paid positions. He tells us in his own words the difficulty he is facing; and it is high time that the civil service, and whoever is handling negotiations, stepped in here to make this right.

But more than that, I think the hon. Minister himself ought to indicate to the department that he is quite willing for these scales to be raised. There will be no objection on the part of the civil service association. I think they will reclassify and raise these salaries. It seems to me a very simple thing for the hon. Minister to put on record that he wants to see these salaries raised; he is having difficulty in getting people and holding them at this salary scale. Therefore, it is high time that something realistic was done to raise those scales.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Obviously, Mr. Chairman, I want as much as I can get for my

people and we know what the answer to that is. We have gone into that.

Mr. Bryden: I do not really think that this is the answer, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: There is no other answer I can give. It is a subject for negotiation between the civil service association and the civil service commission.

Mr. Bryden: If past experience is any guide, there is going to be a lot of difficulty there; because, as far as I can see from my observation, the civil service association is dealing with the blood brother of Simon Legree at all stages. I am not specifically referring to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), although he is closer to Simon Legree than is fit and proper, but that is not the point I am most interested in.

The hon. Minister's answer up until now increases my alarm, because what I am afraid of is that these particular categories—types of employment which are of vital importance to his work, and there are also similar types of employment in some of the other departments—are just going to be lost in the big shuffle.

After a good deal of negotiating and bargaining, and perhaps even some hard words, there will be some general increases in pay; but our problem, as I see it, is: Regardless of the overall level of wages in the service—and that is one point we should discuss on some other occasion—there are particular categories of people who are simply misclassified in the total picture. They have been at a level which is far too low for the type of work that we would expect from them, and I would hope that the hon. Minister would make his voice heard as strongly as possible.

Perhaps the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) could make a similar representation that, apart altogether from general overall increases in wages, specific consideration should be given to such classifications as rehabilitation officers, correctional officers—what is the other one?—training school supervisors, and social workers. These are people who are dealing with human beings on a direct personal relationship; people who are vital, I am certain, to the future development of many of these human beings. And the civil service commission simply has not given consideration to the type of qualifications that I think we all want.

I think it is up to the hon. Minister to make this case extremely strong. I do not think he will have any trouble with the civil

service association. His troubles lie within the government—with the Treasury board and the civil service commission. I would suggest to him that he should really raise a fuss this year because every year we get the same answer: that this is all a part of a total policy and all Ministers want more money. Here is a case that has much greater merit than most cases, I am sure, that are put forward to the Treasury board.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on that last point: I would hope that the hon. member does not think that I have a reputation at Treasury board for being a shrinking violet.

Mr. Bryden: I do not know what the hon. Minister's reputation is.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: As a matter of fact, there was an increase just last year, but the complete effect of it is still not being felt because there will be another increase beginning April 1. I got an increase—I think the average was around \$750.

Mr. Bryden: You mean you raised the wages from disgusting to disgraceful. They were away down at about \$3,200 a year; it is just incredible that you could even think of paying—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I offered to get some information for the hon. member for Bracondale. I think I was asked about qualifications for correctional officer 1, what they are: Grade 8, as I said, preferably grade 10; ability to pass mental ability test—that is a score in the average range or higher.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale has the floor now.

Mr. Ben: When were these specifications set?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I will try to get that.

Mr. Ben: The mental range score; how does that compare to IQ? I asked that of the hon. Minister. He said: "In the average range." Does that relate to IQ, or do you use the words "mental score"?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, that would be IQ.

Mr. Ben: That would be IQ in the average range. Mr. Chairman, one of the things that confuses me about the debate—there are a lot of things that confuse me but one

thing specifically—is that the hon. Minister took exception when I referred to what are now called correctional officers, as custodial officers, and said they were formerly turnkeys. It is quite conceivable that perhaps there is a distinction, but if there is a distinction, Mr. Chairman, should not that distinction be recognized by this government?

Is it not rather strange that a Minister of the Crown gets up there and says, "We cannot dictate the salary ranges here; that is out of our hands because the civil service wishes to protect and maintain a certain pecking order, and keep a certain group down in salary to make their position look more illustrious and give it more stature." Is that a reason for a government to sit there complacently and do nothing and say, "Our hands are tied. They are the ones that set this routine"?

If, as the hon. Minister states, these people are correctional officers and not simply turnkeys, can I suggest their salary should be commensurate with their new responsibilities? I suggest also that it is the responsibility of the hon. Minister to take the initiative in that regard, and not throw that task to the civil service who, I respectfully submit, are trying to maintain their own pecking order, to maintain the gap that exists between the top and the bottom, for if the salaries of the lowest paid go up then they feel that a certain stature is being lost.

One of the things that strikes me about this is why it should be the hon. Minister's department where they have, we might say, so many dropouts. Why should it be the hon. Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: All departments have dropouts.

Mr. Ben: Fine, we will find out from the other departments if this is what our civil servants are composed of. I refuse to accept it.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Industry has dropouts. There are a lot of changes.

Mr. Ben: I refuse to accept that our civil service is composed of those who have an average education of grade 9½ or 10 and I am sure that if we ask every Minister, as each estimates come up, we are going to find that this is not so. Why should the reform department attract all these unless, as pointed out by my hon. friend here from Woodbine, it is the salary, the pittance that is paid to

these people so that they cannot even operate with dignity down there?

Now it is fine for the hon. Minister to say, —though I rather surprised me—that the Treasury board were giving him what was wanted, because I was under the impression from information received that the hon. Minister had no difficulty in getting whatever funds he needed. It just goes back to what I always suspected, that The Department of Reform Institutions is a forgotten department, that people do not see it, nobody cares about the thing. The hon. Minister himself made a statement before the John Howard society that most of the public do not care how those people are treated there. Maybe most of the public do not but I suggest that the members of this House, at least those that are sitting on the left of the Speaker, do care. They want something done about it.

One way of doing it is not by lowering the requirement to grade 8. Perhaps some of the hon. members of this House may have thought I was very nasty in implying that the inmates have a higher educational level than some of the correctional officers that are looking after them, but I can see it is quite possible if the hon. Minister here is saying we are recruiting them at grade 8.

Now, how in heaven's name do we expect the people incarcerated there to have respect for these people, as the hon. Minister so bluntly pointed out in criticizing me for having brought this to the attention of the public, when they know the correctional officers are no better off as far as education is concerned than they are?

Furthermore, as the hon. Minister pointed out in saying that these inmates are probably smarter than both he and I, I would suggest that if they are smarter—and a lot of them are more clever than both the hon. Minister and myself—how does he expect the correctional officers to cope with these inmates?

I would respectfully suggest that when he goes back to the Treasury board, he should tell the hon. Provincial Treasurer that although he may have forgotten that there are people in the reform institutions, other people have not, and he should also look at it from the financial point of view if he will not look at it from the humanitarian point of view. If he is afraid to part with the almighty dollar, remind him that as long as he is coming back, and back, and back, the hon. Provincial Treasurer will have to raise more and more and more money. If the hon. Provincial Treasurer wants to save money and stop increasing his budget all the time, perhaps if he could find some way of keeping

these people out of prison all the time; he might do that.

Mr. Chairman: The Provincial Treasurer wants to say something at this point.

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might bring a message from one of the supervisors at the boys school at Hagersville, whom I met in Hagersville last night. He asked me to tell the hon. gentleman that he had a great deal more than a grade 8 education.

Mr. Thompson: We all waited with bated breath and I notice the hon. Provincial Treasurer—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me, the member for Scarborough West.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, perhaps it might be worthwhile for some of the hon. gentlemen who are making the statements to find out the truth of the matter before they make the statements.

Mr. Bryden: We have been finding out.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, the hon. member has not.

Mr. Bryden: Oh yes, we have.

Hon. Mr. Allan: No, you have not. The civil service commission did not set the salary that you are talking about; they were agreed to by the civil service association and the commission, and as far as I know, and I think this is correct, they are entirely satisfactory to those who are receiving them.

Mr. Bryden: We can perhaps deal with the hon. Provincial Treasurer more fully under his estimates, but I can warn him right now that that sort of statement will not do. We know the kind of bitterness involved in negotiations between—

Hon. Mr. Allan: There was no bitterness.

Mr. Bryden: Does the hon. Provincial Treasurer think we cannot read? You fellows just tried to ram it down their throats and then you have the nerve to get up and—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): How does the hon. member know that?

Mr. Bryden: I read their statements, as the hon. member ought to, and he would know if he read them.

I was on my feet, Mr. Chairman but—

Mr. Chairman: Well, I assume that the Provincial Treasurer was on his feet on a point of order. What was the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Allan: My point of order was that there was no bitterness in these negotiations, they were agreeable and the settlement was satisfactory to both parties.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer likes to pretend that the civil service association is entirely satisfied, but he and his colleagues live in a dream world; they do not know what is going on.

Hon. Mr. Allan: Yes, we do—

Mr. Bryden: We get the publications—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I get so tired of listening—

Mr. Bryden: —put out by the civil service association, and those memos and other publications show a continuous story of grievance, of dissatisfaction, on the part of the association at the thoroughly arbitrary and unreasonable attitude that the government persistently takes in negotiations.

The government does not negotiate at all, it lays down the law and says "This is the way it must be" and then if they say they would like it some other way, the hon. Provincial Treasurer says, "You fellows are unreasonable."

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I ask the hon.—

Mr. Bryden: No, I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, and I am fed to the teeth with the hon. Provincial Treasurer coming in here with these bland assurances for the benefit of his own backbenchers who apparently do not read any of the material they get from the civil service association—

Hon. Mr. Allan: I do not know whether the hon. member can read or not but—

Mr. Bryden: —I will bring in some of it and we will see how well satisfied these people are. At almost every stage it is a bitter fight; you trying to dictate to them and they are trying to bargain; you say that whenever they want to bargain they are not reasonable, that the only way to be reasonable is to accept what you dictate and I—

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Hon. Mr. Allan: The point of order is that I have made a statement which is the truth and I object to being told that it is untrue.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Provincial Treasurer has put a certain interpretation on facts which cannot be borne out by the facts at all, and now he is coming into this House with the suggestion that we must accept everything he says as the gospel truth. It was not a statement of facts, it was a matter of interpretation.

Hon. Mr. Allan: It was a statement of fact.

Mr. Bryden: As far as I am concerned, the hon. Provincial Treasurer's interpretation is 100 per cent wrong and anybody with any brains can see that it is wrong. However, Mr. Chairman, we will deal with this more fully when the estimates of the civil service commission are before this House.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, while we are talking on this point could I ask the hon. Provincial Treasurer, is he aware that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has said one of the problems that he has in filling his staff is because of inadequate salary? Is he aware of that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Point of order, please.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: On a point of order. The hon. leader of the Opposition is twisting my words. I was asked the question whether in fact I thought that salaries have anything to do with my difficulty in recruiting staff and I almost remember word for word what I said. I said I would be insulting the intelligence of the hon. members if I said to them that the salaries were not a consideration in recruiting any staff any place. Of course they are. Obviously if I paid more money I could get more people, anybody could.

Mr. Thompson: Is the hon. Provincial Treasurer aware that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions has told us he is not a shrinking violet when he approaches the Provincial Treasurer in order to get more increases for his staff?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order again. The hon. leader of the Opposition is putting words in my mouth.

Mr. MacDonald: That is exactly what the hon. Minister said.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Just a moment. There was an implication that this department was being neglected in favour of others, and that I should allow my voice to be heard. I answered that he may rest assured that I am not known at the Treasury board as being a shrinking violet. As a matter of fact, my estimates this year are up 14 per cent.

Mr. Thompson: May I ask if the hon. Provincial Treasurer is aware that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions wants an increase in salary for his staff?

Hon. Mr. Allan: I am not aware of that.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): That is not bad for a shrinking violet.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, since he is now sitting in this House, that he might have attended the debate during the course of the afternoon and recognize that the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions desperately wants an increase for his staff, and that the government policy of bludgeoning civil servants into submission on wage rates is no answer to the present staff crisis.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I rise to a point of order again, Mr. Chairman. I made exactly the same statement that the hon. Provincial Treasurer made. I said salaries were the subject of negotiations between the civil service commission and the civil service association. As a matter of fact, I said it was improper for me even to discuss salaries with my own staff. I did say it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the civil service association would appreciate a little help from this side: we will give them all we can.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bracondale.

Mr. S. Lewis: You interrupted me on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me. The member for Scarborough West has the floor.

Mr. S. Lewis: I would like to follow up the point because I think that what is happening in this sub-estimate is instructive for what is going to happen in related fields of welfare, education, health, the Attorney General, and

so on, and that is that the wage level the government is prepared to set is systematically starving the social service personnel in this province. Most important, it is systematically starving them out of their own department.

It is not only that the educational incentives are low; that the retraining incentives are non-existent; that the work conditions in many instances are inadequate, but that the salary level is destroying the social service complement in our civil service. I suggest strongly, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister that we are bringing departments such as his to a point of paralysis; five or six years from now they will simply not be functioning because of lack of adequate personnel. He may not be a shrinking violet, Mr. Chairman, but he is certainly going to have to exert a much more dramatic and persuasive influence at the Treasury board, as will his colleagues in these related departments, or the departments will be undermined beyond repair. That is what the members on this side of the House have been driving at this afternoon.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister points out that his budget this year is 14 per cent above last year's budget. I would like to ask the hon. Minister why, therefore, on page S1 in the public accounts of the

province of Ontario for the period ending March 31, 1965, is there shown to be unexpended of the appropriation of \$20,631,000 the sum of \$4,011,276.06?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is a very detailed explanation. If we have time, Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to go into that. There are all these unexpended amounts in every department.

Mr. Ben: Like 25 per cent?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, in some instances. It depends on what they are set for.

Mr. Ben: Well, if that is the way the hon. Minister does his calculations—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee of supply rise and report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

ERRATUM

(Thursday, February 24, 1966)

Page	Column	Line	Correction
872	1	38	Change to read: would have to pay \$25,000 a year or more for them.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, February 28, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

CONTENTS

Monday, February 28, 1966

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Nixon, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Peck, Mr. Racine, Mr. Olde, Mr. Apps	973
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Apps, agreed to	1001
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1002

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: First order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, when this debate was adjourned last Thursday I was drawing to your attention, sir, the sorry state to which the awarding of Queen's counsels in the province of Ontario has fallen during the tenure of the present government and particularly during the two years during which the present hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has had the responsibility to make the recommendations on this matter. And as I have told you previously, sir, this year 110 lawyers were elevated, if that is the correct word, to this designation. A year ago 107 Queen's counsels were awarded; and the year before that in 1964 only 79. Under the direction of the former Attorney General, the present hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass), a much stricter policy towards these appointments was followed.

But I would like to bring to your attention, sir, that the large number of QCs that are presently practising in this province tend to degrade the honour to some extent because it has become common, and also for the citizens who are looking for legal counsel there is nothing in the award that assures them of any extra responsibility or even any extra competence.

Now I feel that there is a remedy for this, and as a matter of fact it could be one of several remedies. I believe that if the government severely restricted the number of QCs awarded, and acted on the advice of the legal profession itself through the Bar associations, the judges and magistrates, who surely would have some opportunity to judge the

relative merits of certain lawyers, that these awards could be put on a better basis. Failing this, I suppose the other method would be just to award the QC to any lawyer who stays out of jail himself for a period of five years so that it would be on a perfectly equal basis for all.

But I would say myself that I still feel that the designation could be used to honour and distinguish those truly learned in the law. If the government would accept a farmer's suggestion, I would think that the next few lists should be those from whom the QC designation has been removed until it becomes reduced to a manageable number.

Mr. Speaker, there are two or three other items that I would like to bring to your attention. The first has to do with a matter that we followed very closely in the recent federal election campaign a few months ago. The hon. Prime Minister of Ontario (Mr. Roberts) himself took an active part in this particular issue. I want to bring it to your attention now.

I refer to the need for adequate old age retirement pensions for the citizens of Ontario and the fact that the prime responsibility for making old age pensions available in this province is a provincial responsibility by The British North America Act. It is true that down through the years this responsibility has been taken over in some measure by the federal jurisdiction so that the old age pension, the old age security pension as it is known, is a federal pension. But there is precedent in Ontario for awarding an amount in addition to the basic pension.

During the tenure of office of my friend, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), when he was Minister of Public Welfare, I understand that in those days the government of Ontario undertook to pay a premium of 15 per cent of the basic pension to those in the province of Ontario in receipt of old age pension in those days. Now much has been said about the need for a \$100 pension and I myself am firmly convinced that this money should be made available to our pensioners in Ontario.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Support our subamendment!

Mr. Nixon: We certainly will support the subamendment that the hon. member tacked on to the amendment offered by my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson), and when this debate is finished I hope that this matter will have been fully discussed by all parties because I feel that there is a general consensus that for the senior citizens in this province \$100 is the amount that we should make available to them and which would enable them to live in some dignity in their old age.

There are many things that are going to be done to assist these people from the federal level. It has already been mentioned in this House many times that The Canada Assistance Act, when it comes into being as it surely will, will provide the assistance for this government to award additional pensions on a needs test. We know that the Canada pension plan itself will make available additional moneys and already premiums are being collected. But this pension will not really be available to those that need it for another ten years, although the premiums are already returning to the province of Ontario. I understand that these will be made available for a sort of basis of social expansion; that is the money will be loaned at a reasonable interest rate to the municipalities and school boards, and with this I heartily concur.

But I very well remember some months ago the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario said that the pension should be raised to \$100 and he felt that it would be quite in order for the premiums collected in the Canada pension plan to be applied for this additional pension. Now admittedly this was only for an interim period so that the extra pension would be made available to everyone until the Canada pension plan came into force at its full amount. Nevertheless, the suggestion was made by the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario and I feel that there was a certain amount of irresponsibility associated with this. Since it has been decided finally that it would be a funded plan, surely the funds that are collected from the premiums would be invested, as now we are evidently going to do in Ontario, so they would be available to support the plan in the future.

So that the assistance that is available is going to be augmented by The Canada Assistance Act and finally by the Canada pension plan. Another very useful suggestion that has been made by the Senate committee on aging is that for those over 65 years of age

the government should guarantee a minimum income, and the amount suggested is \$105 a month. Now I feel there is great promise in this suggestion. I am convinced that in the years that lie ahead, this is the type of plan that would eventually be adopted in Canada and may be expanded into other areas besides those just related to our older citizens.

In the meantime, the citizens of Ontario have to get along with the restrictions of the \$75 a month. Often there is considerable need, not sufficient however, to warrant the extra assistance that is made available by the government of Ontario, under special and exceptional circumstances. So it appears to me that the increase to \$100 will soon be available in one form or another as Canada grows and prospers under Liberal leadership.

Nevertheless, until this is economically possible all across Canada, we in this House have the power—and I submit to you, sir, the responsibility—to meet the immediate needs, so that the amount can be raised in Ontario to \$100 monthly for old age pensioners and all of the related categorical pensions. I would heartily recommend this to the government.

Mr. Speaker, in the next few weeks the Parliament of Canada is going to be called upon to decide on whether or not capital punishment will be retained in this country.

This is obviously a federal responsibility. Nevertheless, we in this province have been talking just this afternoon, and we will talk in the future, about the responsibilities that our police, law enforcement officers, and prison guards have and their changing responsibility if in fact capital punishment is abolished.

So it does concern us in this House. I was interested to note at a fairly recent federal-provincial conference the hon. Attorney General of Ontario recommended to the federal government that capital punishment be retained.

Now it is not made clear, as far as I am concerned, whether he was speaking in a personal capacity, or whether in fact he was representing the opinion of the government of this province. I suppose he was speaking as an individual citizen. Nevertheless when the hon. Attorney General makes a statement like that, it is widely reported and it would appear to me that it would represent the opinion of this government.

If this is so, I would like, as a citizen of Ontario and a member of this House to go

on record as saying that I very strongly favour the abolition of capital punishment and I hope that this is the decision that is reached by the government of Canada.

I want to say something about it, because there is all sorts of information available to those who would seek it out and read it. For example, there were commissions and committees in the United Kingdom in 1949 extending through to 1953. The government of Canada itself had a committee looking into this in 1956; there is a United Nations study of capital punishment released in 1962, and the states of New York and New Jersey have carried out rather exhaustive studies recently on this matter.

Now having read the arguments for and against abolition, I find that they rather boil down to a relatively small number. There are those who feel that capital punishment is an effective deterrent and, on the other hand, those who feel it is not an effective deterrent. Search as I may, there are no valid statistics to prove the case conclusively, one way or the other.

The next one is that many people feel that capital punishment is just retribution for some of the ghastly crimes that are committed in this country. An eye for an eye is the philosophy that would govern them in this.

On the other hand, there are many who feel that capital punishment in this form is morally wrong and completely unjustifiable. Many feel—and I am sure that there are hon. members of this House who would agree—that capital punishment is a real help to the administration of law and order in any jurisdiction, and an assistance in keeping order in our penal institutions.

There are others, of course, who feel that the risk of error in capital punishment puts aside that argument. It seems to me that after rational argument approaches exhaustion, it tends to deteriorate to charges on the one side that the opinion is vengeful and sadistic and on the other that it is made up of impractical bleeding hearts.

In other words, it tends to boil down to a moral conviction held by the individual and it is in this connection that I believe that in the absence of proof that capital punishment is an effective deterrent, that the principle of the sanctity of human life must prevail.

I favour the abolition of capital punishment and I regret that the hon. Attorney General of this province has advised the government of Canada to the contrary. I am not saying

that we have the responsibility even for advising the government of Canada. Nevertheless, they requested this advice and it seems that the hon. Attorney General has gone ahead and offered it without consulting this House.

It is for this reason that I feel quite justified in going on record, Mr. Speaker, with the opinions that I hold very strongly myself.

Now, as you know, Mr. Speaker, in the last session of this Legislature, a select committee was set up to deal with conservation in the province of Ontario. This committee is not, as I understand it, prepared to give a final report and it may well be that our deliberations and investigations will continue for another year.

This remains to be seen. But it is true that over the years there has been a lot of talk about conservation and particularly about measures that would combat increasing pollution of our waters and the air.

A lot of this has been largely disregarded. It is true that a reorganization of the Cabinet some months ago has put all of the government emanations that deal with conservation and anti-pollution work under one Minister, and I believe that this is a reasonable thing to do. But it is also true that the Ontario water resources commission that was set up some years ago—and we are called on to support with very heavy appropriations of money—still permits some of the large cities of the province of Ontario to flush raw sewage into the rivers and the Great Lakes of this country. It is almost inconceivable that this is still going on, but the thing that would bring the emergencies of pollution to our attention more than anything else in the last few weeks is the report of the joint commission on boundary waters that was made public recently.

There is every indication from this report that it is time we woke up and did something more than talk and raise the alarm. We have to spend more money; we have to bring together the people concerned on an international basis to make plans to meet this emergent situation that is coming upon us so rapidly.

I am not going to spend time dealing with the specific details of the international joint commission report. It is true that they refer to pollution coming from the American side as being even worse than that which is dumped into the Great Lakes system from Ontario and the rest of Canada, particularly Quebec and to a lesser extent right along in the Gulf of St. Lawrence itself.

But I well remember the last emergency situation that occurred in the Great Lakes and this had to do with a water level crisis that was discussed in this Legislature in the last two sessions. We heard all the talk about how the shipping industry was going to be seriously impaired unless action was taken, and the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario convened an international conference at which representatives of the states bordering the Great Lakes, with Ontario bordering on this side, got together and discussed the problem.

What all this did was to calm the fears of the citizens until the prayers for rain were answered and the levels of the lakes are coming up.

I believe in the future that a plan has got to be evolved to control the Great Lakes, but for the time being the emergency associated with this situation has passed.

But the emergency associated with the pollution of the Great Lakes is not going to pass as readily. This is a situation in which we are going to be troubled for years, we are going to be asked to spend tremendous sums of money, and I am sure that the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) and those who work with him in this great responsibility, Mr. Speaker, are going to spend a good deal of time searching for solutions.

I would suggest that this is an important international problem. I personally doubt whether the international commission on boundary waters has all of the powers and all of the funds that are going to be needed to solve it. Action is going to have to be taken immediately, I would say at this session, the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario should once again convene an international conference together with the hon. Minister and the hon. Minister's counterpart at the federal level. The governors of the states which adjoin the Great Lakes system and who, in my opinion, are largely responsible for the greatest measure of the pollution, should be called together. I think Ontario can take the lead because Ontario borders every one of the Great Lakes, and some of the St. Lawrence river as well.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): We are, sir.

Mr. Nixon: This is a great thing.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): You will find out there is not a meeting on the Montreal harbour at the same time.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: The hon. leader of the Opposition is not speaking.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend the leader of this party has studied this and has spoken on it before; and I add my voice to his to urge the government to take immediate and powerful action to begin the alleviation of this crisis. I recall to your mind, sir, that there are still cities in Ontario putting raw sewage into the rivers and lakes of this area, even after the years of operation of the Ontario water resources commission.

I understand that certain studies of northern waters are taking place with the co-operation of the federal government. This, of course, is a great study. Indeed, the fact that the waters now draining into the Arctic perhaps in the future may be made available to add to the flow to the Great Lakes is not going to be a sufficient answer, even in the years that remain in this century, to even partly combat the growing pollution of the Great Lakes—particularly Lake Erie, this small shallow lake that has been described by experts as becoming an area of dead water because of the pollution in it. It is decaying, and the growth of algae is using up all the available dissolved oxygen. It is harming the system for recreation, and also the basis of the fishing industry. One of our most valuable natural resources is very rapidly losing its value and may be lost entirely as far as being a natural resort and an asset to Ontario is concerned.

There are already indications that the Americans are taking the lead in this. They have fallen behind for years, but already a meeting of governors and authorities of the states bordering the Great Lakes has been convened and they are taking some of the steps that we feel would be necessary.

Hon. Mr. Simonett: That we took nine years ago.

Mr. Nixon: Well, what I want to happen, Mr. Speaker, is that on an international basis, Ontario and the states bordering the Great Lakes co-operate; and without co-operation we are not going to get anywhere. For years the government opposite has sat there with eyes glazed as the members on this side, and often their own members, have brought this to their attention. Their arms have been spread out, saying "Everything is all right, and nine years ago we took the decisions that would make this right." And still raw pollution from Ontario is flushing into the Great Lakes system.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that Ontario

must take the lead in this. The hon. Prime Minister of Ontario has got to convene an international conference. We may have to give up some of our authority over this matter because of the international jurisdiction that is required. It is going to cost us money; we are going to have to put ourselves in a position where people who are not directly responsible to this government or any other government are going to take samples at the mouths of all the rivers and pinpoint the pollution, say what its nature is, and what must be done to control it.

Until this is done, the Great Lakes will not be brought back. I submit this government is not doing enough to combat pollution, and that the emergent situation that is on us now is their responsibility. Every member of this House is ready to co-operate with the appropriation of necessary funds; we are ready to discuss this when the opportunity comes up; and I submit to you, sir, that the time for action is now. As a matter of fact, it should have been taken some years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) has referred to the possibility of our support for their subamendment that the pensions in Ontario be raised to the \$100 level. This is something that will be discussed again in this House, I am sure.

But I want to bring to your attention, sir, the fact that the hon. leader of the official Opposition (Mr. Thompson) has, before this House, a well-constructed and well-thought-out amendment which points out the shortcomings of this government in areas other than the pollution I brought to your attention a moment ago—the fact that the economic development of the province is lagging; the farmers of Ontario have not had an opportunity to take part in development as they should; the milk prices have already been discussed from time to time here and will be discussed again. And, on point after point, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that this government does not warrant the continued confidence of the people.

It is my strong resolution and recommendation to every hon. member of this House that, when they examine the amendment carefully, they support the amendment and vote in favour of the reforms that have been lacking for the last 23 years on the part of this government. With this in mind, sir, I would strongly urge this action on the hon. members here.

It has been an honour, sir, to bring these matters to your attention. You were not in the chair when I first began my speech, but

I want to assure you, in conclusion, of my confidence in your direction of our affairs in this House, and your impartiality and fairness.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to add my words of appreciation for the manner in which you conduct the business of this House, the very able and very fair manner in which it is done. I am sure my appreciation is echoed by all of the other hon. members. We respect your fairness and your decisions as well.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, like to add my words of welcome to the new members in the House this session, the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben), and to wish them well during the time they spend in this House. I would hope that they will continue as they have already begun, that they will continue to add something to the affairs and to the business of this House.

Mr. Speaker, within the last few days, as a matter of fact officially I believe as of Friday, and in a business approach as of Saturday, the east-west subway was opened in the city of Toronto. While I have not had the opportunity to ride on the new subway as yet, I became as confused as some of the other people, who were in the city over the weekend, in trying to find my way in the subway going north and south. However, I think I have found that now.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciated very much on Sunday—Saturday, rather, and Sunday—was to ride in the new subway trains. And I particularly want to express appreciation to the people who, in our community, Fort William, built 164 of these new subway cars.

(Applause)

There will be more reason for cheers as I continue my remarks. I would like to call the attention of this House to something that may or may not have passed out of their minds in the last two years—and so many things do pass out of the minds of some of the government people so quickly. I would repeat again that the Canadian Car division of the Hawker-Siddeley Corporation, which is situated in the city of Fort William, the city I have the honour to represent in this House, was successful in tendering and getting the bid for 164 of the cars which were used in this new extension. The contract amounted to some \$17 million. Now this has been good, of course, for the economy of the area which I represent in Fort William, but it has also

been good in so many other ways. May I point out just one particular area?

Four different firms made bids on this contract and I can tell you, as recently as this morning when I was in touch with Montreal, with the head office of the Hawker-Siddeley Corporation operation in this country—and I believe this information is absolutely accurate—that the German bid for the 164 cars in question amounted to \$150,000 per car. The Japanese bid amounted to \$140,000 per car. The Montreal Locomotive Works which was the next in line as far as bids were concerned, lower down the scale, was \$103,500 for the cars involved.

Our people in Fort William saw fit to and very successfully bid in the sum of \$94,000. They, of course, got the contract and I am told by everyone who has been in close contact with this operation of the building of cars from the time the contract was let until the cars were actually put into operation last Friday and last Saturday that everyone in connection with the total operation are very happy about the way this contract turned out.

Now to add just a bit of information that may be interesting to at least some of the hon. members who are present this evening, may I tell you that at the present time negotiations are in progress in Mexico for a contract which will involve 240 units of a similar type of car and 16 countries in the world are bidding for this contract.

We know that of the 16 countries in the world which are presently bidding for this Mexican contract Canadian Car is one of the three lowest of the 16 bidders, and the other two are Japanese firms.

Now I would hope that the people of Mexico in their wisdom decide, of course, to grant this large contract to a Canadian manufacturer. I think that we people who live in Fort William and in northwestern Ontario would look forward to the opportunity to journey to Mexico in the not-too-distant future and ride in vehicles made in Ontario and in our own community.

I would also add that Can Car in Fort William is presently building 48 units for the projected subway system in the city of Montreal and also that almost imminently, I believe, a contract is about to be let for a large number of cars in Montevideo, Uruguay. We look forward also to having that contract and producing this type of vehicle that we have in Toronto, for use in Montevideo.

Now with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get into the main problem that I would like to call to your attention, sir, and to the hon. members of this House

and it is something that is concerned, very seriously with all of us. It was only very lightly touched upon, unfortunately, in the Speech from the Throne, and that is the Indian problem. Or as I sometimes think of it, not as an Indian problem necessarily, but rather as a white problem in this province and in this country.

By way of approach to the problem I ask the rhetoric question, of course: What is an Indian? What are some of his problems in the white world? And before giving an answer to these questions, let me tell you a story that happened not long ago, and it is a true story, Mr. Speaker.

It happened up in our part of the country. I know the man, although I was not present when this episode occurred. I know the Indian gentleman involved and a very fine person he is, and I also know the person with whom he was talking, very well indeed.

I do not need to give hon. members the man's full name. Jake is his first name—I have known him for years and been on fishing trips with him and he is a very good guy. He lives on a northern Ontario reserve. Jake is not very healthy but he does get by. An official of the federal Indian affairs branch has been trying for three years to move Jake into a better home on the reserve. At that time Jake lived in a little old shack that was a definite threat to his health. For three years Jake simply shook his head and said "no." He would not even explain why he did not want to move.

Now this is an approach that is rather strange to many people who do not know the Indian people. This one particular day that I speak of, the official saw Jake sitting in front of his shack in the sun and he said, "Jake, tell me, why do you not want to move?" Jake reflected for some time and then he said, "My mother would not like it." And this is true. This is fact.

The point of the story is that Jake's mother has been dead for 20 years. The rest is quickly told. Jake was convinced that his mother would not really mind and Jake was fine and moved into a clean and rather better home.

I think that here we have the crux of the so-called Indian problem. It is a problem of communication of long pent-up distrust of the white man, of a totally different cultural background, of a significantly different philosophy of life.

Which way of life is better, that of the Indian or that of ours? We want the Indians of Ontario to live, however, and think and act as we do, but so far we have failed to convince them that our way is superior.

We all know that through the factors of time and technology the old ways of the Indian no longer exist. All cultural change is continuous anyway, but what is to replace the Indian philosophy? The largely vague and undefined quest for knowledge, money, a regular job, convertible, keeping up with the Jones'? These are apparently not the things.

One of the things that I would like to call to the attention of you, sir, and to the House is some excerpts and some remarks made by a lady who is very often in the news, Miss Kahn Tineta Horn, who was recently in this city.

Among the remarks attributed to Miss Horn and I quote here:

Money, power, possessions, influence, education, comforts, luxuries, benefits and so on are not what the Indians want. These don't mean anything to an Indian. He does not want a nice home; he does not want money because he knows he is going to spend it before the day is over. He does not want progress because he feels he has arrived. He does not want trips because he is where he wants to be until he gets up and goes somewhere else.

The things that we find of value are of no value to the Indian. What can you offer to Indians to make them work, worry and suffer? The different kinds of punishment you organize for yourselves through your own intensive efforts to get ahead.

Miss Horn goes on, of course, to extol the virtues of Indians and I am sure they have many virtues. I do not necessarily agree with all she says but certainly she is very forceful and very anxious to get her part of the story over to us.

I suggest that none of these concepts fits into the thinking of the Indian at this time. First, we must win their trust, their respect. Only then can we think of programmes to help Indians find their place in our society. A man who has worked with Indians all his life told me not long ago: "Now is not the time for hysterics." And this was near Fort William, just off the reservation. "Now is not the time for crash programmes, we have to move slowly."

I would go along with this statement to a certain degree, Mr. Speaker. We certainly do not want to resemble an Indian task force and descend on the reserves or other places where Indians live with an overwhelming Indian programme, but a crash programme is needed where money for Indians is concerned and when we start thinking about the Indian.

What is the Ontario government doing about the Indian? It has initiated with the federal government a crash programme to help the Indians in far northern white communities. That federal-provincial aid programme reads wonderfully on paper—\$500 million in aid, spread over the next 50 years. But let us see, Mr. Speaker, what it means in dollars and cents to the average Indian in Ontario.

There are somewhat less than 50,000 Indians in this province. This glorious aid programme, then, means almost exactly \$200 per year per Indian, if we take a year's budget to average out at \$10 million, over the 50-year period.

How much economic opportunity can an Indian buy for \$200 a year? Spreading a so-called crash financial programme over 50 years is ridiculous. The need for money is now and in massive doses. Fifty years hence we would hope that there is no longer an Indian problem to be solved. My contention is that we should establish the need and apportion the money in whatever amount is necessary, not in dribbles over a longer period of time.

Let me say it here and now. The province of Ontario, and I mean not only the government, but most of its white people as well, has taken a belated and sudden interest in Indians. All of a sudden, it is fashionable to sympathize with the Indians. It is the sort of "hip" thing to do, somewhere along that well-worn and hypocritical cliché: "Some of my best friends are . . ." You have heard it before, you have seen it.

But this sudden crash programme, a belated attempt to right the wrongs of decades is, despite its unquestionably good intentions, a blundering effort to salve a nagging conscience. We in the New Democratic Party do not trust the basic thinking of such a programme because it is not accompanied with a statement of intent.

We hear flowery words from both the federal and Ontario governments. We hear words like "co-operation," "federal-provincial planning for Indians," "streamlining of efforts" and above all, "co-ordinating all the services for the Indians." There is still precious little co-ordination of these services. And if they are co-ordinated, we do not believe these services are based on the philosophy that Indians have as many rights as we Caucasians have. When we talk to officials dealing with Indians, we often find the right attitude; and progressive thinking is gaining ground. But the policies that emanate from the governments are still rooted in

old-time paternalism. Paternalism is like a ragweed, it is difficult to stamp out. What has this abominable paternalism done to the Indians?

Actually, Mr. Speaker, it has turned them into aliens of our white society. It has failed to educate them, to provide them with the only tools with which an Indian living today can brave his future: knowledge and skill. Paternalism has created a system of Indian ghettos which are commonly known as reserves. And here I will quote from the select committee on civil liberties and rights of Indians in Ontario, 1954—a committee that shows an abysmal absence of common sense when it said, and I quote:

Generally speaking, the committee found that Indians lack the healthy respect for the future held by the rest of the population.

There it is again, that old fallacy, also known as ethnocentrism. It goes something like this: "If only the Indians were like the rest of us, we could handle them better."

This report by the committee proves that its members resorted to pious pap in their pet solutions. Let me give you an example:

There are numerous misunderstandings and cases of plain ignorance as to the position of the provincial government with relation to the Indian population. The committee would point out that Ontario has ample cause to be proud of its Indian population.

That is a quotation. So far, so good; but the very next sentence is so hilarious that I cannot refrain from quoting it. Why can Ontario be so proud of its Indians? Because, the committee's report states flatly, and I quote again "a majority are descendants of United Empire Loyalists." This is no doubt a reference to those Six Nations Indians who fought on the British side some 170 years ago.

On education, and I know the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) would appreciate this, the report said, and I quote again:

The committee cannot stress too strongly the importance of education as the eventual solution to the problem of integration of the Indian. The goal of such a programme must be that the finished product will be able to take his or her place alongside the non-Indian neighbour, to compete freely in free economy.

Of course, educating the Indian here means to tell him the white way of life and how to merge without fuss.

One recommendation of this committee makes so much sense that it was never implemented by this government. This quotation reads:

Your committee believes that a permanent civil servant should be appointed to act as liaison officer between the various departments of provincial and federal governments and the Indians themselves.

What is wrong with education for the Indians? White teachers tell Indian children about things and situations that are wholly alien to an Indian child who grew up, more often than not, in a world uncluttered by civilization and technology. Indian children are taught in English and are at a loss to understand what that strange teacher is trying to tell them.

This applies mainly to Indian children living on reserves and out of touch with our civilization. There is evidently a good case for educating Indian children in English when, and only when, they are sufficiently urbanized to comprehend the language and the environmental references of the curriculum.

But no one has to take our word for that. Here are the views of Professor Jacques Rousseau, an anthropologist at University of Laval's centre of northern studies. The professor says:

When discussing the problems of the natives, there is a strong tendency toward oversimplification, as though there were one problem and a single solution. To solve the problem of the natives, two proposals must be rejected. One would keep them in a kind of zoological reserve and prevent them from evolving. The other would impose on them a uniform southern pattern, which is utopic for any community.

And a quotation here:

The initiation of natives into our modern technology is a matter of proper teaching.

This is by Professor Jacques Rousseau:

The teaching of natives should be in two languages, the first language obviously their own, the second either English or French. It is not our mission in life, not our white man's burden, to force them to abandon their own language.

The most urgent need for the natives is the establishment of specialized schools in which the prospective teacher would learn some ethnology and at least the rudiments of a native language. The curriculum

must be adapted to local conditions. We must choose the more brilliant Indians and bring them to universities, after proper preparation.

And in conclusion, Professor Rousseau states:

I understand that the natives have to be integrated in the national pattern but their characteristics should not be lost.

I have quoted Professor Rousseau at length for one reason. I am willing to trust his judgment of the Indians, but I am not willing to accept at face value the programmes devised for Indians by the federal and by the Ontario governments. These governments lack that degree of sensitivity and understanding of the Indian that, in my opinion, is a prerequisite to any policy. One of these government officials, in this case a senior civil servant of the Indian affairs branch, recognizes this and he says:

Too few officials in governments understand the Indian mentality.

In government administration of Indian affairs, this lack of understanding the Indian mentality is coupled with a constant, vicious and ludicrous tug-of-war between provincial government departments. And I am sure that many of the hon. members in the House this evening are well aware of this fact, whether or not they will admit this is true.

A prime example of this petty war for priority is the squabble that has gone on for years between the Ontario Departments of Public Welfare and Lands and Forests. Both departments want to champion the Indian cause. As a result, the Indians are caught in a squeeze and very little gets done.

An example illustrates this. I maintain these departments are largely ignorant of each other's aims. Why else was it possible not too long ago for one department to take Indians from the job training programme of the other department, thereby confusing the Indians involved and nullifying the efforts of both departments? The irony is that both job training programmes are fair efforts in themselves, and that they should be co-ordinated.

How many Ontario government departments dabble in Indian affairs? As some, I can name The Department of Public Welfare, The Department of Lands and Forests, The Department of Education, The Department of Health, The Department of Municipal Affairs, and The Department of Labour, to some extent. The Ontario government has failed to develop a cohesive and comprehensive programme for the Indians. Only

a few years ago did this government wake up. The newest slogan is: "Co-ordination of services for the Indians."

How does this government go about it? I have earlier pointed out the inherent faults that make the much-heralded \$500 million programme for the Indians a predictable abortion. Here is why: A report entitled, "The Indians and Métis of northern Saskatchewan" was prepared and written by the centre for community studies in that province. The authors are: an economist, an anthropologist, and a research specialist in community development. All three have recognized status.

The report of this centre states:

Co-ordination of services is a relative condition dependent upon: (a) The establishment of an administrative authority with power to control and hence to co-ordinate activity; (b) The acceptance of common goals by the various agencies or groups; (c) The provision of adequate financial and technical resources; (d) The establishment of an efficient division of resources and responsibility among the agencies or groups.

If we compare the activities of this government with the objectives set out in this report, we see very quickly that none of these objectives has even been attempted, let alone recognized. This government should commission an extended sociological, anthropological, educational and economic study into the Indians of Ontario.

Today we know barely enough about Indians in order to start action in certain fields. But for a fuller understanding of what is involved we must learn more about Indians and their life and their behaviour.

Let me be more specific. This government has finally sat down with federal government officials to talk about what both governments can do for the Indians. There is no reason for this government to wait for brilliant proposals from the federal government. It has to take a bold and imaginative initiative itself.

The federal government has severed the Indians affairs branch from The Department of Citizenship and Immigration and has elevated the branch to a proper Department of Northern Affairs and Indian Affairs. But we cannot afford to hope for action on this ground alone.

I propose to this government that it cast aside its bureaucratic attitude toward Indians and establish, within a year, a separate administrative authority to deal with Indian affairs.

This authority must not be under the jurisdiction of any department. It must be set up as a separate entity with power to act. This authority must negotiate directly with the federal Department of Northern Affairs and Indian Affairs.

This authority should take the organizational form of a provincial agency under one man with the status and the power of a deputy minister. The government would, in all likelihood, have to go outside the ranks of the civil service in order to find a man of outstanding qualifications to head this Indian agency. And this man should then assemble in his agency men from the six government departments currently dealing with Indian matters.

The agency's ultimate goal, of course, would have to be self-elimination once its job is done. But while the task is in its initial stages, this agency must develop a core of competent men and women who understand Indians and their problems.

This new Ontario Indian agency would have to look after the needs of four basic groups of Indians in Ontario:

1. Those Indians who lead an integrated life in their villages or reserves and go fishing, hunting and trapping. Their livelihood is scanty and erratic; they need the opportunity of other industries.

2. Indians who have come to terms with the industrial civilization and economy. Many still live outdoors and work in the seasonal industries. Many are unskilled; some are skilled and work as cowboys and loggers in various parts of the country.

3. Indians who have nearly completed their adjustment to the white society and work as high riggers, skilled labourers, long-shoremen, particularly in British Columbia, office workers here in Ontario, and even professional men in this province and in other provinces in Canada.

4. Those Indians who are lost in limbo. They drift from trapping and hunting to the fringes of towns and cities. Often they live in shanty towns under conditions of squalor and dejection. They are the victims of the clash between an indifferent society and the uncomprehending native who has no physical and mental resources to adapt.

Now, many Indians belonging to any of these four groups develop nostalgia for their reserves where they can live among their own people. When they go back to live on the reserve, they fall prey to the inherent inertia of most reserves. There is no industry, no job on the reservation for them.

One of the solutions thought up for Indians in any of these four groups is community development. But to quote the Saskatchewan report again, Mr. Speaker:

The community development programme, as it applies today, is a piecemeal approach. While some programmes are good, others are thoroughly inadequate, and their sum total is very far from supplying the answers that are needed.

The federal Indian affairs branch has initiated several community development programmes in Ontario, with varying success, and the Saskatchewan criticism applies to Ontario as well.

In order to be successful, community development needs these following conditions, according to the Saskatchewan report and they are listed as:

- (a) Sufficient economic potential;
- (b) Overall planning for economic and social progress;
- (c) Adequate capital investment in relevant economic and social progress;
- (d) Democratic participation and control, including viable local government and a network of vigorous voluntary organizations.

These four conditions are non-existent in this province's Indian reserves and communities. There is, in parts, a very limited economic potential on reserves. Overall planning for the Indians is in the baby stage at best. It lacks, still, a definite commitment on the part of this government.

There is no thought being given to capital investment. In fact, whenever there are efforts by Indians to start an industry, they cannot get capital grants, nor are there plans to interest industry in developing new enterprises in northern Ontario from which the Indians could benefit.

Democratic participation and control by and for the Indians is an idea on paper, but this government has not yet made clear that it considers going along with federal efforts in this field; voluntary organizations have formed but have not received substantial or any help from the government, and there is no network of such organizations.

But it is not only a question of what has to be done, Mr. Speaker. The question is, who is to do it. The division of federal and provincial authority is the crucial factor.

Let me propose, therefore, that this government, after setting up a specific agency for the Indians, approach the new Department of Northern Affairs and Indian Affairs,

with the goal to establish a unified, single Indian authority involving both levels of government. But unless this federal-provincial Indian agency is equipped with a competent staff and given funds it, too, will be doomed to fail. And much more than just funds is needed.

As a third measure I suggest to the Ontario government, the establishment of an Indian development fund. I remind the House of the ill-fated attempt of Cape Croker reserve Indians to manufacture furniture without adequate credit and grants—and this matter has been mentioned in this House on previous occasions.

As a fourth measure I propose that this government start thinking seriously how it could foster self-government for the Indian reserves with the stipulation that pace and decisions be left to the Indian councils.

A federal programme is in progress here, and in the case of the Walpole Island reserve, there has been initial success in encouraging Indians to run their own affairs.

The Indian affairs branch has the right idea, but this branch cannot move on a broad scale for lack of money and lack of staff. But here is a splendid opportunity for the Ontario government to throw in its resources and develop, with the new federal Department of Northern Affairs and Indian Affairs, a well-planned, well-staffed and well-financed programme to foster self-government for Indian reserves.

This, of course, means an amendment of The Ontario Municipal Act that does not, in its present form—as I understand it—provide much incentive for Indians to administer their own affairs as independent municipalities. This, incidentally, proved quite a frustration for federal officials in the Indian affairs branch when they helped the Walpole Island Indians.

We certainly do not adhere to the view that the federal government should abolish, *ipso facto*, all reserves which would mean denuding the Indians living on reserves of their vestige of ethnic security and familiar comfort.

Instead, we favour according the Indians a chance to be their own guides in future life with help and understanding. In most cases, it is not only the reserves that lack economic opportunity. It is more a regional problem involving the surrounding white communities as well. Any development, therefore, that would benefit the Indians would have to benefit the entire region as well.

In northern Ontario, where this lack of

economic planning and opportunity is most prevalent, Mr. Speaker, the reserves could easily grow into self-governed communities or municipalities.

This is obviously not a concept that should be hoisted on the shoulders of the Indians. It would be the culminating chapter in a long novel of adaptation and of integration along the lines of my speech this evening. The initiative must come from the Indian and he has to be in full charge of the speed of this adaptation and integration with, at most, a guiding and helping hand from an Ontario Indian agency.

To envision such an initiative on the part of the Indians is by no means utopian. We have seen it happen on the Walpole Island reserve, on the Cape Croker reserve and on many other reserves. The reason that these initiatives have not been more successful or more speedy is simply that the Indians, by and large, are not equipped with the know-how.

And I would hope at this juncture that the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) had a great deal to do with the establishment of the scheme on Walpole Island.

I think that the onus to provide them with the know-how is on us. Were it not for the settlers in Canada, the Indians would no doubt be still masters in their own house. Because we Caucasians pushed the Indian into the role of the social outcast we have an obligation to make up for this betrayal of confidence.

Let me stray here for just a moment, Mr. Speaker. One of the barriers to Indian achievements is a well-justified sense of grievance about the wrongs done to Indians in the past. Let me suggest what I think the government should do to remove the basic cause for this long-held grudge.

This government must set up a broad and generous programme of compensation for land lost by Indians, hunting and fishing privileges lost by them and redress for other injustices, such as the purchase of large tracts of land owned by Indians and bought for absurdly low prices from them by the government.

This government, together with the federal government, must initiate a just and honest system of compensation that would go some way to satisfy the Indian claims. In my opinion it would pay to be generous and forget the restraints of narrow legalistic thinking. By removing this grudge, the government would encourage the Indians to act for themselves and give them more financial resources to work with.

May I point out the criticism made last year by members of the federal New Democratic caucus in regard to the federal Bill No. C-123, An Act to provide for the disposition of Indian claims? If such mixed Caucasian-Indian settlements, or communities, or municipalities, will develop within the next 30 or 40 years in Ontario, the Indians could rest assured that this kind of integration would never eradicate their own cultural heritage. On the contrary, we have every reason to believe that it would bring in its wake a renaissance of Indian culture, traditions and customs.

Self-governing Indian communities, instead of strangled reserves, is the concept then. But how does a government agency for Indians inject economic life into these underdeveloped areas? There is room for a series of feasibility studies for economic opportunities, a series that should be initiated now for the coming years. There is plenty of work to be done. This is a golden chance for scholars of nearly every description; for students and for voluntary organizations; all under the firm and inspired leadership of a government Indian agency.

Rather than drag Indians off their reserves and hang a big sign on the gates reading "Closed for lack of imagination"; we should ask Indians and friends of the Indians, young people and older people, to advise the agency on what is needed.

The main aim of community development has been described as a programme to involve people living in substandard conditions in the improvement of their lot, and that this programme should include an effort to change the mental outlook of the Indians by developing in them ambitions for higher standards of life, and the determination to work for such standards. I am opposed, Mr. Speaker, to this kind of protestant work ethic, a hang-over of the Victorian era that is still the dominating factor in our whole white society. Its false credo is that to work is an end in itself.

If community development should mean that Indians must assimilate with our ideas, then I say that is wrong. If it means that Indians should integrate with the white society on Indian terms, then I am prepared to accept this type of integration to a limited extent, but it would have to be very carefully carried out. I believe it would be highly desirable to attack the so-called Indian problem on this or a closely similar basis.

Those Indians who wish to adapt to us and who want to integrate fully should be given every possible assistance to do so. Those Indians who prefer to live on their own,

who want to fish and hunt and trap animals, should be allowed to do so with financial assistance by the government. But I am not thinking of degrading welfare payments. I am thinking of guaranteed incomes that would keep them independent of any necessity to rent out their bodies and minds to employers.

Can we afford to do that, financially and morally? Will that not set a bad precedent? I am thinking of enough guaranteed income so that Indians can hunt and fish and trap the year round. The same principle holds for those Indians who would want to engage in full-time production of handicrafts.

Indians who would want to establish a co-operative should be given grants to do so. They should be given the education or vocational training they require. The co-operative union of Canada has worked out a suitable system for Indian co-operatives. And I need not go into details here, for I am sure it is within the knowledge of many hon. members; they are well aware of it.

Indians who wish to come to the cities in Ontario should be given advice on the pros and cons. And this is something I am afraid has never been done in the past. Their chosen road to integration, in other words, should not necessarily be paved, but it should at least be graded so they can pave it themselves.

This government must learn how to develop compassion and must forget the dollar symbols as a cure-all. This government must act on humanitarian faith rather than on the principles of the capitalistic manifesto. This government must substitute fraternalism for paternalism.

I challenge the government to issue a statement of intent about the Indians of Ontario—a statement of intent that can serve as a blueprint for the next ten years. The government should study our proposals, compare them with the ideas set forth by many other bodies, for example, the Indian-Eskimo association, and come out with a truly meaningful document. And I believe firmly that this can be done. The government must live, not just preach, the Ontario human rights code. It must declare to the people of Ontario that the Indian is indeed our brother and that every one of us is his brother's keeper.

If the government, and the people who elected it, did not believe in this premise we would not have medical insurance—of a sort as it is—hospital insurance, welfare payments, and the many other transfer payments that make life bearable for millions of Canadians.

But unfortunately we keep hearing, from the government, grandiloquent monologues written in 19th-century English; we hear bombastic generalizations; we see our sacred cows grazing in the middle of Bay street. The result is a gelatinous attitude toward Indians, and the Indian has been a perennial victim of such government sterility. But only the government, Mr. Speaker, has the power and the money and the means to help the Indian. The job, hon. members of this House, is ours.

Mr. G. H. Peck (Scarborough Centre): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne with three subjects uppermost in my mind. In order to give some idea as to the scope of my remarks, I will first make some reference to the topics I intend to discuss. I do not intend to dwell on them at great length but I feel they will be of great interest to hon. members of this House and to the government.

The first topic is the Royal commission on Metropolitan Toronto, a subject of much interest to that most important area of Ontario in terms of population and wealth. The second topic is the important part that education must play in the war on poverty; and I hope to touch on the question of car insurance.

I have spoken at length in previous debates on the necessity of an equitable reorganization of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, in such a way that it would eliminate the glaring inequities that exist in the corporation without at the same time eliminating those things that have made it strong. I might say that in my opinion the Metro concept has been a very good one. At the time the Ontario government implemented the recommendations of the Cumming report it created a viable system of local government, in a large growing metropolitan area, that laid the groundwork for the growth and the prosperity we have enjoyed in this area. However, the report and the ensuing legislation failed to provide for the population explosion that occurred in the areas suburban to the city of Toronto.

As a result, those who lived in the so-called bedroom suburbs were providing the labour force that made possible the high industrial assessments of those municipalities which enjoyed a comparatively low tax rate in an overall area that is basically one economic unit. The population explosion of these suburbs has created another inequity. The concept of representation by population, a

keystone in our hereditary British democracy, is sadly lacking when a municipality like North York with 300,000 people and Scarborough with 250,000 people, should have the same voice on Metro council as Swansea or Weston with under 10,000 population.

Arising out of this point, and the fact that the suburban areas in total now have a larger population than the city of Toronto, has been the continuous friction that has resulted between the city and the suburban representatives, both on Metro council and Metro board of education. While the representatives of the city on the whole have been very understanding of the problems of the metropolitan area, there have been times when, to say the least, they have been very parochial. This has happened in the past, and we have no assurance that under the present organization it will not happen again.

The third and perhaps most important flaw is the lack of equality of educational opportunities in Metropolitan Toronto. This is a point which has been accepted in most quarters and I do not intend to pursue it at great length. It should be sufficient to say that Scarborough, with a per capita assessment base of \$1,969 in 1964, cannot compete in education services with Leaside which has a per capita assessment base of \$4,178 in the same year. Or, to put it on an elementary per pupil basis, Scarborough had \$9,700 assessment per elementary pupil in 1964 compared to Leaside with \$45,700—four-and-a-half times as much assessment basis—to pay for educational facilities and opportunities. Yet Leaside's high industrial assessment would not be possible without the large pool of labour, much of which comes from Scarborough, and the large market for the goods which are produced.

So we find that, basically, we have only three changes necessary to make Metro a strong system of local government: One, the need for equal educational opportunities; two, representation by population; and three, the elimination of the friction between the core city of Toronto and the surrounding suburbs. The third I consider of least importance as we can live with that quite easily if the other two are corrected.

There has been much comment in the press in recent months that the government Metro members were widely divided on these three questions. This was not the impression I had from the meetings which we held. I feel that we were agreed on the basic changes and the only difference of opinion was how this could be best translated into legislation.

I would like to go on record as agreeing completely with the government's intentions as to the new Metro. The hon. Prime Minister's (Mr. Roberts') report in my opinion has opened up new horizons for this most important region and will lead to local government which will be the envy of the whole world, as indeed our Metro organization has always been.

There has been criticism that the white paper is a compromise. But what political decision is not a compromise? If it does the greatest good for the greatest number of people then our democracy is well served. I intend to support the bill wholeheartedly. I feel that it will adequately correct the three failings that I have mentioned in the present Metro organization and still give the core city of Toronto the authority that it should have by giving it half the seats on the executive while the council membership itself is based on the population of the city and the boroughs.

It is the right answer. Perhaps minor amendments will be necessary but it is basically the answer to the problems of creating a very strong system of local two-level government for this area.

Mr. Speaker, one of the concerns of our modern society, an expression we hear frequently, is the war on poverty. President Johnson of the United States has made it a major concern of his. The federal government in Canada has put itself on record as being concerned, with promises of legislation to erase some of the poverty that exists in our affluent society in Canada. And the Speech from the Throne in Ontario which we are presently debating has made many provisions which when enacted into legislation will have a major effect on the pockets of poverty which, while we may decry them, are still with us even in this most prosperous province of Ontario. It behooves us to go to great lengths to eradicate this cancer in our society.

There are many things which can be done, Mr. Speaker, to wage the war on poverty but more welfare handouts are not the main answer. While it may alleviate things in the short term these handouts in effect only perpetuate the problem and could be carried on from generation to generation and never really come to grips with the problem.

With older people, the sick and the infirm, this may be the only thing possible, but with the middle-aged and the great mass of our young people, the real answer to the war on poverty lies in education and retraining.

In an age of automation and cybernetics

this is a necessity, for most people must make a decision in favour of life-long education. First, because the contents of jobs keep changing under the present pressure of technological change, there must be a constant updating. Second, there is considerable evidence that adults can learn as well as the young.

Thus it must be a never-ending process to train our young in those skills which give promise of the greatest longevity.

An example of this in its simplest form is that there is every reason to learn and memorize the multiplication table because it is reasonable to believe that the decimal system will survive. On the other hand, there is less incentive to memorize such facts as 16 ounces to the pound and 5,280 feet to the mile, as non-decimal pounds and miles may all very well be abolished in the foreseeable future.

In vocational training we often tend to devote too much time to particular methods, procedures and specific models, rather than arriving at a general understanding of underlying principles. The sign of a good basic education is not the mere acquisition of facts but the ability to proceed independently to investigate problems. There is a marked shift away from what we know as the blue collar jobs to the white collar variety. There are fewer jobs requiring manipulation and there are more jobs requiring records, thought and data. This means that we must increase our teaching of abstract things and decrease our emphasis on material things.

Many people talk of the age of automation as one in which there are fewer jobs constantly being competed for by one or more job applicants. But this is not really the case and I take issue with the so-called experts in this field, as it is becoming more and more obvious that on the contrary job opportunities are increasing, but only for those who prepare themselves for them. Any war on poverty must be concerned primarily with providing the means, and if possible the motivation, so that all can obtain the necessary education in the case of the young and retraining facilities in the case of the middle-aged to fit them for the opportunities that do exist.

In this country there has come an understanding that the cause of poverty which still remains is not the mal-distribution of wealth but a shortage of education.

The province of Ontario has made great strides in a few short years in providing our children and our adults with the education they so badly need. The more we study and ponder the nature and changes of poverty in

our society, the more we have to face the fact that with some exceptions our system of education, public, parochial and private is starved. We must educate and convince the voters that a second-rate system of education is just not acceptable, and in our war on poverty is indeed a poor investment.

The children of the poor are often hard to educate, often because their homes are so cramped and meagre and they have to go to schools that have fewer skilled teachers than the schools attended by the children of the more fortunate families. If this nation and this province is to succeed and flourish as it ought to do and it well can do, we must be willing to tax ourselves to provide the very best education facilities and opportunities that it is possible to provide. We must convince our citizens to dread ignorance more than they dread taxation.

I feel the time is here when our federal government must make a positive move into education, not to take away the cherished provincial rights in this field but to set up a department here to assist the provinces, to percolate down to the local school boards and to give an overall sense of purpose of the educational system across our nation.

The knowledge explosion has put an end to the mythology of the self-made, self-educated man, as well as the self-sufficient local school or school board. With the rapid moving of our families and our nation, the interlocking economy—and in spite of many of our differences, the growing sense of a national economy—it is archaic to think that education is not a federal responsibility. The homeowner should have some relief from education taxes and local authorities are often loath to tax real estate for educational purposes for fear of driving away industry.

Federal aid should be equal for public and parochial schools and combine local autonomy with a great deal of federal initiative, and leave latitude for the play of creative ideals.

I firmly believe in local control of education but with some reservations, for local control also means that a community can allow its education system to be as poor as it wants to be, and we cannot afford that any longer.

Mr. Speaker, before finishing my brief remarks I would like to say a few words about automobile insurance. In March, 1963 the select committee on automobile insurance tabled its final report in this Legislature. With all due respect to the chairman and members of this committee I feel that they

did not make an attempt to solve the real problems of automobile insurance—the availability and the reasonable cost to all citizens of our province. Perhaps because it was not spelled out as such in the terms of reference. During recent years it has become apparent that many insurance companies that write automobile insurance have found it to be a very unprofitable business owing to the high cost of automobiles and automobile repairs and some of the judgments that have been handed down by the courts.

In order to compensate for this they have arbitrarily cancelled the insurance policy of any person or persons whom they suspect might be in the least accident-prone.

I have in my files, Mr. Speaker, letters from many people who have had their insurance either cancelled or the premiums doubled and even tripled because of some slight infraction or minor accident. Indeed I know of one case where a person was informed on a Saturday afternoon that he would not be insured as of Monday morning.

I am sure you will agree this is hardly sufficient time to arrange a new insurance policy, and indeed once having had car insurance cancelled, the rates greatly increase and it becomes virtually impossible to obtain insurance from any other company. The applicant comes up against a stone wall. In most cases they cannot even find out why they have lost their insurance.

In one case, after having written to the president of an insurance company, I was able to find out that a constituent of mine had lost his car insurance because he was a little late in paying his premium the previous year and so he incurred a record of having had his insurance cancelled and it made it extremely difficult to obtain insurance elsewhere.

What of the problems of the young people? A young man under 25 or a family with a young driver finds the premiums soaring to astronomical heights. It is claimed that males under 25 have a proportionately higher accident rate than any other group. But there are many fine young people who are careful, competent, conscientious drivers who are forced to suffer because of the few who are careless. It may be, as some authorities suggest, that driving a car on our highways is not a right but a privilege; but I submit that driving a car to many, if not to most, of the people of our province is almost a way of life. To many it is certainly a means of earning a living, or of getting to or from a place of employment not readily accessible by public

transportation. And to incur an accident while not covered by insurance is often a disaster much greater than to have a serious illness while not covered by medical insurance.

The government of Ontario has proposed legislation that guarantees everyone in the province the right to medical insurance at a reasonable cost. I feel it is imperative that automobile insurance also be a basic necessity that should be available to all responsible people; and, if the insurance underwriters are not prepared to offer it, it may be necessary for the government to execute an automobile insurance scheme similar to medical insurance to ensure that it is available for all.

I would insist that I am not by any means suggesting a system of compulsory, government-operated automobile insurance. This has been in effect for nearly 20 years in Saskatchewan, and I feel it significant that while literally dozens of other jurisdictions have investigated this system, none have seen fit to follow Saskatchewan into the extensive bureaucracy and endless juggling of figures which are necessary to give this plan an appearance of success. I do not pretend to know the answers to this problem, but to many of our people it is a real problem, and one that affects many people.

I would like to urge that the government appoint a select committee on automobile insurance to begin where the last committee left off, to study this matter and bring in recommendations that will cure a problem that is growing more serious every year for a great many of our citizens.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, as other hon. members have done, I would like to congratulate you on the fair impartial manner in which you conduct the affairs of this House. I would also like to congratulate the two new hon. members of the House who gained their seats in the by-elections last fall. They replace two very fine members who have passed on. Mr. Leo Troy was a man very highly regarded throughout Ontario. I was very much privileged to have served on the select committee on youth with Mr. Troy; he made a very great contribution to the committee and, as we all know, to this House.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I would like to repeat some of my previous remarks about your great fairness in presiding over the debates of this Legislature. I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) for his election as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the committee of the House.

This Legislature was fortunate in having two new hon. members elected last September. I would like to congratulate them for their success at the polls, particularly in view of the tremendous campaign by Conservative candidates who had the full force of the Cabinet behind them in the election. Both of the new hon. members have already made their presence felt in this House. I am quite happy to have been closely associated with the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith) during his campaign.

In speaking in this Throne debate, I would ask the indulgence of the hon. members if I make my introductory remarks in my mother tongue.

May I at the outset, sir, express the wish that I do not have to read in tomorrow's papers that I was allowed to speak French through the courtesy of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts). I believe it to be the right of every individual to do so in this country, and more particularly so in this province.

Mr. Speaker, before starting my remarks in French, could I ask a special privilege? I have translated the few remarks, that I am to make in French, into the Shakespearean language. Could I have permission to have the page boys distribute the English copy before I start my remarks?

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that people will not understand my remarks in French. I think the majority of hon. members in this House could follow my remarks in my language but I thought, just to make matters a little easier for everybody, I might have this part translated.

Mr. Speaker, since the last session of this Legislature, many things have happened in our country and in our province. I would like to make some observations on two speeches delivered last fall in Montreal by the hon. Prime Minister of this province on the rights of French-Canadians in this province and on the problems of Confederation.

As reported in *Le Droit* on November 15 last, in an editorial signed by Marcel Gingras, entitled "French in Ontario," I quote:

Once again, the Prime Minister of Ontario has asked the rights of "Franco-Ontarians" to a "certain equality" with their English-speaking compatriots. We have read "a certain equality."

The expression is in quotes, not because it was made by Mr. Roberts but because we must thus interpret the recent speech to the members of the council of Christians and Jews.

According to the Canadian Press, Mr. Robarts is reported to have said:

It seems to me that the equality of opportunity between Canadians of French descent and Canadians of English descent as regards education in Ontario must, to be really significant, consider the needs and the desires of Ontario residents who speak French and who reside in localities which are predominantly French.

The hon. Prime Minister of Ontario believes he is showing a lot of honesty and justice and we have seen a sign of satisfaction on the part of his counterpart in Quebec, the Hon. Jean Lesage, but the truth of the matter is that his justice is restrictive, even though he later talked of a "realistic and intensive" programme to give justice to the French-Canadian:

We will not doubt his sincerity, but it is evident that his programme will not give total satisfaction to those he promises to serve. Luckily, he intends to consult them [still quoting the Canadian Press]. He is reported to have said that measures to be taken must be determined by the real needs of the French-speaking population itself. In this sentence can be seen a hope for justice because one cannot be satisfied by his first statement.

The editorial mentions the fact that, with a population of more than 50,000 French-Canadians residing in Toronto, only two French schools were available; and I quote another paragraph of the same editorial:

Mr. Robarts should try to serve the total French population of the province. One cannot demand the teaching of French to three or four families totally lost in a sea of Anglo-Saxons. But, when their number justifies it, French Canadians in Ontario should have the right to French instruction, even if they are in a minority.

Mr. Claude Ryan, editor of *Le Devoir*, comments on a speech by hon. Mr. Robarts at the Montreal Canadian club, in which he gave his views on Canadian federalism. Time will not permit me to read Mr. Ryan's editorial entitled: "Mr. Robarts' position in the Canadian dialogue." I will simply quote some paragraphs which I believe will make you understand his thoughts:

Let us note that Mr. Robarts did not try to define his complete philosophy on federalism. A man of measure, the visitor from Toronto limited himself to the examination of certain economic problems related to the functions of our federalism. It would be

unjust to judge him by using arguments which were not part of his subject.

Mr. Ryan would have liked Mr. Robarts to say in a more precise way what he thinks of the complex problem of co-ordination between the federal government and the provinces. This problem is the one in which Quebec affirms itself as a distinct unit in Canada.

I will quote in full the last paragraph of Mr. Ryan's editorial:

Mr. Robarts, in his brief speech to the Canadian Club, appeared to be a realistic man with an open mind. His speech, however, was too general and too compact to understand the profound articulations of the political thoughts of the speaker. It was a sort of a methodical speech for sincere Canadian politicians. It was not the political exposé one would have the right to expect from Mr. Robarts if he wanted to exercise his action on a larger scene.

I have quoted these two editorials in order to tell the hon. Prime Minister that the French and the Catholic population of Ontario would now like to see him do some of the things he has been preaching. The French population of this province has the right to expect instruction in its own language and the province itself would benefit considerably if this were done.

It seems to me that the economic council has said in the past year that the progress of this province would slow down because there was a shortage of skilled workers; not enough technicians to fill the openings in industry. And yet there are many areas in this province, particularly in the eastern and northern areas—where one can find a large proportion of French-speaking persons—where we find a larger number of unemployed than anywhere else, and also a large number of low-income persons. One has to consult the report on poverty in Ontario to learn these facts.

In a speech in the last session of this Legislature last year, I mentioned the fact that if the government of this province did not give to the minority the facilities for education to which it is entitled, it should demand that the federal government do so.

My idea has just been supported in a speech by Mr. Jean-Eudes Dubé, member for Restigouche-Madawaska in the House of Commons, in which he suggests a federal department of education and culture. This federal department would have a double function: 1. To protect the rights of minorities in Canada; 2. To co-ordinate the complex ramifications of federal initiatives in several

departments which have to do, directly and indirectly, with culture and education.

In his address Mr. Dubé mentioned that it is the responsibility of the federal government to "protect the constitutional rights of the minority" even though, according to Section 93 of the BNA Act, each province may pass laws regarding education.

He speaks about the inglorious history of provincial legislatures regarding the rights of minorities. He mentions two exceptions: Quebec and New Brunswick. Commenting on this speech Mr. Marcel Gingras, in *Le Droit* of January 28, 1966, says:

The situation, fortunately, is improving but there is much to be done. If New Brunswick and Ontario, for example, are waking up to do justice to their people of French descent, conditions are quite different elsewhere. Furthermore, even in the two provinces mentioned, especially in Ontario, equality of education does not exist at the secondary school level.

And I could add that, even with the tremendous progress in the past few years, much remains to be done to bring our separate schools to the levels of other schools.

In closing my remarks in the French language, may I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to repeat remarks I previously made: that, in the not-too-distant future, the debates in this House be permitted in the two official languages of this country?

END OF TRANSLATION

Mr. F. Guindon (Stormont): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the hon. member?

I just wanted to tell the hon. member that two or three years ago his own party voted against French in the high schools, in this very House. Is he aware of this?

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer my hon. friend from Stormont, but the opinions that I have expressed here are my own and I have not cleared them with the caucus, but I am sure that if I did I would have the assent of the caucus.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I hesitate to interrupt my colleague, but could the hon. member give us any citations as to where we voted against the teaching of French in high schools?

Mr. Guindon: I am speaking from memory but I will give the hon. member the citations tomorrow.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to make a few comments on the report of the Ontario economic council, regarding human resource development in the province of Ontario.

First, let me quote one of the two paragraphs of the summary of this report:

The Ontario economy is experiencing a major expansion and a need for professional and technical skills is evident in many areas.

In another paragraph we read:

This survey clearly shows that there are skilled-labour shortages in all areas of the province, and in almost every occupational category. There were indications from some employers that the uncertainty of obtaining trained workers was causing them to hesitate about expanding.

On pages 4 and 5 of the report, mention is made of the profound effect on the growth of the country by a large number of immigrants who came to this country, particularly between 1896 and 1913. I think I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker, that those were good Liberal years. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was elected in 1896 and was Prime Minister of this country until 1911.

This was a period during which there was a lot of immigration that came to this country to settle in the Canadian west. It was relatively easy for an immigrant to adapt to the predominantly agricultural Canadian economy. A lack of skill, education or language training was not a serious obstacle in establishing a farming operation in the prairies, Mr. Speaker, or supplying physical strength in factories, mines, forests and construction work.

Then, and now, immigrants with a high degree of personal motivation have made, and are making significant contributions to this country's economic and cultural development.

However, conditions in the latter half of the 1960's are likely to be different. The rapidly changing state of technological development is progressively making employment prospects less promising for those who have little academic or skill training. An unskilled immigrant without a working knowledge of the languages of the community, English or French, has less geographic and occupational mobility and therefore less favourable prospects of obtaining long-term employment.

Further in the report there are several paragraphs dealing with language require-

ments. In order to make my point, may I be permitted to read some parts:

It is stressed that the learning of the language of the community, English or French, is an essential part of an immigrant's preparation for successful competition in the labour market and full participation in community life. Without knowing the language of the community, his employment opportunities are more limited and his skills may be only partially utilized.

I will quote another sentence:

It is recommended that instruction in English or French, whichever is relevant, be given to certain immigrants where possible prior to their departure to Canada, because at that time they are highly motivated.

And a final quotation from the same report:

It is also recommended that skill training courses be conducted so far as possible in the language of the community, English or French. For those people now in Canada whose command of the language of the community, English or French, is limited, some bilingual instructors in the skill training courses might be advisable. The programme should, however, have as its basic objective, the training of workers with a basic fluency in English or French and enough power of adaptability to ensure not only their own safety, but that of their fellow workers.

Some hon. members might ask why I should be quoting this report dealing with immigrants coming to this country. My answer is that the same problem exists in areas I mentioned previously where a large part of the population have French as their mother tongue.

Let me mention some of the facts I am aware of in Ottawa and eastern Ontario. For instance, according to very reliable information, a much larger proportion of French-speaking students fail in their examinations in the trade schools sponsored by The Department of Labour than their counterparts speaking English.

I do not believe this situation exists because of a poor IQ on the part of these students. I honestly believe that it is due solely to the lack of qualified French-speaking instructors in these schools who could give their courses in their own language to these students.

I am sure that the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) understands this situation and

will try to remedy it as soon as possible. At the beginning there might be an increase in costs which would be more than offset by a very substantial reduction in the cost of welfare and other services provided to the unemployed and the partially employed people in the areas mentioned, and a substantial increase in skilled labour in eastern Ontario might also draw there a number of industries.

Later in the session—possibly during the estimates of The Department of Education—I intend to bring to the attention of this House, the very great problem of secondary education for the French and Catholic students in this province. This is an area that weakens our entire educational system. It is not only an injustice to a large part of the population of this province, but deprives our own economic resources of many thousands of trained people so badly needed.

The hon. Minister of Education is aware of this problem and I am sure that he is trying hard to find a solution which, I hope, will be included in his estimates later this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to refer to the very fine debate which took place a few days ago on the resolutions introduced by the hon. members for Forest Hill (Mr. Dunlop) and Downsview, respectively. However, the very high plane on which this debate had been kept was somewhat lowered by the remarks of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence), particularly by his unwarranted attack on the hon. Minister of Welfare of Quebec. I hold no brief for the Minister, who is quite able to defend himself. I would also like to say that quite often I disagree with some of his declarations—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Which declarations?

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I might at some time during another debate mention some of the things I disagree with.

What I would like to say, however, is that had minorities been treated as well in other parts of Canada as they have been treated in Quebec, many of our present problems would not exist. Those remarks from the hon. member for Russell were doing exactly what these resolutions wanted to eliminate.

I would like to draw to the attention of this Legislature, and more particularly to the hon. members sitting on the government benches, that in my view one of the worst offenders in the dissemination of hate literature in this country is none other than their

own national leader, the leader of the Opposition in the federal House.

This man, for whom nearly all Tories in this Legislature worked so relentlessly and with so little success in the November 8 election, has the habit of attacking one special group of people in this country, the French-speaking members of the federal Cabinet, notwithstanding the oft-repeated remark that he was a firm believer in national unity.

He has done more to destroy understanding between the various groups that form this country than any individual since Confederation. And I would particularly ask the hon. members of this House—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: What about the ones Pearson fired?

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): Yes, what about Favreau and some of those other mobsters?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): That is a good comment from a fellow Canadian.

Mr. Letherby: Well, I cannot help it, he had it coming to him.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to end this paragraph here by asking the hon. members—and this I use as a proof of what I have said—just to read last year's flag debates and they will see that what I am saying is the truth.

My final remarks, Mr. Speaker, will be on the Jones report for Metropolitan Ottawa. The headline in an article by Peter Jackman of the *Ottawa Journal* a few days ago reads as follows: "Jones' Plan Is Dead."

Mr. Jackman says that this is the all but formal verdict of the provincial officials in the face of the almost unanimous opposition to the proposals.

It seems to me [he goes on] that the Minister is far too busy to make a recommendation to the Legislature. In the meantime there is plenty of argument going on in the entire Ottawa area, many suggestions being made but no action is being taken by the government. Why? Because the government does not want to lose votes in the Ottawa area. It appears to me that too many decisions taken by Ministers or by the Cabinet itself are taken in view of the next election and not with a view of doing something that will benefit the majority of the people.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is a complete waste of the people's money not to implement a report of that kind as soon as

possible after its presentation. The lack of decision on the part of the government is causing a lot of unrest in the entire area. Furthermore, it prevents the municipalities from doing some of the pressing things the public is waiting for.

Because of almost instant protest from councillors and communities involved, the report was immediately shelved at Toronto.

Mr. Jackman continues.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): May I ask the hon. member a question? Is that his own statement or is he still quoting that newspaper man?

Mr. Racine: I am quoting Mr. Jackman.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, yes.

Mr. Singer: Is he right?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: He is not a member of the Legislature.

Mr. Singer: But is he right?

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Oh, he is not right at all, I will answer this in due course of time.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: May I ask the opinion of the hon. member himself? That is what concerns us very directly. Is he of the opinion that the Ontario government should adopt the Jones report forthwith?

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Let him continue his speech.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: It is a simple question, Mr. Speaker, and it requires a "yes" or "no" answer.

Mr. Thompson: Listen to his speech and he will develop it.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I do believe that I have an answer for the hon. member for Russell but I may have some comments later on in my speech.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Racine: Now, just for the hon. Minister, I was just getting to the stage where I am reading the last of that paragraph:

Because of almost instant protest from councillors and communities involved, the report was almost immediately shelved at Toronto.

Mr. Jackman continues. He then quotes one provincial Minister as saying:

You can't say it has been a complete waste of time, it has stirred up a lot of

interest and discussion in the Ottawa area and this could lead to an acceptable solution. However—

and I still continue the the quotation:

—everyone, Ministers, members and civil servants familiar with the Ottawa situation say privately that the Jones plan hasn't a hope of approval. So why not say so officially?

Last August when the hon. Minister invited all the interested parties to attend a meeting at which the Jones report was presented, he brought upon himself, I believe, some of his present difficulties by asking all those present to offer their criticisms to the report.

Who should take the decision in matters such as these? The local municipalities or the government? The Jones commission had received briefs from all interested parties during its sittings. It might also be said that comments from municipalities about the recommendations should have been encouraged.

But the recommendations in the report have now been completely torn apart and now the implementation of that report has been rendered almost impossible by the lack of decision on the part of the government. One of the main reasons for the present situation is the lack of sufficient guidelines given to the commission. For instance, nothing was said about bilingualism in the Ottawa area. I believe many of the objections stem from the fact that Murray Jones did not make any recommendations along those lines and, because of that, antagonized some 30 per cent of the population of the area.

I also believe that in view of the fact that the city of Hull and the surrounding district in the province of Quebec are so closely associated with Ottawa any decision by the Ontario government would considerably affect the Quebec municipalities on the other side of the Ottawa River.

I realize that it was beyond the jurisdiction of the government to conduct a study of the Hull area. It seems to me, however, that our hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs should have communicated with the Quebec counterpart and told him about the study. This would have prevented a lot of difficulties that will be encountered whenever, if at all, the Ontario government takes a decision in the matter.

Perhaps this state of affairs will bring to a head the matter of a federal district for Ottawa. According to a usually well-informed

person, it would seem that the federal government on recommendation of Mr. Greber, will organize a federal district, possibly within the next 25 years. If so, why not now?

My own suggestion would be—and there are a number of persons who think likewise—to form an eleventh province extending on both sides of the Ottawa river with a possible population of some half-million people. This new province would be a really bilingual one, being divided almost equally between English- and French-speaking people. It would have its own premier, it would have representatives from various areas, it would have the power to tax federal buildings in order to be able to give the necessary services to the area. Two excellent universities, Ottawa University and Carleton, would become institutions with a special status. The new federal district would really become the cultural centre of Canada.

Other schools would be on an equal basis and consequently the numerous problems now facing the separate schools and other schools in that area, would automatically be solved.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt again? Is the hon. member still quoting that newspaper man?

Mr. Racine: No.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: When did the hon. member cease?

Mr. Racine: I told the hon. Minister at the time. I am quoting my own thoughts, Mr. Speaker.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: When did the hon. member stop quoting the newspaper then, would he mind repeating that? What was the last sentence of the newspaper man's quotation?

Mr. Singer: Read it in *Hansard*.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, I will not read it in *Hansard*. I want to know it now. Read it, please.

Mr. Racine: The last sentence of this newspaper article is: "so why not say so officially?" This is the last sentence which I read—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: And hon. members will remember, Mr. Speaker, that I made a statement in this connection before.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, if, as I have said earlier, the federal district is inevitable, why not do it now? It would help the present local government and possibly the present administration out of its present impasse and undoubtedly the residents of Ottawa-Hull and area, would have a government which could serve as a model to the rest of the country.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member a question: That is, whether or not his last utterance in favour of an eleventh province is the policy of the Ontario Liberal Party or not?

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that in a Throne speech you can give the policy of your own caucus, but I am sure—

Mr. Thompson: He is bringing forth some bright ideas.

Mr. MacDonald: Everybody speaks for himself in the Liberal Party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, the ideas I have expressed here are my own ideas, but I am sure I can sell them to my party in due course. Thank you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! The debate is getting somewhat out of order.

Mr. N. L. Olde (Middlesex South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I would first like to congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) on his selection as Deputy Speaker. We all know that the hon. member is well qualified for this position of utmost importance, and he will carry out his duties fairly and in accordance with the practices of this Legislature.

I would also like to join the other hon. members in congratulating the Speaker of the Legislature who, since the very beginning of his term in the Speaker's chair, has reigned over this House in a dignified and capable manner.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of the House that, in the last session of the Legislature, during the debate on the Speech from the Throne, I mentioned a noxious weed menace on dis-banded railroads in southwestern Ontario. Hon. members will recall this problem, or

more precisely this nuisance, came about mostly because of the discontinuance of the operations of a branch of the New York Central railroad. At the time I raised the issue, it was very much a troublesome one in regard to farmers who had land adjoining the old abandoned railway. Today, I am happy to report action has been now taken in the area which I represent.

The weeds were sprayed last year and I am sure this weed menace has now been well taken care of. This, of course, reflects very substantially on the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), whose interest brought about this quick action. It also reflects great credit on this government, inasmuch as it shows again that no problem is too small or too large for it to move rapidly in solving a private member's concern for the wellbeing of his constituents.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn to an area of great importance to me. This is a problem which concerns all of us, for those who have regard for the first citizens of Canada, the Canadian Indians. I noted with interest the remarks of the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman) on this important subject.

Probably the most significant step in the history of Indian affairs was the agreement signed last month by the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile). This committed Ontario to a joint programme, with the federal government, of developments which will lead to the provision of equal opportunity for Indians and the extension of a full provincial service to their communities.

You must know, sir, that in my riding there are three Indians bands. The constituent population of these bands now exceeds 2,500 persons. The signing of this agreement is a further move on the part of this government in relieving the poverty and squalor that is far too widespread among the Indian citizens of this province, and is welcome news to me. I would hope these Indian leaders, who are more vocal than others, quickly discover this agreement contains within it a realistic hope for the future of their people.

The usual conjectures as to the aims and purposes of this new undertaking could be detrimental to the programme. One such surmise would warrant stressing; this is that Ontario has no desire to abolish—reserves. Furthermore there is no design on the part of the province, even though this was possible, to cancel ancient commitments and treaties which were made with the Indians, some of which go back long before Confederation. These must be honoured by the federal gov-

ernment, in respect of any desire by the province to develop the social and economical potential of Indian people.

The agreement imposes acceptance of the reserves as Indian communities. Its aim is to bring them to approximate social and economic parity with non-Indian communities and eliminate segregation. It is my understanding that this agreement does no more than set out the broadest possible outline of the programme that is ultimately to emerge from it. In my opinion, it is exactly this kind of flexibility that holds out most of the promise. The joint features of the agreement mean that the financing arrangements will provide for generous federal help.

Another important aspect is the premise that all Ontario Indians, whether on or off the reserve, will be eligible to participate in this programme. There are many Indians, particularly in the younger age groups, who want to accommodate in outside communities and are unable to do so owing to insufficient means and training.

What can this agreement accomplish that was not possible under former programmes? The answer is in fact that almost all the problems of Indians are susceptible to treatment under legislation common to this province as a whole. Furthermore, the plans and programmes tentatively proposed are both intelligent and practical. They appear to be aimed at the root of many Indian problems. Some of these, such as the establishment of nurseries and day-care centres, will teach Indian children English and the capability of self-care. Homemakers' training to help Indian women, and treatment centres for excessive drinkers, should produce results. Other plans include adult education, job training, provision of near-home sources of employment, and large-scale relocation of Indians through areas with opportunities for employment, will contribute towards closing the gap that now exists between Indians and non-Indian cultures.

One important feature in the agreement is that plans will be developed in consultation with the Indians, and these will proceed at the pace dictated by their own awakening and interest. This will not be easy; the skepticism of the Indian will have to be overcome. Their mistrust of non-Indians, our way of living and doing things, is deep-rooted. However, I am sure this agreement will work out once the people on reserves are made to feel this plan belongs to them and they are in command of it.

During the past ten years the province has progressively advanced a wide range of spe-

cial benefits and welfare services to Indians. Old age assistance, mothers' allowances, child welfare services, rehabilitation services, disabled pensions, disabled persons' allowances, are available to them in an identical manner as to other citizens of the province.

As one measure of assistance to band councils, the province has recognized 38 bands as municipalities and reimburses them directly for 80 per cent of their expenditures under The General Welfare Assistance Act. The councils of these bands now direct and control their welfare programmes. These activities indicate The Department of Public Welfare has acquired experience and understanding in dealing with Indians and their problems. This knowledge, combined with social development, education, housing and employment should provide them with new opportunities, sir, to advance their living standards.

Turning to another subject of importance to my constituency, I would like to mention the United States-Canadian automobile pact. Much has already been written and spoken on this agreement and I do not intend to go into it in any detail. My purpose in mentioning it at all is simply to express the general approval of the residents of Middlesex South in their support for this plan.

While the new \$75 to \$100 million Ford assembly plant is being constructed in Talbotville, outside my riding, its effects on the purchasing power for the whole area, including Middlesex South, will be enormous. On the whole, the only unfortunate aspect of that agreement as it affects Canada was the lack of consultation by the federal government with the provinces.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention ambulance services. As you know, the hon. Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart's) report on ambulance services was released on February 23, 1965. Just how far the hon. Attorney General has progressed with this report I do not know. After reading the report myself it became very apparent that this is indeed an extremely complex subject.

Be that as it may, ambulance services are a very important necessity, particularly in rural and semi-rural areas. In the past, these services were managed mostly by funeral homes. However, since the hon. Attorney General's report was made public, many funeral directors have decided to discontinue services in this field. The reason for this is the possibility of general regulations upgrading before the service is reformed and the new equipment that will be required.

This, of course, places an even more immediate problem on the shoulders of both the province and the municipal governments. It has been suggested that the provincial police or The Department of Highways take over the responsibility for ambulance services. However, these suggestions have not met with any widespread approval for obvious reasons.

At the same time, few municipalities provide ambulance service. One major reason is the cost of these services. It should be noted that the hon. Attorney General's report points out that only 81 out of 181 operators had more than 100 calls per year. Sixty-one had less than 50 calls. Then again out of the 50,000 calls made by ambulance operators in 1963, only about 7,800 were related to traffic accident calls. Obviously ambulance services are presently operated on a part-time basis. And from the figures I have just quoted, there is good reason for this.

Mr. Speaker, while I realize the complexity of this problem, I would suggest that maybe the provincial government should study or even draft legislation, firstly implementing the minimum standards for equipment as recommended by the report of the hon. Attorney General so that this province can be assured of proper ambulance facilities, and secondly, that the province should provide 60 per cent of the cost of operating ambulance services within a municipality, leaving to the municipality 40 per cent, along with the responsibility of the municipality for the cost of the ambulance and its equipment and the training of qualified staff.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate, I, like many who have gone before me, wish to congratulate you on the way in which you conduct the proceedings of this House.

You may remember that two years ago I compared your position with that of a hockey referee, indicating at that time that you had to know the rules, you had to be impartial and you had to have the respect of all the members of the Legislature.

I would like to tell you now that I am still of that opinion and I think that you are doing the job excellently and that you have a much tougher job than that of a hockey referee.

Hockey players usually know the rules pretty well and in observing the conduct of the Legislature over the last six weeks it appears to me that many of us need to know the rules and procedures of this House much better than we do. And I might respectfully suggest that perhaps among your many

duties you might have time to hold a few classes for us to explain the rules and procedures of this House so that the business may be conducted much more quickly and easily. I know we would all appreciate the opportunity of hearing from you the many rules and procedures which I am sure many of us do not really understand.

I would also like to congratulate the new members of the Legislature, the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith). At this time I would also like to pay my respects to the late member for Nipissing, Mr. Leo Troy.

Mr. Troy served on the select committee on youth and I would like to pay a tribute to him tonight in saying that he made an outstanding contribution to this committee. His wealth of knowledge, his patience and the effort that he put in while helping the committee I think will be long remembered, not only by the members of the committee, but also by the people to whom we hope our recommendations will be of great help. I regret very much his passing and I would like to pay my respects to him at this time.

Now the riding of Kingston and the islands which I have the privilege of representing is made up of the city of Kingston and the three main islands of Howe, Wolfe and Amherst, the largest of which is Wolfe. Lack of adequate transportation between Wolfe Island and Kingston has in the past made life very difficult for these year-round residents who are forced for several weeks during the winter to cross over the ice, which is a rather dangerous procedure at any time. Through the fine co-operation of The Department of Highways, the service so far this year has been excellent. Almost without exception the ferry schedule has been adhered to and, for the first time, the island residents can look forward to fast, comfortable transportation throughout the winter.

I would be derelict in my duty if I did not convey to the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) and to those civil servants who worked so hard to make this possible, my thanks and the thanks of the residents of Wolfe Island, for the fine job the department officials are doing in maintaining this ferry service in such an excellent manner.

The purchase of the second ferry, the "Romeo and Annette," which has now been renamed the "Upper Canada," for use during the spring, summer and fall, will I am sure, help to solve the very overcrowded conditions which have been prevalent during the last few years. I would like to extend to the hon. Minister of Highways a very cordial welcome

to come to Kingston to officially open this two-ferry service when it goes into effect this spring. I can assure him of a very enthusiastic welcome from a group of fine, warm-hearted and appreciative people.

One of the problems facing the people of Amherst Island which I mentioned in a speech to this Legislature last year, was the fact that for approximately six to eight weeks during the winter, the ferry, "Amherst Island," was not able to break its way through the ice from Amherst Island to the mainland.

This, I am told, was due to the underpowered motor recently installed in the ferry. Last fall, this motor was replaced and a more powerful one installed, and I am happy to say that up until a few days ago, when unfortunately it broke down too, it was doing a tremendous job in providing service to the people of Amherst Island.

However, despite this unfortunate mishap, The Department of Highways has given every consideration to the residents of Amherst Island in an effort to provide them with the best possible transportation at a reasonable cost. I am sure I speak for these people of the island, when I express my thanks for the understanding way in which the department has tried to solve their very pressing transportation problems.

I would also like at this time, to make a few comments on the role the Ontario housing corporation is playing as it affects my riding of Kingston and the islands, particularly as it affects the city of Kingston.

Kingston is a combination of the old and the new. Fine new subdivisions are built around the perimeter, with many beautiful old houses in the heart of the city; and it also has its share of old, rundown areas where new housing is urgently needed. At the request of the Kingston city council, a housing survey was made by the Ontario housing corporation; and, once the report was submitted, immediate action was taken. Thirty housing units are now under construction, a contract for 30 more has recently been awarded, and plans are under way for an additional 70 units to be built during the coming year—making a total of 130 units which are planned to be built in a period of approximately one year's time.

This is the kind of direct action, with a minimum of delay and red tape, that is required to overcome the problem of adequate housing and to meet the very pressing needs of many very deserving people in the city of Kingston. As you may know, the province pays the initial ten per cent down payment.

The balance of 90 per cent is financed through an arrangement with the central mortgage and housing corporation. Rents are graduated according to income and full taxes are paid to the city. Any deficit in operation is divided equally between the city and the province.

In Kingston, the availability of this type of housing now is limited only by the ability of the city to designate the land where these housing units will be built. They have very correctly decided that this kind of rental accommodation must not be concentrated in one area, but should be distributed throughout the city; and I am sure they are making every effort to find suitable areas for these badly needed housing units.

In the area of housing for elderly citizens, the Ontario housing corporation has already asked the city for their recommendations for property where 30 units can be built, bearing in mind that the area should be large enough to accommodate additional units that could be constructed in the near future. This also is a very pressing need in our city, and I am confident that a suitable location will be chosen and that this unit will be approved very shortly. May I take this opportunity, on behalf of those citizens in my community who will benefit directly from the building of these housing units, to thank the Ontario housing corporation for its quick response to help us start and solve one of our most pressing problems, that of improving the housing standards in our community.

I am sure that many other areas in Ontario have had a similar experience, and it is gratifying to know that in the Ontario housing corporation we have a department that is doing such a fine job in this field of housing in Ontario. I personally, as far as Kingston is concerned, think the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) should be congratulated for this outstanding contribution that his department is making in helping us solve this most urgent problem.

I know the people of Kingston and surrounding district will also be very pleased to know that the government of Ontario has appointed consulting engineers, De Leuw Cather & Company (Canada) Limited, to do a full-scale feasibility study on the proposed Kingston-Wolfe Island-Cape Vincent bridge, which will mean so much to the economy of this whole section of eastern Ontario.

I have also made available to those interested hon. Cabinet Ministers a copy of a study made by Syracuse University on this

bridge, which I think illustrates the potential that such a structure would have for our whole district. It is a rather sad commentary on our initiative when a foreign study has to point out to us what could be done, if we would just show a little imagination, a little foresight and a little faith in the economic future of eastern Ontario.

I believe there is a gradual awakening in the rest of Ontario that eastern Ontario has, to some extent, been overlooked in the industrial expansion of this province. True, certain areas are prosperous and I am happy to say that Kingston is one of these. However, many other areas are not, particularly in the rural areas north of Kingston, where farming is marginal and the one hope for a better life and a higher standard of living is conditional on two things: one, a large increase in industrial development; and two, far greater promotion and help for the tourist industry. In many of these rather impoverished areas of eastern Ontario, there is a tremendous potential for a large increase in tourist activity—a whole vast, relatively undeveloped tourist paradise is ready and waiting to be developed.

For these reasons, I was delighted to learn that, at long last, a serious attempt is being made to make a full-scale feasibility study of this proposed bridge. I am confident that such a study will show, beyond a doubt, that this bridge is not only feasible, but is a necessity. It should be built with the least possible delay.

Mr. Speaker, there is a slow awakening to the tremendous economic possibilities along the eastern shore of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. It was very gratifying for me to learn that this bridge development, which I am confident will prove what my people have contended for many years, that the Kingston-Wolfe Island-Cape Vincent bridge must be built, will be the beginning of a new era of prosperity for many people, who have waited patiently, for a long time.

I would like, at this time, to bring to the attention of the hon. members of this Legislature an experiment which has begun in Kingston, and which I think foreshadows great development in the area of our bail system in Ontario. In so doing, I would like to read to you a short article which appeared in the Kingston *Whig-Standard* of Tuesday, February 22, which illustrates this idea very well. It is entitled: "Bail system experiment proves a resounding success." I am quoting here from the *Whig-Standard*:

A revolutionary new bail system, designed to put the poor on an equal footing

with the rich, has proved a resounding success in Kingston and Frontenac county. Basically the plan allows some accused persons without money for bail to remain free at least until the trial date.

The accused person, after the circumstances of his arrest are examined by a bail assessment committee, is released on his own recognizance, his word that he will show up on the trial date. Results so far have pleased the architect of the plan, Frontenac county Crown Attorney John E. Sampson and the two members of the bail assessment committee.

Of the 68 arrested persons released on their own recognizance during a six-month period from June to December, only one failed to turn up for his scheduled court appearance. He had been arrested for another offence in another city, prior to his appearance in the Kingston court, and when arrested he had a copy of the remand date in his pocket.

The experiment was born after provincial Attorney General A. A. Wishart requested the advice and assistance of Ontario's Crown attorneys in modernizing the bail system. Mr. Sampson volunteered to handle the experiment. He indicated that it was a professionally worked-out plan under professional supervision. He recruited Lieutenant-Colonel L. J. Flynn and Lieutenant-Colonel O. A. Earl, both retired, to serve on the bail assessment committee.

He said, "I feel that without men of their calibre the experiment could not have been successful."

The function of the committee is to examine each case referred to it, decide whether the accused should be released on his own recognizance, or cash bail, or whether he should be remanded in custody.

"Essentially, the system is to make the law equal to all," Mr. Sampson said. "We are trying to ensure that a man is not unduly penalized by serving time because he comes to trial just because he has not the money to raise bail.

"But the results of the experiment indicate that it is not only beneficial to the accused; there is a substantial saving of money to the community. Some families do not have to go on welfare because the breadwinner is not jailed before his trial. He may be working but that does not necessarily mean that he can afford bail," Mr. Sampson pointed out in the interview.

Statistics indicate that there is also a

saving because of the reduced number of mouths to feed at county and city jails. During the three months previous to the beginning of the experiment, the number of prisoner days for Frontenac county jail, was 574. During the first three months of the experiment, it was 439.

Mr. Sampson said that it also avoids any suggestion that magistrates get a preconceived opinion of the accused, because the bail procedure does not have to be conducted by him. He can hear the case with an open mind.

The experiment is under study by the provincial Attorney General's office and by Crown attorneys around the province.

I am very happy to see that it was in the city of Kingston, in the county of Frontenac, where this experiment which can mean so much in this connection to the people of Ontario is being conducted.

During the last few weeks there has been a great deal of controversy in connection with the national hockey league's expansion plans and many harsh words have been said both in the federal House of Commons and, to a lesser degree, in various provincial Legislatures, because Vancouver was not granted a national hockey league franchise.

No one is sorrier than I am that this decision was made. Vancouver has already proven by its support of football that it is one of the finest sporting centres in this country and if it had been granted a franchise, I am sure it would have supported a national hockey league team in the same manner.

However, I think we must realize that the national hockey league is a business which apparently leaves very little room for sentiment or, if you will, patriotism. The fact that St. Louis was granted the franchise—even though they did not apply for one at the time—was in large measure due to the influence of men on the board of directors who have special interest in St. Louis and who were certainly bound to influence other directors to this end.

This is being done all the time in many other businesses and I do not think that the national hockey league directors can be criticized for their action, even though our pride, as Canadians, is hurt. I think we must realize that for many years, the national hockey league has been dominated—commercially at least—by American interests. This being the case, and realizing that the national hockey league is big business, and is run as such, we are left with very little hope that professional hockey will be of much help to

Canada in developing amateur hockey teams which will be able to regain the position of prominence that we once held in international competition.

We have heard great wailings and crying that professional hockey has ruined our amateur hockey players and that young hockey players are slaves to the professional hockey teams. Why, even the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) has expressed himself on this very subject a short time ago—which I am sure is a subject about which he knows very little.

If young amateur hockey players of this country are slaves to the professionals, they are the most willing slaves that have ever been known. I listened with interest as the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. MacDonald) announced in this House, the victory of the Weston peewee hockey team in the recent Quebec tournament. He went on to say that many of these boys hope to some day play in the national hockey league.

I am sure that this is the wish of thousands of young amateur hockey players in Canada today. To be a professional hockey player is the ambition of a great many young Canadians and I, for one, wish them good luck, for any young hockey player who attains such a goal, deserves a great deal of credit and he has entered on a very worthwhile career.

Regardless of how many professional teams there are in the United States, as long as we can produce hockey players of major league calibre to play on those teams, we are bringing honour and prestige to this country and we, as Canadians, should be very proud that we have developed a truly Canadian game that has such a tremendous appeal to millions of people in other countries.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Apps: So let us not be too hasty in criticizing the national hockey league and the players who play on those teams. Admittedly they are not all perfect, but they have done a far better job of selling our national game as professionals than we have been able to do as amateurs.

I was, however, rather disappointed that the president of the national hockey league for whom, by the way, I have a great admiration, that he said in a recent national television show that because Vancouver spends so much money supporting the B.C. Lions football team, that there would be nothing left for national hockey league hockey.

He was certainly downgrading the appeal of our national hockey league hockey, as well as being a little insulting to the people of one of Canada's outstanding cities.

So now what happens to amateur hockey in Canada? The expansion to 12 teams in the national hockey league will certainly drain off most, if not all, of the good amateur players in this country and make it much more difficult to field good amateur teams for international competition.

There will be some who will say: "Let us not send any more teams to play in these international tournaments." I do not think that we, as Canadians, are built that way and I hope that we will never admit to any country, let alone ourselves, that we no longer wish to compete with international teams in playing our national game. We must not only continue to send our teams to international competitions, but we must develop and send teams of the highest calibre in both playing ability and sportsmanship. It is obvious that the Canadian amateur hockey association has not been able to do this—at least, that is certainly what it appears like.

Our hockey teams can make a great contribution to Canada in the area of goodwill, national pride and prestige. If we really want to and if this so, and I am sure it is, is it not worthwhile to try to do something about it?

If this game of hockey in which we take so much pride is important to us, then I would like to ask our governments what they have done about it? What has the federal government contributed toward our national game? For that matter, what has the provincial government contributed?

The answer is, of course, very, very little. We send telegrams of encouragement and congratulations to our national teams; we bask in reflected glory when they win and look for excuses and people to blame when they lose and sometimes even contribute a little to their expenses. But overall, very little help is given.

I think our game is worth a better effort and I would like to make a suggestion—particularly to the federal government; this is rather popular at this time so I might as well join the crowd in this regard. I would like to see a group of 25 to 30 good young amateur hockey players recruited and enrolled at the Royal military college at Kingston as cadets, or in the army at Barriefield, or even as students at Queen's University.

They would have an arena in which to practise and play at all times; they would

certainly be physically fit; they could have the best of coaches and over a period of four years, could develop into a hockey team that would certainly regain much of our diminished prestige in international hockey.

I am sure that this team would receive the utmost co-operation from amateur and professional hockey associations alike. I know that the city of Kingston would welcome them with open arms because where else would it be more fitting than in the birthplace of hockey to have this hockey team developed? I have reason to believe that if given the opportunity, the Royal military college would be only too happy to take on this project.

I would like, for a minute, to say something about the young hockey players that we have here in this province today.

We hear so much about hockey going to the dogs and the kids are being spoiled, and so on, and so I am going to relate to you a little experience I had about two days ago. We happened to entertain the junior B hockey team—the Kingston Frontenacs—for lunch yesterday, Sunday. There were 16 boys there and I do not think you will find a better bunch of 17- and 18-year-olds in this province than the members of that junior B Frontenac hockey team. Most of them are in grade 12 or 13; they are fine clean-cut young fellows, polite, well-spoken and a credit not only to themselves and to their parents, but to this province. Of those boys in grade 13, there were four of them who were trying college entrance examination papers, to apply for enrolment in American colleges.

That seems to me to be a pretty fine state of affairs, when the finest young athletes in the city of Kingston, as far as hockey is concerned, are planning to go to American universities to study.

Now these young fellows have to pass their grade 13, they have to come up to the entrance standards of American universities, and they are doing that, because it has been indicated to them that they will receive some financial help in going to those colleges.

I am sure that the same thing is taking place in many other areas throughout this province. It seems to me that we, in Ontario, should take another look at our scholarships here, and try to keep these fine young Canadian athletes here in Canada. We should promote our game here through our own universities, much more than we are doing at the present time.

It seems really a crying shame that these young fellows even have to contemplate

trying American college entrance examinations in order to go to university in the United States, when they should really be going to university in Canada. But you cannot blame them. If they are going to get help, they are going to go on, and I do not think anyone can blame them for their decision to do so. The only people we should be blaming is ourselves, because we do not give them the same opportunity.

Also, I would like to say just a few words in connection with the young people of this province. As you know, in our travels with the select committee on youth, we have had the opportunity of visiting many areas in Ontario, and discussing various problems with the youth of this province. Unfortunately, many of the adults have a poor impression of the young people in Ontario, and they get this impression from the day-to-day reading of the newspapers, listening to the radio and looking at television. Because it appears that most of the stories that you see in the newspapers are sensational stories of those few, that small percentage of young Canadians, or young people in Ontario, who are getting into trouble and the newspapers are playing up this sort of sordid story in a sensational way. The result is that many adults in this province are getting the impression that most of the young people here are delinquent. This is very far from the case.

The more young people you talk to, the more you realize that the great majority of the youth of this province are pretty fine people. I think that the press of this province, the radio and the television, could render a tremendous contribution to the youth of Ontario. Instead of playing up these sordid tragedies that a few of them get involved in, they should go out and look, and see some of the fine contributions that a great many of the young people of this province are making.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the voting age and whether the voting age should be changed. I have my own opinions on that. I feel that the young people in Ontario are much better educated on the average than they were 20 or 25 years ago. I feel they are a pretty fine bunch. I think it is almost time now for us to consider reducing the voting age of the young people in this province, and give them an opportunity of partaking in many of the decisions that are going to affect them in this country. When we realize that over half the population of Ontario, in the next few years, will be under 24 years of age, then

we must realize that we are going to have to pay a lot more attention to the youth of Ontario than we have done in the past.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, two years ago in this legislative building, a very moving ceremony was performed by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) when he presented certificates of achievement to a number of dedicated people who had made a significant contribution to amateur sport in Ontario. I thought it was very fitting that our government should recognize, in this way, some of those who had done so much for the young people of this province. I was keenly disappointed when the ceremony was not performed last year. I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that it will not be overlooked again this year.

During the work with the select committee on youth, we had the opportunity of visiting several areas in Ontario and talking with many people who are working for and with the young people of this province. I think I can say that we were most impressed with the great number of adults who were giving of their time, their money, along with a great deal of effort, to provide our youth with sports facilities, coaching and training.

They receive very little credit for what they are doing. As a matter of fact, they are not looking for any credit, because they are genuinely interested in making a contribution to the youth of their community. I believe that the least this government can do is to publicly recognize their efforts by having this ceremony again this year and presenting, to another group of dedicated individuals, a small token of recognition for their efforts, to let them know that our government is sincerely appreciative of the contribution they have made to the youth of this province. Mr. Speaker, may I urge as strongly as I can, that the least we can do is to say, in this way, "Thank you for what you have done."

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of this debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions and, from five to six, private members' resolutions; then back into estimates, the estimates of The Department of Highways, when we are finished with Reform Institutions.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask the hon. Prime Minister about the private

members' bills. Are there any particular bills being taken tomorrow? Is there any order in their appearance?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: It has been settled by the Whips; resolutions No. 8 and No. 12 can be dealt with.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.50 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 1, 1966
Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Fifth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Reuter	1005
Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, continued	1008
On notice of motion No. 9, Mr. Spence, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. McKeough, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Knox, Mr. Gisborn, Mr. Rowe, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Henderson	1026
Recess, 6 o'clock	1036

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests in the west gallery, students from Gravenhurst high school, Gravenhurst.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's fifth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bill without amendment:

Bill No. Pr21, An Act respecting the city of London.

Your committee begs to report the following bill with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr36, An Act respecting the township of North York.

Your committee would recommend that the following bills be not reported:

Bill No. Pr1, An Act respecting the township of Saltfleet;

Bill No. Pr31, An Act respecting the town of Hespeler.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the commissioners of estate bills their report on Bill No. Pr3, An Act respecting the board of education of the township of Toronto.

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MACKAY
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KELLY

Osgoode Hall, Toronto 1
February 28, 1966

RODERICK LEWIS, ESQ., QC,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO, ONTARIO.

DEAR SIR:

Re: Bill No. Pr3, 15 Elizabeth II, 1966.

The undersigned, as commissioners of estate bills, as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act, RSO 1960, chapter 208, section 57, having had the

above noted bill referred to us as such commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

We have examined the petition and the draft bill; there has also been submitted to us:

(a) Photostatic copies of the original grant from the Crown dated November 9, 1833, whereby the Crown granted to William Thompson, James McGrath, and Joseph Gardiner, the east and west halves of lot 3 in the first concession west of Hurontario street in the township of Toronto, in trust for the endowment, support and maintenance of a school in the township of Toronto, reserving one acre thereof for the purpose of a burial ground;

(b) Photostatic copy of an order of the court of chancery dated February 6, 1864, whereby the said lands were vested in the trustees of school section No. 12, township of Toronto, county of Peel;

(c) Evidence that the said lands became vested in successively the board of trustees of the public school board of the township school area of Toronto No. 1 and the board of education for the township of Toronto, by statutes of Ontario, 11-12 Eliz. II, chapter 190, section 4;

(d) Letter from the office of the Deputy Minister of Health dated June 5, 1964, evidencing that The Department of Health has no interest in the matter of the said lands on account of the fact that the cemetery referred to was not established, and disclaim any interest in the lands for cemetery purposes.

We recommend that the preamble to the said bill be amended by adding thereto the appropriate recitals to indicate the successive ownership of the lands, as indicated above.

With the amendments set out in this report we are of the opinion the provisions of the bill are proper for carrying into effect its purposes and that it is reasonable the said bill should pass into law.

The bill duly signed by the commissioners and a copy of the petition for the same are accordingly returned herewith, together with the material to which we have referred.

Yours truly,

(signed)

J. G. MACKAY, JA,

A. KELLY, JA,

Commissioners of estate bills.

It was therefore ordered that the bill, together with the report of the commissioners of estate bills thereon, be referred to the standing committee on private bills.

Mr. H. J. Price (St. David): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would just like to say that there are a few members of the House, like myself, who have the honour to represent a riding which is named after a patron saint. On the occasion of St. David's day, which is today, March 1, I wish that you would join with me in extending our very best wishes to the Welsh people on their national holiday.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), notice of which has been given.

Would the hon. Minister inform this House whether one of the bean companies has rented office facilities and furnished same? If so, whose money was used to finance the operation?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the hon. member whether he said "a" bean company, or "the" bean company?

Mr. Gaunt: I said "the" bean company.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: The answer is "no."

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett), notice of which he has had for 24 hours.

Would the hon. Minister comment on the charge made by Thomas W. Kierans that the United States Public Law No. 89298 may have the effect of cutting water levels on Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence river, resulting in damage to Canada's downstream interests?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I have not had the opportunity to study the United States legislation to which the hon. member for Yorkview refers. I am advised however, that so far as Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence river are concerned, the legislation would appear to deal only with tributary waters flowing into Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence river. Such waters are not boundary waters, as defined in the boundary waters treaty of 1909.

I would like to remind the House that under that treaty, each country reserved to itself and to its states and provinces, exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion of all waters on its own side of the line, which in their natural channels would flow into boundary waters. It is also provided that any interference with, or diversion of, such waters which result in injury on the other side of the boundary shall give rise to the same rights and entitle injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in the country where the diversion or interference occurs.

It should be borne in mind that one of the very important objects and purposes of the boundary waters treaty is the preservation of free and open navigation of all navigable boundary waters for the inhabitants and ships of both countries equally.

Consistent with this purpose, it was provided specifically in the treaty that neither

Canada nor the United States surrenders any rights they may have to object to any interference with or diversion of waters on the other side of the boundary, the effect of which would be productive of material injury to the navigation interests on its own side of the boundary.

I am advised that what would appear to be contemplated by the United States legislation would not result in any such interference or diversion.

I would like also to remind the House that United States interests bordering the Great Lakes are equally concerned with Canada and Ontario about any proposed prejudicial effects on the levels of these lakes.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett), notice of which has been given.

Is it the intention of the hon. Minister to make available permanent licence plates for vehicles that are classified as a "vintage" vehicle? If so, how soon will these go on sale, and what will their cost be?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, there is no intention to issue any permanent licence plates at this time, neither is there any provision in our regulations for special plates for so-called "vintage" vehicles.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given.

Could the hon. Minister inform this House whether there is a graduate dietitian employed in the Ontario hospital in Kingston, Ontario, and would he also inform this House whether special diets are prescribed for a patient suffering from diabetes? Are there lounges placed on the various floors of the hospital in order that a patient could have a sitting room, rather than be retained in the ward? Are any funds made available or travel warrants issued to a patient who has been discharged from the hospital from out of town?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the first part of the hon. member's question, yes, there is a graduate dietitian on a part-time basis. Her duties are to provide special diets required for medical reasons and to give general supervision to the food service.

To the second part of the hon. member's question, the answer again is "yes." Food

preparation in Ontario hospitals is, of course, for the most part hotel or restaurant type of operation. A very good system has been devised by our food service consultants to provide a variety of standard diet schedules in three-week cycles to avoid monotony. For the most part, patients in Ontario hospitals do not require special diets for medical reasons but in a typical hospital of 1,000 beds an average number of 100 to 150 patients do require special diets. These are principally salt-free diets, diabetic, reducing diets, occasional low-fat, high-calorie diets and others for relatively uncommon conditions.

Again to No. 3, the answer is "yes," Mr. Speaker. Lounges, sitting rooms, recreation rooms and other day space are an essential part of any facility providing in-patient psychiatric care and must be available to all ambulatory patients. Part of the space is provided in the wards separate from dormitories and bedrooms and part of it is located in other parts of the hospital devoted to special activities and not absolutely essentially on the floor on which the patient happens to be sleeping.

Increased emphasis has been steadily placed on the provision of additional day space in new construction and the renovation of older buildings. As the patient population is reduced, much of the dormitory space is converted to these purposes.

Then to the fourth part of the question, the answer again is "yes," on an *ad hoc* basis when required. When a patient is to be discharged from an Ontario hospital, every effort is made to have the relatives or interested friends come to the hospital to take him home. When there are no interested relatives or friends or where a special placement is being made, it may be necessary for a member of the staff to transport the patient to his new place of residence. In some cases where neither of these measures is possible or appropriate, where the discharged person is capable of making his own arrangements, funds or transportation tickets or both may be provided on an *ad hoc* basis.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would accept a supplementary question?

When the hon. Minister says a "part-time dietitian," could he clarify that for us? Is that for three days a week or just what does that mean?

Mr. Dymond: I am sorry, I cannot answer the question. Had I had knowledge of this, I would have had the answer.

Mr. Thompson: Can I get an answer to that?

I have another question, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Health. Could the hon. Minister inform this House what progress is being made in regards to policy of day care hospitals?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, there are no special day care hospitals as such, but day care is run in conjunction with outpatient and inpatient programmes. Now most of our psychiatric hospitals and units can provide day care for individual patients in this manner without a separate day care programme.

As a matter of policy, sir, the development of day care programmes is encouraged but our experience to date is that the utilization of day care is not great.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Is it the policy of the hon. Minister to encourage day care hospitals where there is a cultural background of the people in that they do not want anything of psychiatric care? I am thinking of medical care which would not require a long period in the hospital in which they might be able to get some minor operation and go to their homes, where from a cultural background they feel more secure and safe.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: In the context the hon. leader of the Opposition refers to, Mr. Speaker, the answer would have to be "no." This is a matter that we have looked at very carefully and very thoroughly and there is a great deal of controversy about it.

There are those who would have us establish a hospital type of accommodation for patients who do not need to remain in hospital. We believe that they are better at home. Of course, we run into difficulties when patients visit a large central hospital from out of town and living can become a problem for them.

In our outpatient service, of course, as much as possible is done in this regard, as many procedures now as possibly can be done without the patient being admitted as an inpatient is followed, and I suppose in a sense this could be looked upon as day care. The patient may stay in hospital from some hours to the better part of the day and go right home, but to say we have established day care hospitals as such is not so.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of

Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts), but he is not in his chair so I will save it for tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker: Before the orders of the day I should like to introduce a distinguished visitor to the House today, and former occupant of my chair, the Speaker during the terms of the Legislature from 1948 to 1955—the Reverend M. C. Davies of Windsor. He is accompanied by his charming wife Mrs. Davies.

Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, THE DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(continued)

On vote 1903:

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under vote 1903, in looking over the annual report of the Minister on page 61 under the heading of "Mentality of pupils committed or admitted," I notice two categories: Morons, IQ 45 to 59, and high-grade morons, 60 to 69. Why would the 38 people involved there be committed to this type of an institution? Why would they not be hospitalized? They would need psychiatric treatment rather than this type of treatment.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Well, it may very well be that many of these, if not all of them, at some stage during the year were certified.

Mr. Newman: Does the hon. Minister mean that some time during the year they were taken out of the institution and hospitalized?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Many of them, yes.

Mr. Newman: They were? When the individual first comes to the training school, is his IQ taken at that time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Newman: Well, why is he not sent to a hospital at that time rather than keep him?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: When he enters the system he is examined by our own psychiatrist and as a result of that, at that stage, it may very well be that then certification is applied for.

Mr. Newman: How long a period of time would he stay before he is eventually sent to an institution other than there?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told it varies. I could not tell the hon. member what an average is, if that is what he wants.

Mr. Newman: Okay, I will drop that, Mr. Chairman. I wanted to sympathize with the hon. Minister when I looked at the bottom of page 60 and saw that factors contributing to delinquency of those committed or admitted under "fair home but no control" we have 291 people. Under "poor home and no control," 177. We have 468 who are committed or admitted to training schools simply because the home has broken down. I can see that the hon. Minister's problem would be most difficult if there is no control at home. How in the dickens can the hon. Minister do a good job later?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will agree with the hon. member that it is most difficult.

Mr. Chairman: On 1903, if the members will recall, we had decided that when 1 to 6 had been completed we would go into the estimates of the adult institutions. There were two groups; first the adult institutions, and then the juvenile institutions. If it is the wish of the committee we can do that now on pages 115, 116 and 117 under the adult institutions.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I have a question of the hon. Minister regarding Mercer. A couple of years ago he indicated—and these were his words:

Mr. Chairman, I inform the member and I hesitate to do so because this has been said before for a number of years, I do not want it to sound like a repetitive record, there are plans afoot, I am going to do everything possible to bring this to fruition this year, to replace this institution.

This was in 1964, March 13, in reply to a question which I had raised. Last year the institution was also going to be replaced. This year we did hear that it is going to carry the name of the Governor-General and that plans are again afoot.

I wonder if the hon. Minister can give us any more definite information as to timing, when we might look for the new Mercer to emerge in all its glory?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will recall, I am fairly certain,

it was mentioned in the Throne speech that construction would begin this year. It is now in the hands of The Department of Public Works. Preliminary sketches have been drawn and I think the hon. member would be well advised to ask that during the estimates of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell). We are fairly certain construction will begin this year.

Mr. Young: Well, is there some assurance by a year from now that the institution may well be complete?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know how long it takes to construct the building, all I can tell you is that we expect to get it under construction this year.

Mr. Young: There is one other question I would like to direct to the hon. Minister regarding the statement in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, December 2, 1965, following the incident at Millbrook.

The statement was that eight sex offenders are going to be shifted to the Alex G. Brown memorial clinic. I wonder if the hon. Minister at this time can give us any further information on that experiment; whether it is going to be enlarged; whether more offenders are going to be involved in this experiment, and whether any signs of success have been achieved.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am told that there has already been a second group sent there, totalling 17 in all. Of course, the experiment is still in its early stages, and I am also told that it looks very promising. As this develops there is to be a meaningful programme that will be extended.

Mr. Young: And is there staff there to handle a larger group?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, yes, quite right.

Mr. Young: What staff is there, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Four psychologists, two part-time psychiatrists and two social workers.

Mr. Young: The social workers are full time?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Yes, full time.

Mr. R. G. Hodgson (Victoria): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might have your indulgence for a few minutes? I have received a letter from the Elizabeth Fry society and I

would like to read it into the record, because it is worthwhile.

Mr. Chairman: Is this under the adult institutions?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: It covers institutions.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Why don't you have the hon. Minister read his thank you letter?

Mr. R. G. Hodgson: Well, you objected to that the other day.

It starts off, "Dear member and friends," and I believe each hon. member in the House has received a copy of this.

As a number of changes have been made in the provincial institutions for women during the past year we thought our report of these activities would be of interest. The Elizabeth Fry society has been critical of The Department of Reform Institutions in the past, so we feel that when praise is in order we have an equal responsibility to bring the improvements to the attention of our members and the community.

In June, 1965, Miss Aileen Nicholson, AAPSW, was appointed administrator of adult female institutions. Miss Nicholson received her diploma in social science from Trinity college, Dublin, and a certificate in mental health from the London school of economics. Since coming to Canada in 1957, she has been a psychiatric social worker at the Toronto psychiatric hospital. For several years she provided group and individual therapy at the forensic clinic for persons referred from the courts. She is an instructor at the University of Toronto school of social work.

In November, 1965, Mr. Glenn Thompson was appointed superintendent of the Mercer reformatory for women. He received his BA and MSW degrees from the University of Toronto. Mr. Thompson joined The Department of Reform Institutions in 1960 and for three years was a social worker at the maximum security reformatory in Millbrook. He gained further experience as a psychiatric social worker in Henderson hospital in Great Britain, and on his return to Canada was appointed supervisor, social work for four of the department's institutions in the eastern section of the province. He is married and has a daughter.

Under the guidance of Miss Nicholson and Mr. Thompson, an assessment and

treatment programme for the female offenders in Mercer has been going forward. This programme is geared to the individual needs of the inmates.

Upon entry to Mercer an inmate with a sentence of over 30 days may be placed in a separate corridor where she can be screened by social workers, psychologists and sometimes a psychiatrist. Correction officers who are good observers, intelligent, factual and firm are chosen to work with these inmates, as an understanding officer can do much to lay the foundation for acceptance of the institution's programme of training and treatment. A decision is made as to whether an inmate should be transferred to Ingleside treatment centre or remain at Mercer.

Weekly case conferences of the superintendent and staff are held and recommendations are made about the work and educational programme for each woman. Some thought is given even at this early stage to the kind of after-care agency most suited to the needs of the individual inmates and their families.

Mr. A. Douglas Mackey, MSc, has been appointed director of educational programmes for the department, both vocational and academic. The teaching staff at Mercer reformatory consists of Mrs. J. Steinburgh, BA, home economics; Mrs. E. Lum, BA, commercial; Mr. J. Miller and Mrs. J. Drutz, AOCA. At Brampton, the teaching staff is Mrs. J. B. Millar, MA and Miss I. Leneghan.

Emphasis is placed on up-grading education and commercial training. The methods used are geared to adults, and are comparable to those used at the adult training centres. Mr. Miller is responsible for a new course for functional illiterates which has been introduced into the education programme.

An NCR business accounting machine was installed at Brampton guidance centre in 1965, and this is proving a valuable adjunct to the existing training in typing, shorthand and other business procedures.

Home economics classes are geared to training, and courses in restaurant services are planned.

Miss A. Wright, BA, formerly head of the circulation division of the Toronto public library, joined the Mercer staff in November and is working in close co-operation with the teaching staff in guiding inmates' reading.

Additional education opportunities are

provided by the community. A staff member of the visiting homemakers association, Mrs. Brooks, is a nutritionist and she talks about budgeting, nutritional needs of children, and other family oriented topics.

Sewing instructions, arts and crafts courses, and a highly popular drama group are being conducted by staff and well-trained volunteers.

In January, 1966, a recreational and games programme was started and is conducted by two volunteers who are professional physical education instructors.

The use of trained volunteers is an important aspect of this programme, as it is essential that inmates have contact with stable people, with varied interests and sound values, who can provide a good influence.

A committee has been formed of representatives from each corridor in the Mercer reformatory and weekly meetings with the superintendent are held to discuss requests, suggestions and problems.

Weekly staff meetings are held at Mercer and Brampton, under the supervision of the superintendent or administrator. A series of lectures was given last fall for the staff and a further series was begun in February of this year. Several of the staff members are attending university extension lectures on related subjects.

A programme of research under the direction of Dr. T. Grygier has been initiated by The Department of Reform Institutions. It is hoped to make the institutions more available to universities and to encourage students to join the department staff after graduation.

We think you will agree that this adds up to a new look in the treatment of the inmate, and we should like to congratulate the Honourable Allan Grossman and his Department of Reform Institutions for developing these plans.

There are other changes which have been proposed, such as alcoholics being sent to the hospital now opened by the alcoholism and drug addiction research foundation; increased prerelease opportunities; and more participation by community groups in the evening activities. We will bring you news of these as they occur, and hope you will join with us in making Ontario a leader in the field of penal reform by your continued interest.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. L. R. Weinrich,
for the board of directors of the
Elizabeth Fry society of Toronto

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments on this vote, and particularly wish to refer to the Millbrook reformatory. The village of Millbrook lies within the boundaries of my riding and any matters which concern that community and any of the events which have transpired or will transpire, in connection with that community, have my attention and my interest.

This community has a population of approximately 1,000 people—law-abiding citizens—a community that over the years has prided itself on the beauty of its location and the integrity of its people. As in similar hamlets throughout this province, the activities of everyday life seldom reach the front page of our metropolitan press, but as you will recall, a few months ago, a fire occurred in the reformatory at Millbrook. That fire was caused by certain inmates who were desirous of being moved to the larger environment of Kingston penitentiary where, I may say, their sentences would automatically be reduced because the federal statutes give greater remission to inmates of this type of institution.

In provincial institutions, I am advised, the sentence remission is 52 days for each year of sentence.

In federal penitentiaries, Mr. Chairman, an inmate receives an immediate remission of one-quarter of his sentence, plus an additional 30 days per year. Now, my statement, Mr. Chairman, is supported by the interim report of the committee set up by the Bishop of Toronto, the Anglican Church of Canada, to study statements concerning Millbrook reformatory by the Reverend S. G. West and the Peterborough *Examiner*. May I say that I had a long, and I think profitable discussion with the Reverend Mr. West this morning, and I would like to refer to paragraph 6 of that statement:

The Minister of Reform Institutions is to be commended for his attempts to get the present system of consecutive sentencing abolished. Yet church and public need to bring increasing pressure to bear on the Minister of Justice to have that Act amended. The system of giving a man three consecutive sentences of two years less a day which results in his spending six years in Millbrook should be abolished.

Anyone sentenced to over two years, should be sent to the penitentiary, and not a reformatory. Two inmates who are serving consecutive sentences at Millbrook started the fires in the summer of 1965. They did this to get themselves sent to Kingston.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the important factors bearing on the Millbrook situation and I will refer to it a little later in my remarks. Suffice it to say at this point, that the standardizing of remission is long overdue and federal action is badly needed to remedy this situation.

The fire, however, did provide an incentive for outside groups to take a keen interest in this reform institution. Several flying visits were made to the institution by various groups including the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben), and members of the clergy. The Peterborough daily newspaper ran a series of articles criticizing penal institutions in general, and Millbrook in particular.

Strange tales began to emerge from that usually quiet community. Reports of the inadequacy of the facilities and the staff; tales which told of inmates being shackled and handcuffed for days at a time—punched in the face, kicked in the side of the head, faces pushed into broken glass on the floor, heads bounced off the walls, beaten while shackled and handcuffed—indeed, the institution was described as a “punitive hell.”

Mr. Chairman, I am not, at this time, going to defend The Department of Reform Institutions. The hon. Minister is perfectly capable of answering any criticisms levelled at his department. May I simply state that I have the highest respect for the hon. Minister and his officials. His is a difficult department as we all know and I wish to commend him and his dedicated staff on its efficient operation. He and his predecessors have been able to assemble within that department the most highly qualified personnel in the field of penology.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, this province, as you know, and as the hon. member for Bracondale knows and as we all know, is outstanding in the field of penal reform on the North American continent. But I am concerned, Mr. Chairman, with the manner in which the community of Millbrook and the families of the officials at the reformatory are being maligned and slandered by the unjustified statements of certain individuals and the press.

Great emphasis has been placed on the alleged persecution of the unfortunate inmates of that institution but little has been said of the abuse and attacks made on the officers whose duty it is to protect human beings as members of a responsible society from the unlawful actions of these individuals. The irrational statements with respect to the Millbrook reformatory reflect

a complete misunderstanding of its operation and its role in the reform programme.

The fact that some 190 individuals find themselves residents of that institution is proof in itself, Mr. Chairman, that they have been unable to adjust themselves to the programmes in other institutions, institutions where more advanced rehabilitative measures are used.

The hon. member for Bracondale is quoted in the Peterborough *Examiner* of October 8, 1965, as stating that the \$3 million prison was a bad mistake: "It does nothing," he said, "to reform or train the 200 men it houses."

Mr. Chairman, the residents of this institution are individuals who refused rehabilitation in other centres. They are as children starting to school and must acquire a basic discipline before advancing and this basic discipline, may I say, is supplied at Millbrook through the operation of machines, such as in the making of licence plates, the Braille shop, and other tasks.

Here is taught the concept of a job and if the response is positive advanced rehabilitation can take place.

The hon. member for Bracondale is also quoted in the same press release as saying that: "Treatment for the behaviour problems of inmates is virtually non-existent."

Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of the hon. member and the House, I would like to list again the professional staff of this institution:

1. A registered nurse with psychiatric specialization who is employed full time and on call after hours as well;

2. A full-time psychologist, who holds a PhD degree;

3. A full-time psychometrician, who holds a master's degree in psychology;

4. A qualified teacher who supervises an educational programme for inmates from illiterates up to and including grade 13;

5. A part-time teacher who assists with the above programme;

6. A consulting psychiatrist, who spends at least a day a week at the institution;

7. An experienced social work consultant, who holds a master's degree in social work and who is at the institution one day per week;

8. A qualified dentist who visits the institution regularly;

9. A qualified physician who visits the institution regularly and is readily on call;

10. A Salvation Army chaplain who con-

ducts services there and visits the institution during the week as well, and a Roman Catholic chaplain with a master's degree in social work, who conducts mass, confessions and spiritual counselling on an individual basis each Sunday.

Until several months ago, Mr. Chairman, Millbrook had the services of a full-time Protestant chaplain. The position became vacant when the chaplain accepted a position as superintendent of one of the Ontario training schools. I understand that he is being replaced. In addition to the above specialized medical and paramedical services located in Peterborough are made available to the inmates on medical recommendation.

The hon. member, because of a lack of knowledge of penology, may feel that the institution should have a staff of several psychiatrists and several psychologists. The responsibility of a psychiatrist, as I understand, is to analyze the individual's particular problems. It is completely impractical to keep a psychiatrist permanently stationed in any one institution. The psychologists's responsibility, I am advised, is to develop a programme to meet the needs of the inmates. This is the manner by which the basic programme at Millbrook reformatory has developed.

From a layman's point of view, Mr. Chairman, I consider the greatest problem involved in rehabilitation is related to the period of imprisonment. Certainly a sick person is not confined in a hospital for a pre-stated period of time. The length of stay depends on the nature of the illness and the patient is not discharged until every effort has been made by the doctors and the hospital staff to restore him to full health.

I think we all appreciate that no longer is the punitive aspect of the reform programme emphasized in this province. We all recognize this fact, I am sure. Although some individuals, because of political or other personal reasons refuse to admit it, it is generally recognized that these individuals are sick, socially sick. The day may come when society will recognize this fact. The courts will no longer determine the length of the sentence. Then and then only can these individuals be treated in a manner and within a period of time to meet their needs.

I have tried to show, Mr. Chairman, how unjustified and irresponsible have been the statements made about Millbrook reformatory. The very serious consequences of these actions, however, is something else.

During the past few weeks I have had a number of officers from the reformatory

contact me asking for my assistance in having them transferred to another department of government. It is not for economic reasons; it is not for lack of confidence in the superintendent, who is very highly regarded not only by his staff but by the community at large; it is not because of displeasure with the hon. Minister or his officials.

It is because they are subjected daily to physical attacks and personal abuse by the inmates of that institution. Their children are laughed at and taunted at school, their wives are being subjected to abusive telephone calls. And why? Simply because of the actions of certain individuals. These officers are portrayed to the general public as sadists and persecutors.

It is perhaps difficult for the residents of large metropolitan areas such as Toronto to appreciate the impact such allegations make on a small community such as Millbrook. Instances have been brought to my attention that illustrate the effect of such actions on a community of this size.

The other day it was reported that a lady refused to buy certain articles in the city of Peterborough because they were manufactured by a Millbrook industry. Why? Because in that town they beat people, bash their heads against walls and throw them shackled and manacled into solitary confinement. Another wife refused to allow her husband, I understand, to be employed in that institution, and I understand the reason was that her husband was not in the habit of attacking other people and she would not agree to his working in a place where he would be required to beat people up.

This may seem a little ridiculous, Mr. Chairman, to the people in the city of Toronto—

An hon. member: It does to us all right.

Mr. Carruthers: It may, but in a village of the size of Millbrook it takes on an immense significance.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is not exaggerating.

Mr. Carruthers: No, I am not. Frankly, I am not, I am just reporting these incidents as they have come to me. I have no basis for the facts of these last two, I am just going by stories that have been brought to me. But on the other hand, this is the type of report that is being circulated throughout the Millbrook community and the effect is disastrous on a community of this size.

Statements have been made that the Millbrook reformatory was a mistake, that it never should have been built in an isolated community.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): The hon. Minister said that himself.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Chairman, if this was a mistake, then the federal government is making a bigger mistake in building the new federal penitentiary at Warkworth, which is a more isolated area.

This one fact, Mr. Chairman, the report that Millbrook is an isolated community, has had a very serious reflection on that whole area. Millbrook, may I say, is located at the junction of two modern county roads, both paved, is immediately adjacent to Highway 115, approximately five miles from Highway 28, between ten to 15 miles from the large centre of Peterborough, and approximately the same distance from Port Hope. May I say the community in no way can be classified as being isolated.

I regret, Mr. Chairman, the circumstances that have forced me to speak at this time but I cannot allow the good name of Millbrook or the people of Millbrook to be tarnished. I would like to say that the re-establishment of the inmates at Millbrook to their proper place in society should be, and I am sure it is, the concern and the aim of society as a whole.

Perhaps isolation in any institution is not the answer, perhaps there should be more contact with the outside world through visiting committees, and so on, but I submit that this can be accomplished as well, perhaps better, in a community such as Millbrook as in a large metropolitan area such as Toronto. But I suggest that it cannot be done by unjustified and unproven allegations that reflect on the personnel of the institution and on the community in which it is located.

Mr. Chairman, I am asking that steps be taken to clarify the position of the custodial officers in the Millbrook reformatory, to re-establish the reputation of these officers inside and outside the community as the conscientious, honest, dedicated individuals that they are, and that some form of discipline be established to protect them from personal and physical attacks.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, it had not been my intention to speak on Millbrook because this matter has been pretty well covered in the press and other news media, and I frankly had been hoping to mention it in the Budget debate if it was

necessary. But I was so shocked by the statements made by the hon. member who just sat down when he professed to know what went on in that institution, that institution being in his riding, that I felt I had to rise.

The hon. member is casting aspersions on others, saying that they know nothing of what goes on in that institution. Then he comes out and makes the bald statement that these people who are in this particular institution are there because they could not adapt themselves to other institutions. I would suggest to the hon. member that if he had taken the trouble to investigate, he would have found out that many in that institution had not been in other institutions before. As a matter of fact, a good third of them are not troublemakers at all.

Inmates in there fall in three categories: one category, which they call behaviour problems, is in group one; then there is another group which consists almost exclusively of pedophiles, those that are in on moral offences, sexual offences—most of them are pedophiles involving offences with children; and in the other category we have the alcoholics and the drug addicts. And those last two groups, the pedophiles and the alcoholics and the addicts, are not there because they were behaviour problems in the sense that they were disturbing other institutions, but they were there because they had no place else to put them.

And they are not unreformable, as the hon. member intimates. As a matter of fact, that is the shame of this institution, that at the time we visited the institution, there were 64 in group two and 19 in group three, for a total of 83 out of 197 inmates who had no business being there. They were not what they call the ones that cannot be reformed or anything else. They were simply there because they were mentally sick.

Mr. Carruthers: I did not say that any of the inmates in the reformatory were un-reformable.

Mr. Ben: And I might ask, Mr. Chairman, in October when this institution was visited, what was the practice so far as those unfortunates in groups two and three were concerned? At that time it was only with reference to the alcoholics and addicts. For the last 37 days of their sentence, they would send them to Mimico alcoholic centre and drug addiction centre for treatment—for the last 37 days of their term—and they were supposed to be treated and sent back to the streets, ready to take up right where they left

off after 37 days of treatment for a problem like alcoholism and drug addiction. It was not until after we visited the institution, Mr. Chairman, that they also started to send the pedophiles to Millbrook. These are the people that the hon. member intimates are hardened criminals, and had a chance in another institution and failed.

And then he talks about the training that they get in this wonderful institution that he knows so much about, because he is the member for that particular riding. What is the biggest source of employment there? The manufacture of licence plates. And how many people did they have manufacturing licence plates at the time of the visit in October? Seventy-nine. And why did they have that great number of 79? Because they were operating two shifts.

If it had not been so close to the time of issuing of licence plates, they would have been operating on only one shift. And if these figures here are correct, I believe the one shift would consist of 51 people who are so employed. Eleven worked in the laundry; ten in the job shop; seven on the inner perimeter; two in the library; three in the barber-shop; two in the clothing reception; seven in segregation; two in the outside hospital; six in the mail shop; 19 on scrub teams; nine in the wing cleaners; 27 cleaning the cells; three in detention. This is the wonderful training they were getting there, to adapt them to come out into civilization again.

Now I am not going to read some of these sworn statements that I have here, because I am not going to take the time of the House to do this, but if my hon. friend wants to know what is going on in the institution in his riding, he is welcome to read these. And as I say, they are sworn statements.

In the report that was made by the hon. Minister's department, they say they did not shoot gas at everybody. If the hon. member knows what this institution is like, he would know that there were 25 people in a wing and that the gas was shot into these cells and the gas could not help but spread to the rest of the wing. On July 6, 12 inmates received gas. That is almost half, in fact you might say it is half of these inmates in that particular wing. On July 7, they state two inmates; July 8, two inmates; July 9, five inmates; July 10, seven inmates, receiving tear gas.

Now how about the others who were in that wing that were not doing anything and had to suffer from the gas that was shot at these particular individuals? You heard the hon. Minister say that the only damage was to some dishes and from banging on doors.

Gas is justified for an offence like that? And you are getting up and defending that in this House?

And then there is the inspection, when the psychiatrist of the department admits that he did not question any of the inmates and I quote: "Mr. Penfold said the investigator spoke to about ten guards" at the institution in a "random survey" and some of them were placed under oath. The guards, he said, refused the brutality charges and quoted the present psychologist who would have smelt something if it was there.

I point out to you that the present psychologist was appointed after this happened. And what the chief psychiatrist is intimating is that with his educated nose he would come in there about a month or two after this occurred and he would be able to smell that something happened a couple of months ago.

A psychologist states: "When I was there I saw force being used but not brutality." Well, the decision between force and brutality is a question of law. I would suggest that the hon. member read the report that was published and question some of the inmates, and not be like the hon. Minister's department there. When we ask them why they did not question any of the inmates, they say, "Well, we know what they are like."

As a matter of fact, I will quote you a statement by Mr. Penfold when he was asked, were any inmates interviewed: "No," said Mr. Penfold. As a psychologist, he said he knows the nature of the Millbrook inmates and "if there was brutality the guards would have known about it." I suggest to you the guards say, "Sure, we knocked the bejabbers out of these people."

Mr. Carruthers: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Ben: Yes, the member for Bracondale will permit a question.

Mr. Carruthers: I would like to ask the hon. member how often he has visited the Millbrook institution?

Mr. Ben: I only visited the institution once, but I interviewed enough people and if you want to read their sworn statements here—

Mr. Carruthers: There you are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Ben: I will read one of the statements here. This is a sworn statement that was not signed in front of me—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order! The member for Bracondale has the floor, please.

Mr. Ben: Now all of these statements are here to be used and they were sworn; this particular statement was sworn in Hamilton. We have permission to use his name and the hon. Minister can take it down and investigate it.

I, Ross Gells, 357 McNab street north, in the city of Hamilton, in the province of Ontario, do solemnly declare that:

1. In June, 1957, I was convicted for assault and robbery and sent to the Ontario training school at Bowmanville. After a month I was transferred to Guelph—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, could I make an appeal to the hon. member? I had an idea that he had affidavits and things of that nature, and I hope that I can make myself understood by the hon. members, and I hope the hon. member for Bracondale will take me at my word.

I would ask him to attempt to make his case on individuals by not using their names. Perhaps he can say Mr. A and Mr. B and I could handle them in that fashion, because there are implications involved in this once these names are publicized which makes a problem for our staff either now or later when they have to meet with them. It makes it difficult for rehabilitation later, if they are publicized in public, and there are other implications as well.

I wonder if I can prevail upon the hon. member not to use the names?

Mr. Ben: I have no objection to that. As a matter of fact, I had no intention of mentioning the names of the staff that are in there.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: No, I am talking about the inmates. In the interest of the inmates or ex-inmates themselves.

Mr. Ben: All right, I will. This is another one.

I, Blank, presently of no fixed address, having just been discharged from Millbrook reformatory do solemnly declare that:

I was born in Blank, Ontario [and the date].

My experience with reform institutions started when I was 14 when I was placed in Bowmanville training school for being

unmanageable. From 1950 to April, 1961, I was in Bowmanville training school and from there I was transferred to the Ontario training school in Guelph. In January, 1962, I was released and went back to my parents for five months.

I then stole a car and was sentenced to six months definite and six months indeterminate in Guelph reformatory in August, 1962. In June, 1963, I was released from Guelph reformatory. From there I went to Hamilton and lived there until February, 1964, when I was sentenced again to 15 months definite and six months indeterminate for car theft.

I was taken back to Guelph reformatory where I was placed in lockup. The superintendent did not want me in the institution and was going to keep me locked up so I asked to be transferred to another institution, whereupon I was sent to Millbrook. It was upon my own request that I went to Millbrook reformatory.

Upon my arrival there I was given a pair of pyjamas and three blankets, and put in solitary confinement. I was in solitary for eight days and they took me in the front of 5 wing, which is the segregation area, where I spent another eight days. I was on a special diet at the time.

After 16 days they released me from solitary and gave me a job scrubbing floors on my hands and knees. I had this job for ten months. The inmates, when they are released from confinement, have a choice of either scrubbing floors or being locked up for 21 days.

They are allowed ten minutes in the morning for smoking in the yard, and again in the afternoon for ten minutes in the same yard.

At 6 p.m. they are allowed out of their cells for recreation facilities into a dark narrow quarter where the only recreation facilities are six decks of cards for 26 inmates, a pingpong table which can be used only by two at once, and nothing more. Inmates doing any great amount of time in this institution soon lose interest in cards and start sitting around doing nothing.

This unhealthy confinement saw no let-up except for a period of 7½ hours from November, 1964, to May 1, 1965, when they went out skating six times.

After doing three to six months on the scrub team, the inmate goes before the captain. The captain tells him he has a

choice of working in the laundry or the marker plant.

The inmates are forced to work on the punch presses in the marker plant by threats of transfer of good conduct remission. The environment breeds hatred, violence, homosexuality, drug addiction and fills the inmate with revenge. He is continually brooding about his time because he has nothing on his mind.

The public labours under the impression that the purpose of imprisonment is to rehabilitate. This, to my way of thinking, would include helping the inmate to receive an adequate education so that he can compete with today's high standards or teach him a trade so that the inmate can have a chance to get a decent job in the world, despite his record.

Millbrook reformatory does not provide any of these opportunities. Mr. X and Mr. Y and the higher-ups at Queen's Park have given the newspapers the impression that inmates at Millbrook are incorrigible.

Millbrook reformatory was designed in 1957 for unmanageable inmates at Oakland institution. Yet what kind of inmates do they have at Millbrook? Escapees from other institutions; drug addicts, homosexuals, and 17- and 18-year-old boys from Guelph who ask to be sent to Millbrook with the hope of coming out with a better reputation.

Mr. X also stated that there is no brutality in Millbrook. I know this to be untrue as I was present when many inmates have been beaten in Millbrook. In January, 1965, Mr. X—

This would identify him so I will leave it—

They brought Mr. so-and-so to take over the job. Mr. so-and-so stands 5 feet, 11 inches, and weighs about 190 pounds. Upon his arrival he wanted to set an impression on the inmates to show how rough he was. He would go around to the cells with two or three guards and walk up to young boys 17 to 18 years old and ask them if they would like to lose their teeth. This turned the inmates against the man because he was trying to show his authority—

Incidentally, where the name is involved I am just saying "man":

He thought he was another—who was thrown out in 1962 and the guards started praising him. The guards began writing out phony charges against the inmates, such as talking in the corridor, having a blanket on their mattresses in the morning,

swearing, and so on. The staff then began showing their authority too and began pushing inmates around.

It all began in the yard at smoke-up one day when X was out at smoke-up and a guard called him a "no-good so-and-so" and X grabbed the guard. Two guards then jumped on him from behind and got him down on the cement. He was then taken to 5 wing. The next morning before the—

I will have to read ahead to make sure that I am not embarrassing anyone here, Mr. Chairman, by identifying some officials.

A guard there was told to take this fellow to 5 wing. "I do not care how you get him there; use all the force you want on him." X then started walking down the corridor at a slow pace. Y hit him in the back of the head and told him to get moving faster. X kept walking slowly; Y kept pushing him. X got to the first grill, turned around and hit Y in the mouth. Z, a guard coming out of the squad room, went to jump on X from behind; X grabbed him by the tie and gave him a black eye.

He then brought the goon squad in; six guards grabbed X and threw him on the floor, put handcuffs on him, put shackles on his feet, kicked him in the ribs, punched him a couple of times until X lay on the floor putting up no resistance at all.

Then S came out of the squad room, saw X lying on the floor and kicked him in the head, cutting X's head open. He was then picked up and carried to 5 wing. I do not know what happened after that because I was still down there waiting to see the superintendent.

6. M came to Millbrook, a very quiet person. He would hardly speak to inmates and he would never talk to guards. The guards took it for granted that M was afraid of them.

They started laying phony charges on him. Every time there was any noise, anything wrong in the wing, M was charged for it. They pushed him until finally he rebelled. He was charged one morning for something called "making unnecessary noise in the wing." He was taken to 5 wing where he went willingly and was locked in a cell.

I believe M just got mad, tore his sink off the wall, smashed it, tore the toilet off the wall and smashed it. Three guards came into the wing, opened his cell and told him to come out. He came out with

no resistance, took his clothes off, put his pyjamas on, picked up more blankets and started walking back toward the hall.

The guy in charge of 5 wing came in and rather than from the front, went up behind him, grabbed him by the shoulder and then hit him in the mouth. The captain came running in with handcuffs and M was handcuffed and shackled. He was left on his stomach on the floor.

S sat on M's back, grabbed him by the hair and started banging his face on the cement floor. M could not open his eyes for about four weeks after that.

When he was let out of 5 wing on discharge after he was let out of the hole, he was put on the garden gang to work. He only had a couple of weeks left and Mr. Blank began riding him. He was going to charge him one day for not turning the dirt over correctly. He told M to go inside and M just stood there. Mr. Blank grabbed M by the shoulder and M hit Mr. Blank in the mouth, whereupon he fell to the ground. M walked over to still another guard. Mr. Blank took him inside and M was placed in 5 wing. He was later charged with "assault with a deadly weapon causing bodily harm."

Mr. Blank stated that M hit him with a shovel, which is an outright lie. This happened on April 30, 1965.

I went back to my wing that day from the marking plant where I was working and went into my cell where I had a picture of my wife with a plastic frame on it. The plastic frame was ripped and also my picture was ripped. I came out of my wing, got my tray and told Mr. So-and-so I wanted to see the captain. I thought I was asking him in a nice way. He answered by swearing at me. Then I swore at him and went back into my cell. After dinner they opened my cell, told me to get my blanket, that I was going to 5 wing. When I asked "Why?" they answered, "Never mind." I took my things and went.

When the captain came to see me, he told me I was charged with using profane language before a senior officer. I went the next morning about my charge. Mr. So-and-so was not there. I told Mr. So-and-so that I did not swear at the captain and that Mr. So-and-so had sworn at me. He called this guard in my office and he called me a liar to my face. I was remanded for one day.

I went back to 5 wing and told Mr. So-and-so that he had given me a phony

charge which had better be straightened out. To my way of thinking that was not a threat, but I thought things had gone too far.

The next morning I went back before Mr. So-and-so who sentenced me to indefinite detention. I left his office. I will admit that I was angry and Mr. So-and-so was the guard taking me back to 5 wing. He thought this was a big joke and while I was walking down the corridor he pushed me. I turned around and hit him in the mouth.

He backed up against the wall and started saying, "I don't want to fight." He was doing this to distract me because a couple of guards jumped me from behind, got me down in the corridor and put handcuffs and shackles on me and Mr. So-and-so started kicking me in the side. He carried me into 5 wing and put me on the floor where again Mr. So-and-so kicked me in the side of the head.

D, another inmate, was in his cell at this time in 5 wing and he witnessed it. He is back in Millbrook now doing more time and is still quite willing to testify to this matter. This was Friday. They then put me in the hole, still in handcuffs and shackles and the following Wednesday the superintendent still had not seen me as he was not back yet.

On that weekend, two more fellows were also in the back with me when they started smashing windows with scrub brushes and put things in the toilets until they started overflowing. I did not take part in this because I felt that I was already in enough trouble.

In the hole there are two steel doors before you enter the cell. This was at cleaning time in the morning. My door was open and I could see well through the keyhole. Mr. So-and-so came with two other guards and opened up So-and-so's cell, went in and started fighting with So-and-so. I did not see too much of this fight until it was over and So-and-so was sitting on the bed with handcuffs and shackles on him.

They then put him in a cell with no bed and they went to get this other chap. The same thing happened to this other chap and he was put into the cell with no bed. There are no windows in these cells.

On Tuesday of the next week, the superintendent came back to the hole. I did not know he was back there. I was standing up on my bed calling out through the window at still another person.

I will be very happy to give this to the hon. Minister afterwards. It is very difficult not to mention names here.

So-and-so ran into the cell and punched me in the mouth while I was still standing on the bed and this blow knocked me in the corner. He said something to the effect that I was a "no-good punk" and this would cost me all my good-conduct remission, which was roughly 61 days. He then punched me in the mouth a couple of times again, grabbed me by the head and bounced my head off the wall, cutting the side of my head open. He told still another person that if I opened my mouth he was going to go back and fix me so that I could not open my mouth again.

He left my cell and—

This is just hearsay—this is what it says:

—he punched so-and-so in the mouth along with still another fellow.

I lost 61 days for slapping a guard in the mouth because he was abusing me. I was kept in handcuffs and shackled for five days and nothing more was ever said about it. This is the kind of justice the inmates get at Millbrook.

On July 5 of this year five inmates at Millbrook—Dave White and his brother, and I don't know his first name but this is public knowledge, it was in the newspapers—set two fires in Millbrook reformatory as a last resort to get to Kingston penitentiary as they were doing from three to five years.

These fires concerned nobody else in the institution. While they were going on none of the inmates caused any commotion. They did as they were told. At noon on July 6 we were taken back to our wings from the scrub team and before going into our cells the guards asked us for our lighters. We did not question this as they said they would give us the lighters back later and would give us lights for our cigarettes.

When a wagon came in with the meals I was released from my cell and asked one of the guards if this was authorized by Queen's Park and he said it was. About half an hour after lunch three guards came in with tear gas masks and guns and put about 30 shells on the table. They yelled themselves hoarse saying, "Get away from your doors." At the same time they went around shooting tear gas at inmates' cells, not all at once. They carried it out for six days.

The reasons for the tear gas were not

known. One of the inmates decided he got it for lying on his bed reading a book. The inmate on the other side of me was standing at his door waiting for a light of a cigarette. The inmate across from me got it while he was using the washroom. Another inmate got it when he was told to stand at attention at his door and say "sir" three times. He got two doses at once. Three weeks later we read in the newspaper that we got tear gas for a riot.

We were then locked up in our cells for three weeks after. Mr. So-and-so came around the wing twice in all that time. I asked him why I got the tear gas and he said, "On account of your past record." He added that I had a charge in my record of assaulting one of the staff. I reminded him that I had been assaulted too.

We were never allowed outside our cells except for one shower a week during this time. This had an extremely bad effect on the inmates during this time. One was taken to a mental institution for a month, another to a mental hospital and he has not been seen since. Another inmate woke up in the middle of the night screaming; he was taken out and the remaining inmates were left extremely nervous. Many of them are not over it yet.

There was an investigation after the so-called riots. There were no outside people there. They were strictly investigators from Queen's Park. The five inmates who saw these people were the five inmates who set the fires. They were threatened to keep their mouth shut or get the maximum sentence for arson. After the investigation, the investigators sat around having tea with Mr. So-and-so.

When I was at Mimico clinic in September, 1965, Reverend West came over and saw me. He asked me questions about Millbrook and I answered them for him, whereupon a week later I was sent back to Millbrook. No reason was given for this except that I failed to respond to treatment.

So-and-so, an inmate at Millbrook, gave me a signed statement to be given to Mr. George Ben upon my release but as a result of Mr. So-and-so's influence in Millbrook the statement never reached Mr. Ben. So-and-so called me down, advising me not to make trouble for them when I got out on the street. I told him he was in no position to advise me while I was in there or on the street.

There are only about ten or 15 inmates at Millbrook who would talk to an investigation committee because they are afraid of the superintendent and the captain of Millbrook.

This is describing somebody:

He has only punishment in mind. If you are an informant, a good boy, a homosexual or a drug addict you can be sure that you are going to make your parole, not lose any good time and get along with Mr. So-and-so fine. If you are a group 1 inmate, a so-called incorrigible who is not afraid to speak your mind about the lack of recreation facilities, improper work programmes and many other items needed at Millbrook, you can be assured that you are in for a hard time at Millbrook.

In May, 1965, Mr. X came into the hole and assaulted me, in order that the ventilation be taken out of the hole so that the inmates could not call through the windows. The people who came to investigate some time in August arrived in the front office when Mr. So-and-so phoned another so-and-so and told him to place mattresses, sheets and pillows outside the inmate's cell in the hole. So-and-so brought this committee around himself and told them that the bedding had been there for the last couple of months. Immediately after the committee left these things were taken away and were not brought back for some weeks.

At the moment of this writing there is an inmate at Millbrook, who I think is one of the youngest ever to go into this institution. He is 17 years old and his name is So-and-so. He has problems and he needs help from a psychiatrist. He frequently cuts himself with razors and smashes his cell, and nothing is being done for him. He wants to go to Kingston as he is doing six years and he will not benefit doing this time at Millbrook.

There are no recreational facilities at all at this institution. Inmates sent there are doing anywhere from one to six years at present. There is one teacher to meet the requirements of almost 200 inmates. He has to teach grades 1 to 12. Those students who cannot get assistance from the teacher soon lose interest in what is going on and drop out.

Money given to an inmate released from Millbrook is \$40 regardless of time served over the year mark, and it is less for any time served under the year mark.

He is patted on the back and told they will see him soon. This sum of money is hardly enough to get the inmate living quarters, buy him clothes or keep him for a decent length of time to find suitable employment.

For the amount of work an inmate is required to do at Millbrook this should be considered illegal. The inmate should be permitted to do hobby crafts, which most other provincial institutions have. These crafts could be sold on the market and the money placed in his personal belongings. The rules and regulations at Millbrook state there is a facility for hobby craft available but I have never seen this. It is not true that if you have money you can buy a paint-by-number set.

There is no way for an inmate to keep in good physical condition, and as most inmates work in manual labour after a couple of years in Millbrook they find it almost impossible to do this kind of work upon release. Calisthenics are not permitted in the quarters nor in the sports field. The only facilities in the sports field are baseball and football. Inmates have no interest in these as there are no instructors there and they just lie around on PT period. A gymnasium would solve this problem. As this is considered too costly or impractical some substitute should be given in its place.

Recently they brought a Dale Carnegie course to Millbrook and it is doing the inmates a lot of good, but X in Queen's Park is considering having it taken out because the inmates were discussing institutional problems too much.

Mr. X has often had inmates before him calling them liars and every other name, but a letter to Queen's Park complaining about a health problem or an injustice is not permitted to be let out by Mr. So-and-so. It is amazing how Mr. So-and-so and the rest tried to work against still another So-and-so.

For this last person, it is difficult to read it this way, Mr. Chairman. This last person, to my way of thinking, goes out of his way to—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: May I suggest to the hon. member that I know he can go on indefinitely like this. He has pretty well made his point that he has a lot of inmates who have made charges of brutality against staff. I think this is the point he is attempting to make, and he has, you might call it, documented it with statements by inmates or ex-inmates. Is that the point?

Mr. Ben: Well, not quite, Mr. Chairman. Although I visited that institution only once, I spent all day in there from about eight o'clock in the morning until almost six o'clock at night. When I came out after having interviewed about 13 inmates, I made it quite clear to the reporter that I was making no charges as to brutality, and to this date I have not, Mr. Chairman. I stated I was satisfied that force was used, but I pointed out the force should be such force as necessary to enforce the normal regulations of the institution, and that the force could also be force in excess of that used to enforce the rules of the institution, or that it could be what is called brutality—completely inconsistent with any force that may be needed to enforce the rules. I said I had not been able to satisfy myself into which category this fell and I refused to make any allegations that there was brutality. All I wanted to point out—what I was trying to work around to after I received a sufficient number of these statements—is the need to have an independent commission go in there and investigate.

I am quite as aware as anyone else is that these people are in there for having committed some offence, and that they may be trying to support their own position in it. When I asked officials why nobody believed the inmates, they just said "Well, who believes them, they are criminals. We have to believe our guards. We have to maintain discipline." But when the hon. member for Durham gets up and tries to completely deny these things, I consider it completely inconsistent with the duty of a man who has such complaints brought to his attention.

I am not alleging that what this affidavit states is true. I have got a lot of these affidavits. A lot of them state the same thing.

All I am asking, sir, is that there be an independent judicial inquiry into what is going on in this particular institution.

Certain things are quite clear—that there is no rehabilitation programme in there. I have had complaints from people who did want to take a course, and did not want to work in the plate shop, and they were told it is a privilege to work in a plate shop and there it is, otherwise you just about do nothing. So this person, in order to have extra time to study, had to refuse to work in a plate shop so he would be put in the hole so he could then be put on a scrub team so he would have more time to study.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Does the hon. member believe that?

Mr. Ben: I neither believe nor disbelieve; I question everything.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member should not make a statement like that.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, I neither believe nor disbelieve. I had not mentioned this until the hon. member rose because I am still in the process of investigating this. I am still getting more statements and trying to find out what is the truth. I do not have the facilities of the hon. Minister at my disposal; I do not have about 20 or 30 people sitting there to do my work for me.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, they are all at the disposal of the hon. member. All he has to do is ask a question and he will get an honest answer.

Mr. Ben: Mr. Chairman, one of the things that is quite evident here is that if I did ask somebody from that particular staff to go and investigate they would not speak to the prisoners because it would be a waste of time. Your own staff member says this. I want somebody to go and speak to the prisoners, not just to the guards. I believe in the rule of law that both sides should have their day in court. Evidently the hon. Minister's department does not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will deal with that in a moment.

Mr. Ben: The hon. member for Durham speaks of the wonderful staff. I do not know whether he was in his seat or not the other day when I pointed out that at the time I was in this institution they had one full-time psychologist, who was taken on a year ago last September; one part time on the average of three times a month, and who gave a day to a day and a half at a time; and that they had just then appointed a psychiatrist and how much time he was going to spend there they did not know.

I asked how many people they had in this institution when it first opened. They had one supervising psychologist, two full-time psychologists, two full-time social workers, one part-time psychiatrist who gave eight consecutive days a month, and one part-time psychiatrist who gave a half a day a week. And the last time they had a comparable staff was three years ago—that would be three years ago from last October. Is the hon. member for Durham suggesting that this is progress, that things are becoming better there, that they have more facilities, when the staff is cut completely in half? It may be in his humble estimation, but it is not in mine.

I would suggest that perhaps the hon. member do spend some time there and speak with some of those inmates to find out exactly who is in that institution. Some of them may be hardened criminals—I do not deny that for a second, a lot of them may be hardened criminals—but when he tries to imply that those in group 2 and group 3 fall into the same category, then I say, shame, shame, shame. Because it is not so, Mr. Chairman.

There are a lot of things, and if my hon. friend wishes to come and see me after the House adjourns, I will be more than happy to whet his curiosity by showing him a lot of material that I have at my disposal. Perhaps he will not feel so eager to get up the next time and praise the work that the department is alleged to be doing at this particular institution.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Would the hon. member permit a question? Mr. Chairman, he made a big issue of how fair he wanted to be. I would like to ask the question: He has all sorts of affidavits from prisoners and ex-prisoners, I take it. Is that what he was reading?

Mr. Ben: Yes, I was.

Mr. Walker: Has the hon. member made any attempts whatever to get any type of affidavit from guards or supervisors?

Mr. Ben: My people have spoken to quite a number of guards and we have statements from guards, too, for the hon. member's information.

Mr. Walker: Why not read them in the House, just as well as the statements and the affidavits from the prisoners?

Mr. Ben: I am afraid to say they would be just as damaging.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a comment on the issue that has been raised by the hon. member for Bracondale and I will go back for a couple of brief comments on the observations of the hon. member for Durham.

I suggest to the hon. Minister that if any member of this Legislature—indeed, if anybody—becomes persuaded and is able to secure through sworn affidavits the allegations that there has been brutality in any institution, it becomes an obligation—in the interest of the running of these institutions—of the powers-that-be to resolve this issue.

So that I can deal with it as dispassionately as possible, let me go back to try to make my

case in another context altogether. Many hon. members of the House may well have seen "This Hour has Seven Days" and its portrayal of what goes on in Kingston penitentiary, about two or three weeks ago. In a subsequent programme, they brought Commissioner McLeod onto the programme and they queried him with regard to the allegations of brutality that went on in that institution.

Commissioner McLeod's comment was that if there was an allegation on the part of any prisoner that he has been treated in a brutal fashion by a guard, this was investigated. Then the query quite rightly was put to him by the interrogator, "Well, who does the investigation? Is it done by somebody in the institution or is it done by somebody who is not involved on one side or another and therefore conceivably is going to come up with some objective assessment of the validity of it?"

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that with the kind of evidence that has been presented in the House here, if the hon. Minister really wants to resolve this, if the Minister really wants to find out, perhaps unbeknown to himself, that brutality has been going on among his staff—because this happens in institutions if you have a staff who are of a grade 8 or 9 level of education, and I speak now in an academic sense; sometimes people are attracted to these positions because they have sadistic tendencies, they like to exert authority, and there are many books, many studies, that indicate that this kind of thing happens in institutions—I suggest that when the hon. Minister is presented with evidence and sworn affidavits, it is his responsibility to get to the truth of the matter because he may discover that more of it is going on than he thinks is the case. I think it is in his interest to make certain that it is not going on. That is all I want to say about that.

I want to go back for a couple of brief comments on the observations of the hon. member for Durham. I was interested in his assertion, which apparently is now not true, namely, that Millbrook is an institution filled with people who are misfits from other institutions and have been moved there because they represented a serious behaviour problem and were troublemakers in other institutions.

Mr. Chairman, historically the hon. member is correct. Millbrook was built as a monument to the bankruptcy of this department in earlier years. This department had so many troublemakers in other institutions because of their punitive approach, because of their complete failure in rehabilitation, that they had

real problems. They had riots in Guelph; every third or fourth year there was another riot. Therefore, rightly or wrongly, they thought, "Perhaps we are going to solve our problem by getting the worst behaving instances and cases in the other institutions out, and we will put them all in one high-security institution." And they built Millbrook as a high-security institution, to which they could bring all of the bad actors from other institutions.

That was the historical explanation given to us in this House for the building of Millbrook in the first instance. It is interesting that now apparently it is not true. One-third of the people in Millbrook are there because they were bad actors in other institutions and were causing trouble. The other two-thirds are in categories that are sent there directly, because apparently the institution is being used more and more for these specific purposes—alcoholics, addicts and so on.

Mr. Ben: One-third are sent directly.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, it is still, then, living up to little better than half of its historical purpose, if I have the fractions now correct.

But, Mr. Chairman, in my view—and I am only expressing what many people said at the time Millbrook was built—Millbrook was a mistake. I think we were on the eve of a report from Ottawa, the Fauteux commission—indeed I think the Fauteux commission was down, if my memory serves me correctly at that point, and therefore if it were going to be implemented, all of the longer sentences would be separated out for high-security incarceration under federal jurisdiction and we in Ontario would have, in effect, the less-than-six-months or short-term offenders treated in provincial institutions.

I personally think it was a mistake that Millbrook was built at that time. It was an institution built for a bygone period, and if Ottawa and Ontario could ever get together and implement the Fauteux commission report, then in my view Millbrook should be handed over to the federal government. Millbrook is a high-security institution and it would therefore be the kind of institution that will be required for the kind of inmates they are going to attempt to cope with. We will be left with training schools and the short-term offenders. That is the first observation I wanted to make on the comments of the hon. member for Durham.

The second one is this question of putting an institution in an isolated community. Unwittingly the hon. member for Durham may

well have proved once again that Millbrook was a mistake. I am not persuaded that it is wise to put an institution of this nature out in a rural community.

As a matter of fact, the hon. Minister earlier has indicated that they made a mistake when all of the hon. Cabinet Ministers jumped up like jacks-in-the-boxes when we had a crisis in Elliot Lake a few years ago. They all came up with a solution, and in that crash programme The Department of Reform Institutions announced an institution in Elliot Lake, which the hon. Minister says was a mistake because they have not got the facilities. So they have closed it down.

You may recall a year or so ago that quite a storm broke all across the country with regard to a federal government decision that they were going to build a female institution in Cornwall. What was the focus of the protest, Mr. Chairman? It was that Cornwall, if the hon. member from that area will not be too shocked, was too isolated for this kind of an institution.

Mr. O. F. Villeneuve (Glengarry): Politics!

Mr. MacDonald: No, it was not politics. A few minutes ago you had a colleague to your right, who got up and extolled the Elizabeth Fry society. The Elizabeth Fry society quite rightly said that if you are going to have a female institution that is going to attempt intensive rehabilitative work it should be close to universities and larger hospitals which have large staffs of the various services that are required on a part-time basis; because you cannot, in a relatively small institution, have a big staff of psychiatrists and psychologists.

Mr. Villeneuve: The Hon. Lionel Chevrier mentioned Cornwall could be a chosen area. This was political only.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, I am not sure what the hon. gentleman said but let me not be distracted from my point at the moment. The point was made by professionals in the picture, dispassionate observers of the scene, that Cornwall was too isolated a community—not in the sense that it was isolated like Millbrook but that it was away from the facilities and the modern disciplines that are required to do a job. I think, if you are going to have a relatively small institution of 200 to which you cannot attract these top disciplines on a full-time basis, that inevitably it has got to be close enough to universities and larger hospitals which have psychiatrists and other professional staff.

The reason why I said the hon. member unwittingly proved the case that Millbrook was a mistake was that I think it may also be a mistake to put it in a small rural community. I grew up in a small rural community, and I know that in a small rural community everybody knows everybody's business down to some of the most intimate details—much more so than an individual getting lost in a big metropolitan area. I can quite understand that there may well be a good deal of validity in the proposition of the hon. member for Durham, that when these stories get out—and there may be more truth in the stories than we would like to believe—the children in the school are going to say—

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): No more than you want to believe.

Mr. MacDonald:—"Your father is involved in this kind of thing." If you were living in the city this kind of a problem would not be eliminated completely but it would be less likely to occur.

My conclusion on this point, with regard to isolated communities, is that I think in the future we should study the kind of comments that were made in the proposal for an institution in Cornwall. We should study the kind of experience we have had in institutions like Millbrook, situated in a rural community; and my guess at the moment is that we will come to the conclusion that they should not be placed there in the future.

Mr. Carruthers: Mr. Chairman, we could debate this all afternoon and all day tomorrow, but I wish to clarify my position in this respect. It is a little different perhaps for members in a large metropolitan area. Guards at Millbrook reformatory are people I know, and know personally; after all these are my constituents. I know them, and I know the part they are playing in the community. One young man came to see me not long ago; he was promoted steadily in that institution and he only has a grade 9 education. His personal attributes—understanding and sympathy for the downtrodden—have given him the opportunity to advance in penal reform.

The Peterborough *Examiner* said at the top of its newspaper article that it had the names of the officials who were connected with these statements, and that Mr. Grossman had refused to allow them to be interviewed. I commend the hon. Minister for this, Mr. Chairman, because why should these individuals—and perhaps I am biased because I know them personally—have their names dragged into the open theatre of

public controversy when there is no justification whatsoever for any misdoing on their part? It has never been proven, outside of affidavits from inmates. I have two articles here, that I could quote, from the Port Hope *Evening Guide*, of two court cases where two of these inmates were brought up in court and given consecutive terms—both cases of assaulting officers in the Millbrook reformatory. In one case, I understand, he hit the guard over the head with a shovel.

I am well aware of another case, and this was planned, where when the inmates were let out of the cells, three consecutive cells, each inmate hit the officer as he came out. There is no opportunity for the guards to take action outside of bringing them into court, and they say to the custodial officer, "Go ahead, take me into court, take me into court," because they know, as I said in the first part of my remarks, that they will have the opportunity of going to Kingston.

I do not quarrel with the hon. member for Bracondale. I appreciate his views and I appreciate the fact, perhaps, that my information is not correct with respect to the inmates who have refused rehabilitation. There may be cases, and this is not my information, who are placed in Millbrook who have not refused to take rehabilitation. But his statement that I said that these men were not willing to take rehabilitation is not correct.

I wish to repeat what I said. The residents of the institution are individuals who refused rehabilitation in other centres. I may be wrong, if your information is correct. I stated all of them; there may be just two-thirds of them. But I did say that they were like children starting school; and, as a teacher, I am well aware of the fact that you must go back to the basic knowledge that that child has, or that individual has, and this I understand is the programme at Millbrook.

This is why the operation of the Braille shop and the operation of the marker plant are designed to give them an idea of what jobs really mean. I think if a person, an individual, gets an idea of what a job is, and has developed some sense of responsibility, then he is in a better position to rehabilitate himself—and also the institution and department are in a better position to do something for him.

But I do wish to state that these custodial officers are people of the Millbrook community, people for whom I have the highest regard. Many of them are leaders in public welfare programmes. You cannot make me

believe that these statements—I do not care whether there are affidavits or not—are true of individuals whom I meet in everyday life and know personally well.

Mr. Ben: I will only take a second, Mr. Chairman. I just want to correct a misunderstanding, perhaps. I may have made the statement that we have spoken to guards. We have only spoken to ex-guards, because of the oath of secrecy. There is only one guard that we did speak to by telephone, and when he stated he was still on staff that was the end of the telephone conversation. The people on staff take an oath of secrecy and we have not spoken to any who are presently on staff.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, first I would not like to forget to thank the hon. member for Victoria for having taken the trouble of reading that very complimentary bulletin from the Elizabeth Fry society. Hon. members know that I would be much too modest to read it myself, particularly since it was suggested to me the other day that I might have gotten someone else to read some of the things I did read—although in this particular instance, I can assure them that it was entirely unsolicited.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Durham has shown, quite properly, a great concern for his constituents and I want to impress upon the hon. members the seriousness of his concern. I visited Millbrook last week, because of the situation which was developing insofar as the morale of the staff is concerned. I would hope I could convince the hon. members that this is not just a point I am trying to make just for the sake of making a point. They are undergoing what is almost, in effect, a reign of terror. The hon. member for Durham is quite correct. It is a terrible situation.

The inmates, realizing all of this publicity and all of this agitation is going on outside the institution, are taking advantage of it. They know perfectly well that staff is not allowed to raise a hand to an inmate, except with the necessary force required to subdue any particularly vicious action or any unruly action on the part of the inmates. Knowing this, they needle the staff, and the staff was very much incensed when I was there and insisted that, in spite of the provocation, this rule must be adhered to. I do not think it takes too much imagination on the part of the hon. members of this House to realize what can happen in a penal institution when such a situation occurs. And before any hon. member of this House, or anybody,

makes any statements until they have been satisfied that they are true, I think they should consider this, because those statements in fact are irresponsible until they have been established as being factual. Because a tremendous amount of damage has been done in the meantime, and this is what is going on in Millbrook today.

I sympathize entirely with the hon. member for that constituency because he, of course, is the recipient of the complaints from the people who work in Millbrook, the staff there, who are going through these very trying times.

Now the hon. member for Bracondale—I think first we should explain to the hon. member about the people who go to Millbrook. This has been said before, but I think it is worth repeating: you have in Millbrook the one real maximum security institution in our whole system and I think approximately three to five per cent of all of those offenders in our institutions are in Millbrook today.

These are the real bad actors, the real tough customers, the wheels, the group one, the men who will not behave themselves in other institutions. They refuse to abide by any regulations, do not care at all about the privileges they are losing, and as a matter of fact, in an effort to prove they are real tough guys, want to show the other inmates they do not give a hang about regulations for staff or any of the privileges.

And as the hon. member himself has mentioned, and as anybody in this work knows, some of them will deliberately act up, to be able to go to Millbrook so that they can act out the character of being a big shot and a big wheel.

If we did not have Millbrook where it is, we would have to have it some place else. You have to have a maximum security institution, because if you leave these people in the other institutions, no matter how well you attempt to run them, they destroy your rehabilitation efforts with the other inmates. That seems to me to be fairly elementary.

Mr. MacDonald: Even after implementing the Fauteux report?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: That is another matter altogether, although I suppose even if we are left with only the six month cases, you would wind up with some people who even though they are only serving six months, will still be troublesome. They will abide by no rules or regulations. Something else will have to be done for them. You would have to have a special institution for them.

But really, if we wait for the implementation of the Fauteux report, I think we may all be old men. I hope not, but there does not seem to be any real action in that respect.

However, there are approximately 100 in the group one, that is, the behaviour problem inmates. The others are drug addicts and sex deviates.

Now the only reason the drug addicts and the sex deviates are there is—well, it is obvious about the drug addicts. You have got to make sure that contraband is not as easily available as it might be in some open institution.

Insofar as the sex deviates are concerned, in most instances you have to have them in the maximum security institutions for their own protection, because there would be some terrible situations in the other institutions if you did not do that.

Insofar as treatment for the sex deviates is concerned, as hon. members already know, we have opened a clinic at Mimico and we hope to be able to accomplish something by way of curing some of these people. Hon. members will note I said, I hope we will be able to. This is a difficult area. Everyone I am sure appreciates that. We do what we can in that respect.

The hon. member for Bracondale, in spite of his great deal of research, made some statements which I think establish the fact that his research leaves a great deal to be desired. There are no alcoholics as such in Millbrook. There are behaviour problems who have in addition an alcohol problem, but they are not there because they are alcoholics, they are there because they are behaviour problems.

Now, in any case, in some of the things the hon. member for Bracondale brought up, he skirts the question which the hon. member for Durham has raised—the concern about the charge that the staff at Millbrook in fact are brutal. No amount of waffling is going to get away from that. The charge is there, whether the term applied is brutal or whether it is something else which means the same thing. As a matter of fact, in his maiden speech in this House, he stated: “If I have ever met anything as inhuman as this, short of a way,”—I do not know what that means—“I do not know where. These people were trapped like rabbits in a dead end burrow and for five days they got gas. Now is that humane treatment?” he asks.

Now you cannot, on the one hand, surely, Mr. Chairman, say that somebody is inhumane and acting in an inhumane fashion and is not brutal. You are saying exactly

the same thing. Now either they are guilty of brutality or they are not. And, Mr. Chairman, I deny that. Strongly and most emphatically. The staff in our institutions do not act in an inhumane or brutal fashion in any way, shape or form.

Mr. MacDonald: Have you had an investigation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well now, we will go into that in a moment. You ask if we have had an investigation. Mr. Chairman, again the mention was made of the fact that we used gas and the gas seeped into other cells of people to whom it was not meant to apply. Of course this will happen. But the amount of harm done as a result was little.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Did they use gas? That is the question I would like answered.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Did they use gas? Of course they used gas. We have gone into that before. Gas is the best way to control a situation which may be getting out of hand and it is the most humane way. It is better than sending in burly guards, or anyone of that nature, to beat people up, or use rifles or shooting or anything of that nature. Obviously, if you try to restrain them by force, rather than gas, you are going to get into more fights and then the charge will be that our people are brutal. Because somebody is going to get hurt. And if somebody is going to get hurt, I would hope it would not be the members of the staff.

If anybody is going to get hurt, if there has to be someone hurt, in controlling anybody by force, I would hope it would be the inmate rather than the staff.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was an implication that we only hired a psychologist. We have had a full-time psychologist at Millbrook for two years and he was there at the time. He was there at the time of the riot.

Mr. Ben: A psychiatrist.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, we have a difficult time getting psychiatrists—the hon. member said “psychologist,” as far as I can recall.

He almost made the suggestion, for example, that our people used tear gas on someone who was “doing nothing really, except lying on his bed.” In fact, the statement made was: “They used tear gas, according to the inmate’s statement, which the hon. member read, “because he was doing nothing except lying on his bed.”

Surely, the hon. member does not believe that our staff would inject gas into a cell merely because the man was lying on his bed? This is ridiculous! You could never get anybody to believe that.

Now, insofar as the specific charges which the hon. member has made, we have been able to identify some of these cases by some of the case histories that the hon. member has brought out, and I will deal with these when we come back at 8 o’clock.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves that the committee of supply rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 9, by Mr. J. P. Spence,

Resolved,

That, legislation be enacted to permit school boards located in cash crop areas of the province to extend the summer holiday for high school students by one week, such week to be recovered during the school year or at the beginning of the summer holidays in the following year, in order to provide a maximum labour force for farmers harvesting cash crops.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): I move, seconded by Mr. Bukator, resolution No. 9 standing in my name which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this resolution is to help to overcome the shortage of a select labour force in the harvesting of crops in the province of Ontario. As you know, we have had a shortage of experienced labour in both 1964 and 1965 in harvesting cash crops in the province of Ontario. This has resulted in losses to many cash-crop farmers during the past two years. This industry, I would like to stress, Mr. Speaker, is a multimillion-dollar one and is of crucial importance to the economy of this province and of this country.

This year there were many articles in the press about labour shortages in connection with the automobile agreement of the United

States. New car-parts industries are being located in our cities, towns and rural areas, to which, Mr. Speaker, I have no objections whatsoever. We are pleased to see them develop there. The rates of wages paid by these industries are considerably higher than can be paid by the cash-crop farmers, because the prices of their products are considerably higher.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the cash-crop farmer cannot afford to pay the wages industries are paying. Naturally the labour force is going to work where it will receive the highest rate of pay, which is only reasonable for it to do. We do know that a great effort has been made by the national employment service and The Department of Agriculture, over the past year, to improve the shortage. Again this year, this will result in considerable loss to the cash-crop farmer, if there is not more done.

Too often, valuable crops have rotted in the ground because the farmer cannot get sufficient labour. Many farmers want to know this year, Mr. Speaker, before they plant their crops, whether or not they will be able to hire experienced labour to harvest them. As you know, it costs hundreds of thousands of dollars to grow these crops and if the farmer has no assurance that he can hire experienced help, then he is going to think twice before planting. He does not want to suffer another financial loss.

Many high school students have worked in the harvesting of cash crops. They have proved to be very satisfactory. I know of a cash-crop farmer who this past year employed only high school students, but when the school term opened, they all returned to school and this left the farmer with a portion of his crops not harvested. So while the farmer found high school students very good workers, he still suffered losses because they had to return to school before the completion of the harvest.

After the students returned to school, the farmer had to try to secure other workers, but this was impossible to do because there was no supply of labour available. This resulted in further losses.

The first consideration of the farmer, of course, Mr. Speaker, is his home. He dislikes keeping the young men and women out of school in order to help with the harvest, but he is forced to do this because he does not want his losses to mount. As it is, with the vast shortage of experienced labour, his losses are great indeed.

As I said, cash-crop farmers face a labour famine for the third time this year. These

conditions, obviously, will boost the prices of cash crops—tomatoes, corn, fruit, onions, spinach and other vegetables—to the consumer right across the province of Ontario. We may be forced, Mr. Speaker, if these conditions continue to exist, to import more of these products which will, again, increase the cost to the housewife and which will add another increase in prices to the homeowner.

Many of our high school students work during the summer in cash-crop farming to earn their spending money. If they do not work their parents have to supply them with this money. With the serious shortage of experienced farm help, these students could earn hundreds of thousands of dollars more by the extension of the holidays by one week. This would mean a great deal to their parents; this would certainly help the cash-crop farmer, and, Mr. Speaker, if he cannot get labour, he is just not going to grow these crops.

Let us not forget that food is essential and if we do not grow these crops ourselves, we will have to import them, which will certainly be a blow to our economy and a hardship on the housewife and the homeowner, who find the cost of the products high as it is.

I hope that this Legislature will give consideration to this resolution. It leaves some discretion in the hands of the school boards in the cash-crop areas. If there was a shortage of experienced labour, the boards could extend the holiday season by one week, and the time would be made up at the end of the school term so as not to lose any school time. There is no reason why all of the children in the province must have the same holidays as those in Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Speaker, I was told by some mothers and fathers that they were very concerned about keeping their sons and daughters home from high school to complete the cash-crop harvest. They went to see the principals in some areas and asked them to give some consideration to have the school do review work the first week, so that their sons and daughters who had to stay home for the harvest would not get behind, grow discouraged and become some of those dropouts of whom we have heard so much over the past number of years in this Legislature.

This is one reason for placing this resolution on the order paper. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am in favour of the best possible education for every boy and girl in this province and I would not have any part in depriving any high school student

of an education in any way. This resolution means that no school time will be lost, Mr. Speaker; the extra week of holidays will be made up during the school term or at the end of the school year.

The decision on holidays is left in the hands of the district high school boards because they know local conditions best.

One more point, Mr. Speaker, is that in this day a high school student has to have pocket money to attend high school. He has to buy many more things than when I attended high school.

In conclusion let me say we must make sure the economy is bolstered rather than dealt another blow. I sincerely hope that this government will give favourable consideration to this resolution, as the future happiness of thousands could be affected.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, there are so many factors involved in the issue that the hon. member has raised in this resolution that I must frankly say at the outset that I have not got them reconciled in my mind. I look forward to what other hon. members in the House will have to say in this debate to see if we can get some resolving of them.

I think there are two basic factors which have to be balanced. On the one hand there is the educational need of the young people and on the other one there are the labour needs in the cash-crop area. I would concede immediately to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken that the problem faced by the cash-crop farmers is an increasingly difficult one. I wonder, however, whether we have explored, as fully as possible, alternative solutions to this. There is no doubt that the reason it has been difficult to get labour for the cash crops has been partly, in the past, because of the low wage offered. Therefore the difficulty in competing in a labour market, particularly if that labour market is one in which job opportunities are much greater elsewhere, is one aspect of this phase of the subject.

There is also another one—a few years ago, a great deal of concern emerged in church circles, in press circles—I can remember the *Toronto Telegram* carrying a series of articles with regard to the conditions of workers who came in for a short period of time during the harvesting of the crop in the tobacco area. Conditions were such that these responsible people became disturbed and were voicing protests to the government and asking that something should be done about it. There were proposals for a

number of things, such as temporary housing facilities, which would make it attractive for workers.

I do not think that we in this House have considered these other aspects of how you might meet the market supply without the necessary threat of encroaching on the educational needs of the young people. Certainly, since that protest some two or three years ago, we have had no further discussion in the House and I think it would be interesting to have a report from the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) or the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) as to whether they feel they have gone as far as they can in this particular direction.

Without any hesitation I would say this, Mr. Speaker: If I have to choose between meeting the needs of any industry, even as important an industry as the cash-crops industry, and making certain that I am not seriously endangering the educational needs of the young people, I know what my choice would be—namely, there would be no endangering of the educational needs of the young people. In fact, it is that which makes me wonder, without coming to any final conclusion at the moment, as to the alternatives that the hon. member has suggested in advancing this resolution.

He says, for example, that you could catch up on lost time later in the school year. Now, having taught school more years ago than I care to confess, I think this is rather difficult to fit in. At the end of the term I think there are equal difficulties. I do not think it is a case just of posing rural children vis-à-vis metropolitan area children.

It seems to me, when you get into big district high schools, that your big district high schools operate like a metropolitan school to a very great extent. They have got their own schedules; those schedules are dovetailed with the schedules that have to be laid down for examinations in certain grades—certainly in grade 13. And whether or not it is a practical proposition to say that in one school, because some of the students are needed in the cash-crop industry, that you can rearrange the schedules of the whole student body and take a week at the beginning of the school year and put it at the end, I just am not certain.

Quite frankly I have some grave doubts, and I would like to have the comments of people in The Department of Education and, indeed, some of the comments of people in the educational field whose first concern would be the education of the children—even out in the district high schools, out in

that area—before I would come to a final conclusion on that.

My basic point, Mr. Speaker, is that I think we have got to go carefully on this proposition of encroaching, for a variety of reasons, more and more on the school year. I think I am correct in stating that the general consensus is that, if anything, our school year is not long enough. Certainly I am constantly running into people who say that the summer holiday is unnecessarily long. If you want to look into the studies of children, for example, in Soviet Russia and some of the other countries of the world whose educational systems presumably are more effective, you will find that their school year certainly is not for ten months of the year or nine-and-a-half months of the year; it goes on for ten-and-a-half or eleven months of the year. In short, I think there is considerable validity in the proposition that our school year, if anything, is too short already.

You have here a proposition that we should take off a week to meet the cash-crops requirements. I was interested in reading the report that was prepared by the Ontario economic council on Ontario's tourist industry, to find that among the recommendations there is a recommendation that schools in Ontario should open the second day after Labour Day, not the first day after Labour Day, the reason being that this would extend the tourist season for another week. The concluding part of the recommendation is that high school principals have agreed that little, if any, educational benefits would be lost by one day later opening—but have openly confessed that they were reluctant to support it because the public and school board members might feel that they were merely trying to reduce their own workload.

Well, quite apart from whether or not that is a valid argument, here you have the tourist industry wanting to pick off a day or so there; the cash-crop industry wants to pick off a week here. What are we going to have left—and in an educational year that is already too short?

In brief, Mr. Speaker, I sit down and look forward to what other hon. members have to say—I may have to read it because I shall have to leave for another engagement shortly. I am open-minded on this issue, although I tend to regard it with some doubt.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to commend my hon. colleague from the eastern part of the

great county of Kent for his interest in this matter.

I think my first observation would be this: Perhaps he has exaggerated the problem somewhat, insofar as last fall was concerned. My observation, and particularly with regard to tomatoes, would be that most of the tomatoes, if not all, were taken off. I am not minimizing the problem—I think it is going to be more serious this year and I will develop that particular line of my thinking—but I think perhaps it was exaggerated a little bit last fall.

Having said that, I would agree most wholeheartedly that we are facing a serious problem. Agriculture in Kent county is an \$80-million industry. It is a very important industry. And it obviously provides a livelihood for a great number of people, and represents a very large investment, and one in which we, as members of this Legislature, have a large interest.

I think the hon. member for Kent East pointed out that he made representation—perhaps he did not point this out—but he made representation to the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) last August for a week's extension, and the hon. Minister of Education turned this proposal down. Now I am not a farmer in any sense of the word, Mr. Speaker. I have the honour to represent a number of the members of the farming community, and I lean rather heavily on the advice which is so freely given by members of the press from time to time and by members of the farming community to the press; and I was interested at that time to read an article in the *Chatham News* after the hon. member for Kent East had made this recommendation to the hon. Minister of Education.

Written in the *Chatham* paper on the farm page—it is a very excellent page which appears weekly—by the full-time agricultural writer of the *Chatham News*, was this, quoted in part:

If a tomato or tobacco farmer is just now realizing—

the date of this was September 3:

—is just now realizing, after the start of high school next week, that he will be faced with a shortage of labour, then we say it is his problem. Surely farmers in Kent and Essex counties realize by now that the school year always commences shortly after Labour Day. Agricultural officials early this spring have been emphasizing a need to plan in advance their labour requirements. The national employment service have gone to great lengths to supply requests and still the big screech has

gone up this week by some absent-minded country cousins who claim their crops will rot on the land if students are not granted extra time off to help with the harvest.

The Department of Education officials in Toronto have refused the request by John Spence of Muirkirk for a week's delay in starting the school year in Kent and Essex. They claim the school year is fixed by The Department of Education Act and therefore it cannot be changed by the Legislature when it is not in session. One official said a similar request for a deferral had been received from a school in Delhi but was turned down for the same reason.

And this, I think, is the interesting part:

We are in total agreement with Richard Whittington, chairman of the Chatham board of education—

which includes a number of rural students; I think something like a third of the high school students in Chatham come from the rural areas:

—who claims schools should commence on the date set down in The Education Act unless there is a real emergency, such as war. In our opinion, we can't see how anyone could consider an emergency the fact that students will have to turn from farm work to school work next week. Again we repeat that those farmers that will be left holding the bag have no one to blame but themselves. It will, perhaps, be a good lesson for them.

Now I do not altogether agree with all those sentiments. I think he was a little bit hard on some members of the farming community in it, but I must say that I agree with the proposition enunciated by the chairman of the Chatham board of education that school hours and school time of starting should not be meddled with.

I think my colleague, the hon. member for Kent East has overlooked one factor. He says extend the term. Well, he is as well aware as I am that in June and July the farmers in Kent county are looking and looking very hard for people to pick strawberries, they are looking for people to cut asparagus, and I would say we may solve one problem but you are only going to create another problem at the other end.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Pretty soon the hon. member will want to cut a week off each end.

Mr. McKeough: That is right, that is exactly my fear and I think it is the fear of

your hon. leader. I think, Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member for York South, that there are other solutions. And I think those other solutions should be explored. I said that we should not meddle with hours or time, and I really meant dates rather than hours of the day because I do not want to—and I am sure the hon. member for Kent East and the hon. member for Essex South (Mr. Paterson) does not want to—get into any sort of a discussion at any length about daylight saving time. If there is one subject which politicians try to avoid in south-western Ontario it is daylight saving time. It has been a bugaboo for a number of years.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Why?

Mr. McKeough: That is a good question: why? However, it was interesting this year after this matter had been raised, and raised by the hon. member for Kent East, that the president of the federation of agriculture in Kent county came out and endorsed the extension of daylight saving time to the end of October, which is the way the rest of the world has daylight saving. In Kent county we have done it on a little different basis and sometimes end it on Labour Day. But he favoured daylight saving time and he did so because he pointed out that there were a number of high school students who then had another hour of daylight to work after 4.00 or after 3.30 in the fields and they took off, in his opinion, a great number of tomatoes during those hours after school hours.

This is perhaps one solution. I do not want to be quoted as saying, and I do not want it to be suggested, that I am recommending to the good people of Kent county or Essex that perhaps we should go on double daylight saving time, but it is a solution, a partial solution.

The hon. member for York South mentioned conditions and I do not know that much about the tobacco area. But I do know in our own area in Essex and Kent there has been a great increase in the conditions provided for itinerant workers.

The canning companies, most of them, have provided really quite good accommodation for people who come in and I do not think that is the problem that it once was. However, I think that there is close co-operation between the marketing boards, the fruit and vegetable marketing boards, between the local agricultural representatives and between the national employment service. I think that this co-operation can be improved and I think it will have to be improved.

We have had a considerable amount of success in Kent county in bringing in some of our Indian citizens to work in farm labour and in the canning factories. In some cases this has worked well. In other cases, for example, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Welch) tells me that it does not work well in Lincoln. But I think this is something that we have to work with and continue to work with, perhaps with refinements in conditions, refinements on who is brought in—by the national employment service.

I do not say this critically—I think if somebody in the Maritimes said that they were unemployed and they would like to work in southwestern Ontario, I believe they have been put on a bus or a train and sent to southwestern Ontario.

Many of them have ended up going right on back because they have been laid off and they just have not been up to the work in the plants. It is not just on the farms. As my hon. friend knows; the factories have a problem at this time of the year, and these people have not been up to physically working in the plants. I think perhaps the national employment service has to refine its thoughts in this area and not just send in people just because they are unemployed in some other part of our country.

I think really one of the best solutions to this problem is the use of offshore labour. I attended a meeting last year with our own officials in the department, which was arranged by the hon. member for Lincoln; the hon. member for Essex South was there as were the fruit and vegetable people from the Niagara peninsula and they were most keen. They were here in these buildings to ask the support of the hon. members and the hon. Minister in particular that people should be brought in from Jamaica. They were willing to come in. And I think, mind you, this is a two-way street.

Not only are we providing farm labour but by bringing in people from Jamaica, who presumably will be from farms, many of those people are going to go back to Jamaica, or wherever these areas may be. If we can bring them in and teach them something about how we farm—and we obviously farm at a very high level—then I think we have accomplished something and not only just looked after our own labour problems.

As the hon. member for Essex South well knows, the federal Minister of Immigration said “no” and so no offshore labour was brought in.

Now the hon. member for Essex South

and the hon. member for Kent East are somewhat closer to the hon. Minister of Immigration than I am and perhaps they can prevail on him to seek a solution to the problem of farm labour through this avenue.

I think we are going to hear talk in this Legislature not only during this session but for the next several sessions, not only about the shortage of labour on farms, but about shortage of labour generally in this province and we have now less than 3 per cent unemployment.

My colleague, the hon. member for Kent East, pointed out that we have new industries. I would just say this; in the city of Chatham with a population of 31,000 people, there have been three new industries which have broken ground in the last six months and they will employ over 1,000 people. I do not know where these people are going to come from.

Really we are on the outskirts and will certainly be affected by the Ford plant at Talbotville. Where these people are going to come from I do not know. I suspect many of them are going to come from the existing small farm labour force.

I suppose I could say that this problem, the shortage of farm labour, is no more than the shortage in other areas. I am not sure whether it is or not. I think we must bear in mind that we do have this low rate of unemployment in Ontario and this is undoubtedly indicative and a result of the good government which we enjoy in this province.

An hon. member: Give credit to Ottawa.

Mr. McKeough: My hon. friends over here say to give credit to Ottawa. Well, certainly credit is due to Ottawa, but we must point out that the combination of Ottawa and good government here has produced the lowest rate in this province, not in some of the other provinces.

I just want to make one further point because I think this is part of the problem. My hon. friend from York South mentions farm wages, and certainly at one point they were low. But I think there is a misconception in some areas about some types of farm labour, and my hon. friends from Essex South and Kent East know this, that a good tomato picker for example—and this is back-breaking work—but a good tomato picker will make \$35 and \$40 a day. These have to be people who are prepared to work hard and who have had experience. But there is somewhat of a misconception that farm labour is all paid at a low rate and that the conditions are all poor.

I do not think this is as true now as it once was.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): How long is a day?

Mr. McKeough: It is a long day—eight and ten hours—and I would agree it is a long day. They will probably work six and seven days a week in that period.

Let me just make one further point. The hon. member for Kent East says he is worried. He ended up on these remarks and perhaps I am paraphrasing him, but he expressed the thought that if high school students were not released—and I may be jumping over some of his points—it could only lead to higher farm prices to the consumer.

I say to my hon. friend and I say to the hon. members of the House that perhaps we have to think in terms of farm prices going a little bit higher so that farmers can pay more to solve their labour problems. I for one think that we as members of this House should not just advocate \$4 milk; we have got to be prepared to say we are prepared to pay for the price of \$4 milk.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): This is Cabinet material.

Mr. McKeough: Oh, yes! thank you.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would just say this. I do not think that this is really a very satisfactory solution to the problem. I think there are other answers which are better. I hope they will be explored by the appropriate officials of this government and of the government of Canada, and I would urge therefore that hon. members of the House vote against this resolution. I do so with regret since its proposer is from my neighbouring riding.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the resolution that was introduced by the hon. member for Kent East, I would first like to pass a comment on the remarks of the hon. leader of the socialist party (Mr. MacDonald).

The hon. member for Kent West has told some of his fears regarding low wages. I have here an advertisement from the national employment service, which says: "Students and housewives, you can earn up to \$30 this weekend picking tomatoes." This is certainly true. I know in my own riding people earn as much as \$45 a day picking these tomatoes on a piecework basis. These are experienced pickers.

To echo the words of the hon. member for Kent East, certainly we do not want to

endanger our system of education and the education of our students.

I think the hon. leader of the socialist group touched on something but did not take the final step forward. I am not an expert on educational matters, but I just wonder if we should not change our thinking, get our thinking into the space age. We do not have to operate our schools necessarily during the set ten months of the year. We do not have to operate them on the set hours per day. Certainly we could extend the number of school hours during the day and pick up the lost time as—

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): That just shows how much the hon. member knows about handling children in school, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, well, this is fine. We certainly can. It is done in other jurisdictions.

The hon. leader of the third party also mentioned the economic report on the tourist industry. This matter is very vital to this industry. Certainly industry takes its holidays all at one period and overloads our limited facilities. Surely I think there could be an economic study done by The Department of Economics and Development on this problem, into what this would mean to our province should education be set up in regions, or by staggering the school term, and similarly for industry. I think that these things are things we should face and think out.

It is my understanding, as underlined by the hon. member for Kent West, that the school year is fixed by The Department of Education Act. I think this is the reason why the hon. member for Kent East introduced this resolution because the terms cannot be changed except by the Legislature. The main reason for asking support is certainly the great shortage of experienced farm labour that exists in our province and especially in the counties of Kent and Essex.

Basically I am appealing for this farm help to assist one particular crop, a most important crop in our economy—the tomato. About 85 per cent of Ontario's production of processing tomatoes comes from this area. The peak of production usually comes about the week after students return to their studies. The hon. member for Kent West thinks the hon. member for Kent East has exaggerated this problem, but it is certainly not exaggerated in view of the problem we had in Essex county this past year.

Certainly these farmers must get these tomatoes and other crops off the field in order to pay their taxes which support education,

and this is in the back of the thinking of many of these farmers.

The picking of the tomato crops of Essex and Kent counties requires over one million hours of hand labour in the space of a very few weeks. Acreage of this crop could be curtailed and at the present time it is not even being harvested to its fullest potential. Just one more week in the fields by several hundred students would have a great impact on the production of this one commodity in the province.

Discussions by one area school board in Essex county—and I might say Essex county stays on standard time the year around—centred on the starting of school classes earlier in the day, which would allow large groups of students to be made available early in the afternoon to work several hours picking this particular crop. This plan was rejected by the board as there were very many complications, such as bus servicing and so forth.

Last year in April the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) announced a study of the economic resources of the St. Clair region would be made. I asked him at this time if studies would be included in regard to the economic effect on Essex county in the fact that it stays on standard time. I believe his answer was negative, but I feel that this is most important, and concurring with the view of the hon. member for Kent West possibly these areas should be on daylight time or even double daylight time.

There could be great economic benefits from this. Certainly it should be standardized—where it is on daylight time—with the rest of the province. I certainly think in my own mind that daylight saving time in Essex county might be part of the answer to our serious labour problems and I do hope that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development will look into this matter and come up with some suggested proofs on the economic benefits.

The hon. member for Kent West mentioned the problem of students in the spring of the year. To the best of my knowledge, "A" students are allowed out of school on roughly June 1, they do not attend school for approximately four to five weeks. Apparently this does not have any effects on their scholastic training and The Department of Education thinks that this is quite satisfactory.

Certainly during the spring of the year, help from students is a great asset because they already have their room and board and they do not pose a problem in this regard.

For one acre of lettuce to be planted and brought into harvest requires 439 hours of hand labour, plus another 103 hours of tractor work. This pinpoints that there is an area where these students can play a great role.

I think there is a principle here that could possibly be laid over into the September areas. Could not a portion of these "A" students be allocated to an extra week's time, Mr. Speaker, should they wish to work on farm service?

In my time, and I imagine that of other hon. members of this House, during war years we worked on farms in farm service. I know I was out from May right through to the end of the harvest. I was fortunate enough to get through university and am here in the House today. I do not think it has cramped my education. "A" students certainly should be given every encouragement to get into agriculture and learn the problems of agriculture and help in the economics of the agricultural community.

I think it is up to The Department of Education and our school boards in these cash-crop areas to encourage these top academic students and other students during the summer months to get out and work on the farms and help the farmers. They can start early in the spring term on the weekends, or if they are "A" students they can get out and work the whole week and work right through the summer, becoming hardened and acclimatized to the hard work of farming.

Some further thought should be given to this resolution of allowing at least a portion of these students who are willing and able to work on these farms to take at least a week and help with this tomato harvest and other cash-crop harvests. I certainly think something can be worked out and I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting this resolution.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief because I am not close to the problem. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that if it was a case of this resolution coming to a vote I have not at this point made up my mind how I would vote on it.

I feel that if the problem as put forward by the mover of the resolution is as serious as he feels it is, then this is the wrong way to approach it. This is a resolution that tends to take care of a problem in a section of the province in regard to the farming community, and surely this problem has been with us for many years. We have had a serious problem in regard to farm labour.

The reasons for it are given as: finding experienced people and being able to pay the kind of money that people expect today.

I would first say that the spokesman from the government side, the hon. member for Kent West, has not indicated in his opinion that the problem is as serious as one might think it is. He gave a very brief idea of what the solution might be, and that would be to charge more for the commodity. In this sense I can agree with him. Certainly, if you have to pay something, if you have a charge for doing work and you have to pay that cost out of your commodity, then you have to have enough return to make it profitable.

But I would have thought that, with the interest of The Department of Labour, and certainly there should be a great interest from The Department of Agriculture in regard to this problem, they could have gotten together over the years and come up with a sound solution. I do not think it should be left entirely to the farmers who are affected by this problem: that is, shortage of bodies to do the work, and lack of enough money to pay for the work performed. So I would think that this resolution will not rectify the problem. I think it seems to be a resolution that has some political connotation to it.

I would have thought instead, that if the problem is going to be as serious as we understand it might be, then it would be necessary for the farm representatives—The Department of Agriculture—in the area to get together with The Department of Labour, and The Department of Education, if they felt that the substance of the resolution had merits, to see whether something could be worked out.

I would recommend that it should be a responsibility of The Department of Agriculture in the province to do its utmost to find a solution. Certainly I think that what we have to do, if we are going to first find the experienced people—and it is going to be a tough job to get people experienced enough to perform the kind of work expected by the farmer—is to find out what is a decent rate of pay. Certainly if, as I have mentioned, they have to have returns for their commodity and they have to pay for the work performed, The Department of Agriculture should investigate and study the relationship between the price the farmer is receiving for his commodity, who is getting the profit out of the crop, and what could be paid on a fair basis for labour.

If it is necessary to increase the price of the commodity, so much the good. And I think the public in Ontario would understand why the commodity has gone up in price, if it knew the farmer was getting a fair share and that the labourer who was doing the work was also getting paid a decent pay.

I do not think we can rely on the students from the high schools to rectify this growing situation. We have the situation with us today, as we had one, two, three, four and five years ago—it was not as bad five years ago because there was a surplus of bodies to put into the area to do the work. But then again they were not getting suitable people and, of course, in the opinion of many, they were not paying proper wages.

I think it takes a lot of co-operation between all of the people involved to really come up with a solution to this problem. First study whether there can be a justified increase in the cost of the commodity, then educate the public to the necessity for it. The Department of Agriculture and The Department of Labour should try to find a continuing solution to the problem so that each year we will know that we have trained people, experienced people, that they will be getting properly paid, and that the farmer also will be getting a fair share for his commodity. I think we have got to get away from depending on the students and casual transient help to do this kind of work.

Mr. R. D. Rowe (Northumberland): Mr. Speaker, as a small voice from the east among all these previous speakers, mostly from western Ontario, I would like to say just a few words about this resolution No. 9 on the order paper, standing in the name of the hon. member for Kent East. I realize there are many sides to this proposition and perhaps enough study has not been given to this, as suggested by the hon. member for York South.

At first glance, Mr. Speaker, this resolution might seem to meet a requirement that admittedly occurs only occasionally. However, when one gets down to studying and considering its practicality I have a great doubt as to its real necessity. I can see that, occasionally, a quirk of our weather might delay the normal cash-crop season to where an extra week of school help might be worth while; but, by and large, what percentage out of the secondary school people are actually involved and what real effect would it have on the total crop?

In our own area, I know, in relation to the total school enrolment that the number involved is comparatively small. This, ad-

mittedly, could be larger in other areas. But, should the whole school population be required to postpone returning to classes and get their entire programme out of line with their regular schedules? I think not. There will be several students anyway who, due to special circumstances, will remain out of school to help at home, or even at the neighbours for whatever time is necessary. I contend that it is up to these people to catch up with their own studies.

Speaking as a former teacher and realizing that juggling of days and schedules and so on never really works out, and never really makes up for the lost time, even by adding days on at the end, I question the value of this arrangement. I think, if legislation were passed permitting this one juggling of our school timetable, a good case could be had for almost any reason. In actual fact, as indicated by the hon. member for York South, there is now a pressure by certain groups to delay the opening of all classes for one day—yes, and I have even heard one week—to allow people to return leisurely from the Labour Day weekend. It might, of course, lessen the traffic for that particular weekend, but I think that any principal or any teacher would see this as a further eroding of the time left for classes, and surely, Mr. Speaker, with the workload as heavy as it is in our schools now, especially in the senior classes who would be most affected, further time should not be lost.

I have great sympathy with the farmer who might occasionally be caught in this predicament, where a few more hours of schoolboy or schoolgirl help might be useful, but I do not feel that it is necessary to enact the legislation required for this.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support resolution No. 9. Thank you.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, until about 30 seconds ago, I did not intend to get into this debate, but I think I have found where the problem lies. And I think it lies in Ottawa with that Liberal government.

They have always called this province in the Dominion of Canada, trouble. It seems that every time they are in power, we are short of labour. Everybody is working. On three occasions in the Conservative era, we had a depression. And remember the last time they elected John Diefenbaker and his boys? You would have had a lot of people to pick your tomatoes. Not only to pick them for nothing, but to eat them. They had a depression. I think maybe what we ought to do is persuade the people in Ottawa to call an election, because if it happened now I

would assure you that the Conservatives, if they took over, in six months time we would have a depression and everybody could pick potatoes and tomatoes.

Mr. Speaker: I would ask the member to discuss the merits of the resolution.

Mr. Bukator: The point I wanted to make, Mr. Speaker, was that a school teacher is sitting to my right and I am not going to mention his name. They take off time for track, they take off time for football, they take time to come here to see the Legislature in action. At least they come here and have their member speaker talk to them. I do not know whether they gain any points there, but at least the hon. member talks to the school teacher and the schoolchildren here. They have all kinds of time off. Yes, if the football game is important, they take that day off. And it would appear to me that my colleague did not say that we should shorten the school term, he said they could make that time up. No problems whatsoever, they could still continue.

And finally, I agree with the hon. member's colleague who spoke after him, from Kent West. He said it is about time that you consider daylight saving time and it was this House which refused to bring that about when our friend Maurice Belanger had a resolution on the books.

If you remember, he said that they should standardize and have daylight saving time in that particular area also. Now the pendulum has swung a little too far the other way. He is going to give you a double dose of daylight saving time. There is never a happy medium. But I can say, because my hon. friend who presented the resolution is such a sincere and honest man and he knows the problem in that area, this House has no alternative. Hon. members must help support his resolution. There is no way out. The man is honest, he means well and it is good business.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise today to take part in this debate. As you know, I represent the county of Lambton and a portion of the county of Kent. This is part of the great cash-crop area of the province of Ontario. Tomatoes, carrots, onions, potatoes, it all takes a great deal of help. The beans also. But we can harvest them in a lot greater quantity a lot faster.

Mr. Speaker, coming from that great area, I am one who cannot support this resolution 100 per cent. Our farm boys in

Lambton and Kent counties are in need of their education. We are a growing area. We have industries that require these men. The farms also require them. But my own personal feeling in this regard is that we should petition that great government of Canada to increase the prices of our farm supplies that the farmers of Ontario might be able to compete with the construction industry of Ontario.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): The farm products, not supplies.

Mr. Henderson: The farm products, I am sorry. That they increase these prices that our farmers might be able to compete with the construction industry in wages. In my area, which is very close to the hon. member

for Kent East, we border one another, tobacco is grown, which requires a great amount of hand work. Tomatoes are grown. We also have the other crops which are harvested with great large machines and I would like to add that the hon. member for Kent East, like myself, was raised on a farm. He realizes that a farm boy cannot be replaced by a boy from the town. However, a farmer is always happy to take the boy from the town and help give him some experience.

Mr. Speaker: Is the member finished?

Mr. Henderson: Yes.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.





Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 1, 1966

Estimates, Department of Reform Institutions, Mr. Grossman, concluded	1039
Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton	1055
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	1066

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 25th order, House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF REFORM INSTITUTIONS

(continued)

One vote 1903:

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Chairman, I hope that it is not necessary for me to say so, but I am going to repeat it anyway: I take second place to nobody, but nobody, in my desire to have a humanitarian policy—and I am sure that I speak for my staff as well—and I am sure that hon. members of this House are, at least, firmly convinced that this is my desire. I am always concerned at any suggestion of brutality within our institutions and, no matter from what source information comes in this respect, every report is fully investigated. If there should be any evidence of undue force on the part of members of my staff, the offender knows that he will be dismissed instantly.

There are two reasons why we in this department feel strongly about this: One is that, in the rehabilitation process, one must never adopt the behaviour patterns of those being dealt with; the other reason is that, in institutions dealing with inmates who often have patterns of violence, one must keep very strict regulations to ensure that when force must, of necessity, be used, it never oversteps the point of restraint. Otherwise, it could easily spiral.

With reference to the two points I have just mentioned, we have had, in recent months, two cases of members of staff resigning soon after appointment because they realized that they could not continue with this work, maintaining discipline in the face of so many incitements by the inmates to physical force. Further, in another case, I was convinced that a member of our staff, who had slapped a prisoner, had breached our rules in this respect. Incidentally, this was not at Millbrook. He was dismissed and I was really sorry for

that member of the staff, because he had a very good record with the department; and it was my view, after having investigated the matter, that he had really had to contend with a tremendous amount of irritation and provocation on the part of a particular inmate. However, in consultation with my staff, we decided that, in the interest of keeping our policy intact, he had to be dismissed.

Now this member of the staff whom we dismissed, went before the grievance board in an effort to place his case. A full inquiry was held by the grievance board and they reinstated him. I am only pointing out these examples to show that we are prepared to act when necessary.

With reference to the accusations concerning brutality in Millbrook—and I do not think that we can call them anything else but accusations of brutality—I have a number of comments. All accusations of this nature have been investigated by the inspection branch and, in some instances, by my present assistant Deputy Minister, and no evidence has been uncovered substantiating such allegations. The only inmates who have made any suggestions concerning brutality are inmates who themselves freely admit that they are invariably instigators of violence themselves.

As a matter of fact, I think in some of the cases mentioned by the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben), some of those statements themselves pointed this out by their own admission. This in itself is an indication of the reliance one can place on such allegations. When the grand jury went into Millbrook recently, they reported and I quote:

We consulted in particular with inmates at all levels regarding the alleged brutality and ridicule of the inmates which was reported in the press and, in spite of a thorough questioning, we could find no evidence that these conditions were present.

This is the end of the quote of the grand jury report. Incidentally, this is at least, I think, a partial answer to the question raised by the hon. member for York South (Mr. MacDonald) in respect of any impartial inquiry.

I think this is important, Mr. Chairman, very important; the whole subject of brutality only arose after there had been a great deal of publicity and after all the inmates who had started the fires had been taken to court. In fact, the original suggestions had gotten twisted somewhat by that time. The original charge by the local newspaper, the Peterborough *Examiner*, was that the inmates were being brutal to the staff, who are not able to retaliate. I quote from the Peterborough *Examiner*:

There is fortunately no suggestion of physical brutality at Millbrook though one case of it embarrassed and demoralized guards on one occasion.

And I will deal with this one case in a moment.

The only suggestion of brutality up to this stage had been in an article in the Peterborough *Examiner* on July 9, 1965, and once more I quote from that paper:

In the past four-and-a-half months there have been 27 assaults on the guards, who have only their fists with which to defend themselves. One court case has resulted. The only protection the guard has is discipline and the authority to use it.

This last statement was incorrect as to the number of assaults on guards. In fact I think they numbered some 15, but did not then even convey the true picture of the viciousness of some of these assaults. I have cases in my files of completely unprovoked, unexpected assaults which our correctional officers have been subjected to—very often by the very people who are now making the unjust accusations against them.

It is very difficult for a correctional officer or our investigators to be able to prove the falsehood of an exaggerated rumour but the one case mentioned by the Peterborough *Examiner* gave us an opportunity to do this in a court of law. And this is one of the cases that was mentioned by the hon. member for Bracondale.

On April 29, 1965, this particular inmate, along with eight other inmates, was employed on the garden work party under the supervision of a correctional officer. This officer reprimanded the inmate for unsatisfactory work and the inmate replied with a verbal abuse of the officer in the form of obscene language. At this point the officer advised him that he was sending him, as they call it, "inside on report." As the officer turned away, the inmate struck the officer over the left eye with a shovel. Although severely dazed, the officer closed with the inmate and

they fell to the ground, at which time the inmate sank his teeth into officer's neck and continued to pummel him about the face. Another officer near by pulled the inmate off the attacked officer.

The inmate was transferred to the county jail in Cobourg, charged with assaulting a peace officer. He obtained the services of a lawyer who charged our officer had struck his client first, laying a countercharge of assault against the officer. We then had the inmate's lawyer visit the institution and interview all the inmates who were on the work party at the time the incident took place. From these interviews he received signed affidavits in support of the inmate. However, when the case came to court, the inmate's charge against our officer was dismissed by the magistrate. Subsequently the inmate pleaded guilty to the charge of assaulting a peace officer.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Probably had to.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I do not know what the hon. member means. He was in a court of law.

Mr. Sargent: Quit the whitewash and get on with the job.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. Grossman: This caused a little concern among the inmates who had signed the original affidavits, in case they should be charged with perjury, and one came forward with the following voluntary, witnessed statement:

To whom it may concern:

I lied when I signed a statement for the lawyer representing inmate X regarding the fight with [a correctional officer]. I saw nothing. It was all over when I looked up. The garden gang got together on one story to save inmate X.

That is the end of the quotation from his affidavit.

Mr. Chairman, this case in itself proves a number of things. If a specific incident is brought to our attention, we investigate it. We interview inmates; we do interview inmates; and we even, as shown in this case, are prepared to have a lawyer come in and take statements from the inmates. So any statement that we never interview inmates is disproven by this case alone.

This case undoubtedly proves that you can get inmates all stating the same story, that you can get them to sign affidavits, and anybody experienced in penology will back this

statement up, Mr. Chairman. But when you get a fully detailed legal inquiry, the inmates' story is not necessarily supported even though it is backed by affidavits.

This inmate's sentence was completed before he was formally charged with this assault, and during his period of release on bail, he was again convicted of assaulting a peace officer and having a dangerous weapon, in Chatham. During the time he was in Cobourg county jail he assaulted two prisoners and caused damage to the institution. Since returning to Millbrook to serve his further sentence for assault, he has made one more unprovoked attack on a correctional officer, punching him in the face and breaking his glasses. He was charged with this assault in January of this year, was convicted in court, and is serving a consecutive sentence on this account.

Mr. Chairman, this is one of the cases which the hon. member presented late this afternoon, in which he quoted an affidavit from this particular person. Although, I might say parenthetically the hon. member did not mention at all, of course—I suppose the inmate did not mention it in his affidavit either—the fact of his having assaulted one of the correctional staff with a shovel. This is really typical, Mr. Chairman, of the other cases he has mentioned this afternoon. If the hon. member wishes, I will make available to him the results of our investigation on the other cases he has mentioned without taking the time of this House, because there are so many of them.

I do not think any purpose will be served anyway, because it would be a matter of: Do you take the word of the inmates? Or do you take the word of the other people involved?

Now he did bring in—I do not think it is that important but it is an example of the sort of thing you get when you are getting opinions from this kind of person; he said that one of the inmates had stated in his affidavit that the Dale Carnegie course, which incidentally was instituted at my direction, was going to be discontinued for some reason or other. Why the hon. member would even bother repeating that I do not know, because it is of no consequence; we do not discuss what programme we are going to continue or discontinue with inmates. It was an entire fabrication. Not only are we not discontinuing this course, we are asking them to carry it on further.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Chairman, may I—

Mr. Chairman: Please state your point of order.

Mr. Ben: I object to the use of the words "complete fabrication," because I happened to get that information also from a most reliable source, that there was discussion about discontinuing it because the inmates were too critical during the discussion periods.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, it was not discontinued.

It may not be a complete fabrication insofar as some of the inmates having discussed it among themselves is concerned, but I say that there was absolutely no truth in it at all. At no time, at head office, have we ever considered discontinuing the courses.

The hon. member has stated that he was not going to raise these matters this afternoon, because he had not completed his investigation and wanted to be fair about it. Well, I do not know how the hon. member can take that view when he was quoted in the Peterborough *Examiner* on December 15, 1965, in which he was quoted as saying:

"I am convinced the inmates are telling the truth," Mr. Ben stated. "Something has to be done to clean up this mess."

Well, I do not know why the hon. member suggests to this House—

Mr. Ben: Telling the truth about what? Would you mind reading the whole thing? What was I telling the truth about?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member was stating that the inmates were telling the truth about brutality.

Mr. Ben: If you say I am saying the truth, the truth about what?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: To continue:

Charges of brutality in Millbrook reformatory that have appeared in the *Examiner* recently were substantiated Tuesday by three former inmates.

You want me to read the whole article?

Mr. Ben: By three former inmates. All right.

Hon. Mr. Grossman:

The inmates took part in the Hamilton radio programme entitled, "Millbrook prison," and accused the prison guards of vicious beatings. The three men said guards beat inmates with blackjacks, used fire hoses on them, and so on.

Further down:

Their statements were supported by MPP George Ben, Liberal Party critic on reform institutions, who toured the maximum security prison in October. "I am convinced the inmates are telling the truth," Mr. Ben stated. "Something has to be done to clean up this mess."

If that does not mean that the hon. member had prejudged it prior to having completed his investigations, which he admitted this afternoon he has not yet done, I do not know what else it can mean.

Mr. Chairman, as I said previously, I take second place to no man in my desire, and again I state for the staff in their attempts, to rehabilitate in a humane manner, as far as it is humanly possible, all of those in our care. But I must state, Mr. Chairman: It is no wonder crime is becoming so rampant when there are such irresponsible charges based on sworn self-serving—and I know the hon. member, being a lawyer, knows what this means—sworn, self-serving statements by dangerous criminals.

We have got to a stage now where only society is at fault in the hon. member's view. Our judiciary is at fault, and he has criticized the judiciary. Our police are at fault; he has criticized the police. Our correctional officers are at fault; he has criticized our correctional officers. The hon. member, in fact, suggests the only people who can be believed, the only people who are entitled to our compassion, are those people who have been sent to penal institutions because they have broken the law.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to see some compassion for those members of the staff who have been viciously beaten by some of these people, whose wives and families are suffering from the kind of persecution which the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Carruthers) has pointed out so well; and some compassion for the law-abiding citizens who are attempting to do a tremendous job in this particular field. I would like to give the hon. member some examples, and I would like to hear him say something by way of compassion for the kind of things which some of our hard-working staff have to contend with.

On one occasion, four inmates attacked two officers, injuring them very severely. Both officers suffered fractured skulls, among other injuries, and were both hospitalized for considerable periods of time. They are able to continue their employment, but there is no question that they have suffered very definite permanent disability.

On another occasion, an officer was attacked by an inmate in the tailor shop. In addition to the assault, the inmate attempted to use the officer as a hostage, threatening him with a pair of shears. In another tailor shop incident, without any warning, an officer was struck a severe blow on the face and kicked in the groin.

On another occasion, an officer was attacked and received three cracked ribs. On another occasion, two inmates attacked a trades instructor, who was severely battered and received injuries including a fractured skull. Another officer was struck with a paint can. Another officer was kicked in the face.

There was the case where an inmate stabbed an officer in the corner of his eye with a sharpened toothbrush handle. And finally, among the many other cases we have on file, one of our rehab officers went to help a patient from the A. G. Brown clinic and, while driving the patient to the hospital, was attacked and almost strangled. These are cases of completely unprovoked brutal attacks on our officers.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the wild charges which are being made encourage this aggressive, assaultive behaviour on the part of the worst elements in our institutions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for York South made some comment about "there will always be these charges," and how "do we get to a so-called 'impartial' investigation?" I am concerned more at this moment with the charges of brutality against the staff. Mr. Chairman, there is no possible way any kind of investigation can ever decide anything except on the basis of whose word will be taken—the inmate's or the staff's. Further, you either have a staff in your system composed of reliable people, who can be depended upon to bring to your attention any incidents of this nature, or you might as well give up the job completely. Because no matter what kind of an investigation you have—suppose there was such a thing as an impartial sort of a board set up to investigate these things—they would be busy every minute of every day.

I know that the hon. members who live in these communities—the hon. member for Wellington South (Mr. Worton) lives in a community where there is an institution of this nature, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. member for Durham and the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman), and other hon. members—know, I am sure, that if you are going to have investigations based upon charges by inmates or ex-inmates it would be an absolutely impossible job. There would be

complete chaos in the institutions to begin with, there never would be sufficient people to investigate them, and they would accomplish absolutely nothing. Therefore, I think that those people who suspect that there may be something wrong have to look to the kind of people that you have in your department looking after this sort of work.

Mr. Chairman, does the hon. member, or any other hon. member here, care to suggest that the kind of people we have in charge in our institutions, looking after our work, are the wrong kind? A man like Dr. Flint, the head of our chaplaincy services; Mr. Hackl, our Deputy Minister, who is known as a very progressive man; Douglas Penfold, our assistant Deputy Minister—take a look at these in our annual report. I will not bother hon. members by reading some of the brief backgrounds of these people: Miss Nicholson, the administrator of adult female institutions; Dr. Harry Hutchison, administrator of adult male institutions; Harry Garraway, our administrator of training schools; Mr. David Dougall, the administrator of inspection and jails branch; Dr. Ronald E. Stokes, director of psychiatry; Dr. Grygier, director of research; A. D. Mackey, director of education; S. A. Nicol, the director of staff development.

You could argue that these are all head office people and everything could be hidden from them. This presumes, of course, that they are sitting at the head office and doing nothing else but reading reports from people—which they do not do. They visit our institutions, and most of these people are expert in this work. They have worked with these kind of people for years; they understand them; they understand some of their manipulative characteristics, and they know precisely what they are doing.

Presuming even that these people are being blinded, let us find out who else is involved. There is a treatment staff in every one of these institutions. Is there a suggestion that the doctors the social workers, the students who go in and out of these places, the chaplains, the members of the families of these inmates, the after-care workers, will be going in and out of this institution, day in and day out, and not once reporting some of these things? Why would the inmates not have told some of them about these alleged cases of brutality? Why would they not? And if they did, why would they not have been in touch with our department?

Surely, the hon. member would not suggest that these kind of people would hide this sort of thing and not say anything about it? That is utterly ridiculous! I say this is

the greatest protection the people have in this province; that things are being operated properly, at least insofar as they are being operated humanely is concerned; and this, in the final analysis, is the only protection the public will have.

As an example, Mr. Chairman, something was mentioned during all of this to-do about Millbrook. Somebody suggested that the Salvation Army was not satisfied with what was going on in our institutions. And I think the particular person who was doing that was attempting, somehow or other, to get them sort of against the institutions and on his side. I have here a letter dated October 5, 1965, from George Hickman, Brigadier, of the correctional services in the Salvation Army. He writes a letter to Rev. Maurice Flint, director of chaplaincy services:

Dear Reverend Flint:

In June of 1959 I was appointed by the Salvation Army to take charge of our correctional services in the city of Peterborough with special duties at the reformatory in Millbrook. At that time Dr. Harold Neil was resident chaplain there and we got along very well together, both working in the interests of the inmates. In July, 1962, Dr. Neil left Millbrook and I had the sole responsibility of looking after the spiritual needs of the Protestants and many of the Roman Catholics as well. In September, 1964, Rev. Ken MacDonald was appointed chaplain. He also left in June of this year and I am still carrying on alone.

I should state that the Rev. Mr. MacDonald, who was in charge, is now in charge of one of our other institutions.

During my six years in Millbrook I have seen approximately 2,000 men come and go, and it has been my privilege to talk to most of them—some of them on many occasions. I have always been treated with respect by all members of the staff, from the superintendent down, and always been given a free hand to do as I pleased. There has never been any policy set or any restrictions regarding my work. I am at liberty to see any inmate at any time if he so desires. I interview approximately 100 inmates a month, conduct two religious services each Sunday, hold Bible class on Tuesday evenings, and in all my activities I have the fullest co-operation of all of the staff.

I have been greatly disturbed of late when reading the articles written by the Rev. Sid West and David Allen, appearing in the Peterborough *Examiner*, about the

ill treatment inflicted on the inmates at Millbrook. I have never seen an inmate ill-treated during my six years there. I know there is strict discipline but when one considers the type of inmate, especially the group 1 class, any sane person will realize that without strict discipline we would have nothing but chaos.

I am working in Millbrook in the interest of the prisoner. If I see anything going amiss, or prisoners being ill treated, I would be one of the first to report it. As far as I am concerned, the newspaper reports are a gross exaggeration of the truth and, in many instances, direct falsehoods.

I trust that what I have said will help you get a true picture of the situation.

Sincerely yours,

George Hickman, Brigadier,
Salvation Army.

Mr. Ben: May I direct a question to the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I will be finished in one moment, and the hon. member can ask his question.

Mr. Chairman, I think this speaks for itself. You have to take somebody's word. In any investigation, in any court of law, it is a matter of taking somebody's word. I think I fairly well established the case here, that the kind of people who can be trusted to do a reasonable responsible job are the kind of people in whom the public can have confidence.

Let me just finish off, with a statement quoted in the Kingston *Whig Standard* of Ontario, dated February 12, just a couple of weeks ago—February 12, 1966:

Dr. George Scott told a meeting of Montreal psychology students this week successful rehabilitation of a prisoner must include the maintenance of his individuality and the understanding of his mental reaction to captivity.

I would like to impress that on the hon. member:

—and the understanding of his mental reaction to captivity.

The director of the institute of psychotherapy and psychotherapist at Kingston penitentiary, in the city, said the first step requires marked reformation of society's image of the person imprisoned for crime.

The image of both prisoner and prison will forever be distorted if cheap, uninformed, sensation-seeking charlatans are allowed to present their dismal neurotic

projections of prison life on radio and the theatre and TV screens of our country, Dr. Scott told the McGill University psychology club this week.

Mr. Ben: I also have something to say and I will ask the question while I am saying it. First of all—I trust that I will be forgiven by the hon. Minister for rising because it just occurred to me that any criticisms I make are useless. They will be interpreted as an attack on the people he has named; in other words he set up a saintly image and any attack now is directed against those fine people he mentioned so I am wasting my time in that regard.

Second, the hon. Minister has already established that there is no sense of making any kind of an investigation because, when you boil it down to the very substance of the thing, you either have to accept the word of one side or the other; and the hon. Minister says obviously you cannot accept the word of the inmates, therefore it is cut and dried, so I do not know why I am wasting my time in this House. Perhaps I should go out and get a job as a correctional officer or something, but obviously there is no sense standing up here—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Ben: —and trying to bring out something.

I must admire the hon. Minister. He is very adroit, and for the way he can swing things around I am just filled with admiration. Let me give you a few examples of how he takes a negative to try to affirm a positive. I do not know whether he got this from his experts too, I do not know; but let us go back about the needling of staff.

Being an ordinary, common Joe, I should think I would expect that the correctional officers would expect to be needled by inmates—they do not take a vow of silence when they go there; that is something I would expect. And the hon. Minister said there is nothing that they can do if the guard is assaulted. I should think it would be the duty of the hon. Minister and those under him that, if an assault takes place, the people who commit the assault are brought before a court of law. That would be the logical conclusion.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: They are.

Mr. Ben: And if there is a sanction imposed in bringing the people up before a court of law—there was a suggestion here that the

department does not want to do that because inmates are just doing that to get to Kingston. All I can say is that this institution must be one deplorable place if people would prefer to go to Kingston and serve a longer term—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, the hon. member knows the answer to that.

Mr. Ben: I know the answer to that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Of course, he does.

Mr. Ben: I am pointing out that the hon. Minister tried to twist that argument and say that there were no sanctions.

There is another statement that the hon. Minister made. He stated that those who made complaints of assault were those who were the first to admit, or who readily admitted, that they were instigators; and the hon. Minister said that this was one reason why you should not believe them, because they admitted that they were the instigators. I should think, if there was any reason for believing them, it would be the fact that they did admit that they were the instigators, Mr. Chairman.

Let us take a look at the last letter that he read. He reads that as proof that no violence or brutality has taken place. I had the privilege of speaking to the honourable gentleman writing the letter, and I was amazed at what he told me; that in all the time he was there there had not been one instance, one instance, of brutality or use of force, or anything irregular. I said "My goodness, what a saintly house it is up on that hill."

Yet just prior to that the hon. Minister admitted that he had fired some people for breach of the very regulation he is talking about. So what happened that the honourable gentleman who wrote that letter did not mention them? The answer is simple: He has not seen it. He has not seen it; and, of course, the honourable man cannot speak of anything he has not seen. But the hon. Minister tries to use that to prove his point of view.

Let me read some excerpts from papers just as the hon. Minister has. Let me read from the same journal that he quotes. Perhaps the people who inform us may not be giving the correct information. Perhaps even I may not be giving the correct information to the House. But the hon. Minister is also condemning the editors and the people who write for the *Peterborough Examiner* and other newspapers. If that is the hon. Minister's contention, fine; but let me read an

editorial from the *Peterborough Examiner* dated Saturday, July 31, 1965:

The report of the investigation at Millbrook reformatory is disarmingly ingenuous. It finds that there is nothing seriously amiss at the maximum security institution, and that conditions there could be improved by (a) the addition of a trained chaplain and (b) better communication between senior and other staff. It says also that operations are hampered at all Ontario reformatories by a critical shortage of staff qualified in reform measures.

But the information contained in our news and editorial columns of July 7, and subsequently, cannot be as lightly brushed aside. It is true that the investigators dealt point by point with allegations which were made from informed sources, and found some to be exaggerated and others to be confirmed. We do not intend to become irresponsibly truculent about this report, but nor do we intend to let matters rest with the report's publication.

Clearly, The Department of Reform Institutions enjoys an advantage that the public does not have. It has access to its reformatories and can interview both guards and inmates at length. As we commented on July 10 (Reform at Millbrook): "Precise information about conditions in Millbrook and other reformatories is extremely difficult to obtain!"

This remains true. And it is highly probable that, had the disturbances at Millbrook not so upset its staff, and had not municipal fire services been needed at the fire, the public would not have known that tear gas was being used to control recalcitrant prisoners on five successive days or, indeed, that there was any trouble there at all. In view of the circumstances, much credit is due to those who spoke out that our reports and comment were as accurate as they proved to be.

The report confirms, moreover, that through a technicality the department has been unable to solve, the reformatory is being used as a penitentiary for prisoners whose sentences exceed the two years detention for which Millbrook was designed. This is a serious and most pressing matter. Nor does the report discuss the treatment and penal methods of the institution for these and other offenders in any detail whatever. It confines itself to what has emerged in public as a result of the July 5 fire.

It is only adequate, therefore, to explain

internally to the Minister and his department what caused the present disturbance among 25 men. It gives no information to substantiate the assertion that the department is following anything but "an archaic concept of penology" at Millbrook, which is an opinion stated in these columns and supported by expert advice. The Minister may well be satisfied with the report, but this can only be because he is satisfied that Millbrook, generally is a desirable institution for people with severe behaviour problems.

This will be a matter of contention among penologists, and certainly it is disputed here. Our information on the programme at Millbrook is sketchy because the reformatory itself will not talk about it. But what we now assume to be true is supported by healthy suspicions which have been nurtured (a) by disclosures about other reformatories, (b) by qualified informants, and (c) by the records and statements of previous Ministers of Reform Institutions.

Thus our contention of July 10 stands unmodified. The disturbances at Millbrook are a symptom of the need for a white paper on the reform institutions of this province or an independent inquiry which would place the circumstances of the department's operations in full view. This need arises out of the large reformatory population and the high rate of recidivism in Ontario which suggests that reform in some institutions is far from the primary object.

Now, Mr. Minister, I would like to also read something in justification perhaps of the guards, from the August 21 issue of the same paper:

The life of a guard at the Ontario reformatory here is one of niggling uncertainty. He does not always know where he stands or just who is on his side.

The reformatory is the last word in escape-proof prisons and when it opened in 1957 was designed not only to hold but to treat the most troublesome inmates in Ontario.

And I go back and use the word "treat."

For the first few years guards were given extensive training in how to handle and how to treat these problem inmates. But now training and treatment are all but non-existent.

Guards have told the *Examiner* of working for up to two years at Millbrook with not more than a few days' training.

Financially, the Ontario government considers its reformatory guards, the men who could have the most influence on inmates, as little better than common labourers. Until recently, most guards were being paid less than \$4,000 a year for a 40-hour week. It has been estimated that 60 per cent of the custodial staff at Millbrook moonlight to supplement their income.

When a guard starts work at Millbrook he is supposed to spend the first four weeks on a loosely defined, on-the-job, training programme. The first three weeks he is supposed to be on the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. shift. The fourth week he is scheduled for three afternoon shifts and two overnight shifts.

The fourth day's training, for example, includes two 1½ hour lectures from the superintendent, one of which is called the "Ontario plan and its objectives." The remainder of the day is spent on weapons training.

Throughout the four weeks, there is only one lecture scheduled from the treatment staff. On the 13th day of the programme, the psychologist will discuss "Treatment and training" for two hours. According to the five pages of course outline and rules handed to all new guards, this is the only explanation given the recruits of the peculiar characteristics of the inmates.

One guard's training consisted of 2½ days of pushing buttons and trying keys in cell doors.

Many guards are dissatisfied with the administration of Millbrook. More than 22 have quit in the last 18 months—a few of them with six or seven years service. The guards claim the administrators and senior officers are making their own rules as they go along. Each official seems to have his own version of how inmates should be handled.

Another contentious issue is the use of "finks," or informers, by both the administration and senior members of the custodial staff. Nobody, neither guards nor inmates, know whom they can trust or rely upon. The two-man fink squad operated by the administration was set up shortly after an investigation of conditions in Millbrook in July. So far their work has resulted in the resignation of at least one guard.

The non-commissioned officers, in turn, have their own informants—inmates who

are granted special favours for informing on other inmates.

The guard is the man who must bear the brunt of insults from inmates and reprimands from superiors. He is also on the receiving end of assaults—at least ten so far this year. In short, the life of a Millbrook guard is an unenviable one. The pay is poor, the danger often great. But despite this, The Department of Reform Institutions has little trouble in attracting recruits. There is much evidence, however, to support the claim that many of the guards are unsuited for the job.

One guard, enraged by the reports of conditions at Millbrook, called the *Examiner* Thursday morning to sound off. "These inmates are getting just what they deserve—slapped around—and they don't get enough of it either." He said his piece and slammed down the phone.

That is also from the paper. Now, of course, this is written by inmates, too, I presume, so you cannot believe what they say either.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is not even written by an inmate. It is written by somebody who has never been in.

Mr. Ben: Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not know why I stand up here. The hon. Minister has stated his position rather clearly. Nobody's word will be accepted in any investigation except the report of the staff, and members of the custodial staff. So why we are wasting our time here I do not know.

If the hon. Minister had got up and made that statement in the first instance perhaps this House would have unanimously approved his estimates without any discussion. I feel that I should get up, even though it is going to be useless in the mind of the hon. Minister.

The hon. Minister is continuously taking the sanctimonious attitude that he knows all, sees all, hears all and judges all. I made a statement, Mr. Chairman, in my maiden speech, about the hon. Minister being uninformed, misinformed, and ill-informed. Those are the people outside this House I discussed this with. I told them that I was not referring to the hon. Minister himself, but to the fact he was uninformed, misinformed and ill-informed by his staff, especially the people in prison; that they were hiding facts from him; that they were turning, like the buffaloes when they are attacked, to face the common enemy to protect each other; that the hon. Minister was trying to do a good job but he

was believing everything that was said to him without investigating.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The hon. member just thought I was.

Mr. Ben: And as a matter of fact I told some people that I was a very sneaky little son-of-a-gun, Mr. Minister, because I was going behind your back and praising you. I would suggest to the hon. Minister that the hon. members on both sides of the House will probably acknowledge that the hon. Minister is doing a fairly good job with the training schools and the adults. I suggest to him that he open his eyes now and read something about the penal side of it.

When the hon. Minister gets up and says everybody on this side is a liar, and everyone on that side tells the truth, I think he is being very hypocritical. If the hon. Minister is going to do his duty he has got to get—

Mr. Chairman, is there not any rule against geese being in the House? I hear cackling over there.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest that the member stay on vote 1903, please.

Mr. Ben: So I would suggest that the hon. Minister perhaps should change his thinking and realize that not all is black and white. I have never alleged that all these people are telling the truth, but I am willing to look into it. I am willing to go in there with an open mind. I would suggest that perhaps the hon. Minister should take the same tack. I would think that we would then get a lot further.

If the hon. Minister will just stop getting up continually and saying everything that his people do is right, and everything they say is true, perhaps the Minister might make some other statements and we might be inclined to believe them. But when the hon. Minister tries to tell us that everything he says is true, that everything he does is right, that everything his people say is true, that everything his people say is right, I think that is asking too much of any member of this House.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to prolong this, naturally. I have prepared the rest of my case but—

Mr. Chairman: I would like to suggest to the member for St. Andrew (Mr. Grossman) that, as far as this House is concerned now, we do not want a personal vendetta. We do not want to have the member for Bracondale answer the Minister—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, there was a statement made here which affects a gentleman, a brigadier from the Salvation Army, and which may give the wrong impression. The hon. member said that when he discussed it with this gentleman he got another impression. May I say that I made it clear that the man discharged, to whom I was referring, was not at Millbrook; therefore the Salvation Army padre is quite correct, because he was referring to his experiences only in Millbrook.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 1903:

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sargent: The hon. Minister has put the case for the staff, the guards; and, realizing that the whole problem is a tough one right down the line, he has done a great whitewash of the case. I would like to ask the hon. Minister this: Who puts the case? What recourse has the inmate?

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time the hon. Minister should think in terms of the need for a public defender, or an ombudsman, in prison to put the case for the inmate. Would the Minister please give me his thoughts on that?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would not like the hon. member to think that I disregard his questions. The other day he suggested that I had a sneer on my face when really I was smiling. The answer to that is that the Minister also puts the case for the inmates. As I pointed out, if there is any suggestion of brutality against inmates, an investigation is made; and if it proves to be true, the guard or any correctional officer, or any member of my staff, will be immediately dismissed without any doubt.

Mr. Sargent: Mr. Chairman, who does the investigation?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, I think I have gone into all that, Mr. Chairman. I do not think we need to repeat it.

Mr. Sargent: Well, I think it is time that this government consider the need for a public defender in this. These things happen to the guards; what then is happening to the inmates?

Mr. Chairman: Have we concluded the adult institutions? If so, we will consider the discussion on page 117, the middle, under

“juvenile institutions.” The member for Scarborough West.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Chairman, I thought I had some provocative things to say, but in comparison I will be all sweet reasonableness to the hon. Minister.

Like many other of the members in this House, I have ambivalent feelings about this department particularly with respect to training schools and the juvenile institutions. It reflects a combination of admiration for the efforts that have characterized the last year, and a certain intellectual repugnance for the objectives involved. I recognize what has been done and appreciate, as do hon. members of this party, many of the appointments and much of the work. I think it is only fair that it be said, Mr. Chairman, but I suggest that such efforts are being applied at the juvenile institution level to a crumbling system which is in fact irretrievable, and should in fact be irretrievable because it has no place.

Fundamentally—and I want to reassert it again, Mr. Chairman, as my colleague from Yorkview (Mr. Young) has done on many occasions—we have a basic difference in philosophy with the hon. Minister on the treatment of the juvenile offender and the training school. The difference in philosophy is very simple: We oppose the institutionalization at the training school level within this department. We have stated this before and we state it again, and it is the general base for the remarks I am about to make.

We see no justification for The Department of Reform Institutions at this level whatsoever; and in the presence of the luminaries gathered under the gallery—those people whom the hon. Minister has appointed in his wisdom, people for whom all of us have a great deal of respect, and people who no doubt have a great deal of capacity—let it be said that they are shoring up a corrupt system, that they are contributing to the perpetuation of a corrupt system of penology at the training school level.

It may satisfy them to be public foils for the hon. Minister's ego from time to time—that immodesty which he himself claims; but I suggest that what is happening is that we are introducing a rigidity at the training school level to the point where it will take us years, perhaps decades, to retrieve the rehabilitative process.

Let me give one example to this House, which is well known to them. We are still committing under-12s to training school. According to the report of the hon. Minister, 99 children in this province last year under the

age of 12-7, 8, 9, 10 and 11-100 youngsters were committed to training schools. I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that the policy is completely indefensible, that there is no justification whatsoever for such children being in training schools—in the context of a reform institution—and I would say to the hon. Minister that there is no excuse whatsoever which can be advanced.

If children of that age are so disturbed, so seriously disturbed, Mr. Chairman, that they require some kind of therapeutic environment, it is certainly not at the hands of a training school, and I emphasize that with the hon. Minister.

I, for one member of this House, am not happy about the Hagersville development. As far as I am concerned it is a retrograde step. It just rigidifies the emphasis on placing under-12s in a training school context which I think is an absurdity, and an interesting commentary on the inadequacies of government in other departments. I suggest that that extends to the whole training school system.

In analyzing it, Mr. Chairman, I want to go back to The Training Schools Act, because I think this is the pivotal aspect. This Act came in last year; it was regarded as a tremendous piece of legislation; it was paraded around the capitals of the world and the hon. Minister has invoked praise from several international jurisdictions.

We fought certain sections of that Act, but the section which was pivotal to this part of it, the section which was fundamental, was section 8, and that section said—and I will reread it to hon. members of the House:

8. That upon the application of any person a judge may order in writing that a child under 16 years of age at the time the order is made, be sent to a training school where the judge is satisfied that:

(a) The parents or guardian of the child is unable to control the child, or to provide for his social, emotional or educational needs—

we did not contest that:

—or see that the child needs the training and treatment available that a training school—

We did not contest that, but I want to bring (b) to the attention of the House:

(b) The care of the child by any other agency of child welfare would be insufficient or impracticable—

And it was our contention at the time that that was a bogus provision, was a fraudulent

provision, because there were no alternative community facilities available. Therefore to suggest that, in fact, this Act would weed out the process, was in fact, to mislead the House.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind this House what the hon. Minister said at the time, because interestingly enough the Act has been proved fraudulent and I am going to demonstrate that in the next few minutes. But I want to remind the House what the hon. Minister said at that time to Opposition arguments:

In the first place—I think I used this expression before—I am not too sure, but we are going to arrive at the moment of truth. We are going to find out precisely how many of these youngsters belong in a training school or do not belong in a training school. I am firmly convinced that there has been a great deal of misinformation—I am not saying deliberate—and a great deal of misunderstanding about what uses the training schools are put to, what they can be put to and whether in fact so many of these youngsters do not belong in a training school.

And then the hon. Minister advanced the proposition that we would find, under the new Act, that 90 per cent to 95 per cent of the youngsters who are put in training school in fact belong there and thus the mythology advanced by the Opposition would be effectively destroyed. The hon. Minister said, and I quote:

The judge is now going to have to make that decision on the basis of the evidence before him and not just on opinions which have been bandied about from one person to another. I think this will be helpful in that respect because there are, in fact, many youngsters who are in a training school and who should not be there. We want to make sure and I think this Act will bring about a situation where they are not going to be in the training school.

Now let me say, Mr. Chairman, that there is no doubt in my mind that the hon. Minister was genuine. There is no doubt in my mind that in league with his advisers—particularly his research department—he felt that this was in fact what would be demonstrated and the various contentions made from this side of the House would be dismissed as misleading.

Now I want to discuss this part of the debate, which I think is fundamental to the whole reform institutions complex, sir, and

particularly the training schools. I want to discuss it in the light of information which is now available, at least has recently come to my attention. I want to talk about it for a moment in the light of a report which was at the time written by the present Judge Bill Little, who was then director of social services, juvenile and family court of Metropolitan Toronto.

For some reason, the report has never been made a public document—I believe it is a public document, certainly it has been in the hon. Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart's) hands in his revision of the family court setting—his discussion of what the family court should be.

Some of the propositions advanced in this report are fascinating and I want to place them before the House.

We said, Mr. Chairman, last year, that a significant percentage of youngsters who are going to training school should not in fact be there; and that was dismissed. In fact, Mr. Chairman, the basis for sending these youngsters to training school—at least in the Metropolitan Toronto area—has withered in the interim period. It is impossible in some respects for any of us to analyze the percentage validly being committed because the entire diagnostic and clinic setting on which a judge must base his decision has been undermined by the absence of the necessary staff.

Now as the hon. Minister knows, for several months there has not been a psychologist at the juvenile and family courts in Metropolitan Toronto. I want to read to hon. members just for a moment what Mr. William Little—Judge Little now—said about the role of a psychologist in the court at that time, and I quote:

The psychologist, like the psychiatrist and social worker, has a distinctive role in clinical terms. It is important that the psychologist see every child and give a thorough examination of the child's personality and capacities that is consistent with the requirements of the court. The psychologist, like the other members of the team, is an important member of the clinic conference group, which is under the chairmanship of a court psychiatrist and contributes psychological information relevant to the case and helps in the formulation of appropriate recommendations.

The following information indicates the court psychologist's responsibility and the time factors involved:

1. The appointment with each child in the clinic is always individual and may

consume between two and three hours' average time—it is about two hours and 15 minutes. The test battery is as condensed as possible without jeopardizing the central information on major factors which may affect present functioning and actual behaviour of the child.

2. Reports, whether written or dictated, still entail considerable thought and probably an hour, if the report is average, including the workup time on any problem.

3. The psychologist attends every diagnostic conference that involves a child that has been examined. This involves usually an hour a day four days a week.

4. There are other obligations which the psychologist has which are carried out as time permits. Among these are impromptu additional discussions with probation officers, professional guests of the court, students and staff meetings.

5. One psychologist cannot expect to do justice to more than eight full appointments per week. Emergency cases are usually managed but such additional appointments cannot be handled on a routine basis.

Now let me submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is impossible, or at least very difficult, for a judge to make an assignment to a training school on an inadequate diagnostic basis. Since there has been no psychologist at the court for several months, if we are to try to gain some idea of whether or not we should be sending children to training school we are undermined before we start.

Let us go back to what the study actually said—the only study conducted in the 1960's in this area. It was a careful study of 416 cases in the court over a year period and in the process of that study—and I want to read it very carefully—Judge Little came to the following conclusions:

Recommendations to training schools are at least a third higher than is warranted because of the lack of adequate community resources available in the Metropolitan Toronto area for children who require treatment away from their own homes, but not necessarily training school settings.

A third higher than is warranted! The next sentence reads:

The number of children needing psychiatric hospitalization, although not a large group comparatively, just do not get this service due to the long waiting list and restrictive admission criteria of the various government and private specialized institutions which prevent 90 per cent of those requiring the services from receiving them.

So we send a third more to training school than belong in training school, on the basis of the only study available; and 90 per cent of those requiring special treatment do not get it, on the basis of the only study available.

Indeed, Mr. Chairman, I will read a little more of the report because I think it is interesting:

The normal court tendency is to treat the child in his own home—

says Judge Little:

—under some form of supervision which seems appropriate to the clinic staff. In the instance of those cases where referral to a training school is recommended, we note a great reluctance on the part of the branch to concur with diagnostic recommendations. In 52.3 per cent of these cases, or about one in every two, children recommended for training schools are committed on the occasion of their first diagnostic assessment. It is easily appreciated, when we realize what has been said earlier, that we are now committing to training schools at least a third more children than is warranted because of the lack of the appropriate facilities in the community. The clinic recommendations are frequently obliged to preclude a more appropriate community resource, in many cases due to lack of availability rather than to choice. These shortages of community resources are not peculiar only to Metropolitan Toronto but are the frustration pieces of juvenile court judges across the country.

Now, there is no question that it is not peculiar to Metropolitan Toronto and there is no question that it is in large part not the hon. Minister's responsibility, and the hon. Minister may even dispute some of the contentions in this report. But let me say to him that there is something intriguing, when Judge Arrel of Hamilton, now head of the juvenile courts association in the province of Ontario, has said on one occasion that fully 50 per cent of those in training schools do not belong there, and Judge Little has said fully a third of those in training schools do not belong there. Now we have at least some kind of documented evidence to sustain it; it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, a peculiar contention then to put before this House an Act which pretended to solve the problem.

Mr. Chairman, let me state categorically, and I state it in the presence of fellow members of the select committee on youth, hon. members in the government party, that the situation cannot have improved. It can only have deteriorated. For two years we have

heard briefs from every part of this province which indicate that it is impossible to find adequate treatment for children who fall within this category. We have heard appeals from one social agency after another, begging for alternative facilities to those of training schools and indicating that they would prefer that children go to alternative facilities, but that there are no alternative facilities available. That is what makes this Act hollow; because it is an absurdity to pretend that we are solving the problem of committals to training schools simply by having a clause which assures that they will go to other agencies if they were available.

In fact, Mr. Chairman, the other agencies are not available, we commit children to training schools almost indiscriminately because of any lack of alternative resource.

Now, in order to bring the matter up to date—because I recognize that the hon. Minister is a resourceful man and he will answer—I requested permission, and I must state this very carefully, I requested permission to see the judgment form of every youngster committed to a training school from the metropolitan juvenile and family court since this Act came into effect on November 1, 1965.

Am I right that it was November 1, 1965? Good.

With the permission of the senior court judge, and incidentally in brief discussion with the hon. Attorney General last week in clearing one clause of The Juvenile Delinquency Act so that I would not see the names which are involved, I examined the basis for committal to training schools to find out if this Act is holding up. And this afternoon, in the presence of the senior judge, I saw those forms for every single young person who has been committed under section 8 of this Act to training schools since the new Act has come into effect.

Now, let me say to this House, Mr. Chairman, that a significant number, I did not do any immediate calculation, but I am prepared to stake my word on it, a significant number, up to 40 per cent, express reservation about sending children to training schools. In several cases, three or four cases, Mr. Chairman, it said specifically that Wardendale or Thistletown were more desirable institutions, but since no community facility was available, both because of lack of funds and lack of space, those children could not be sent there, and so would be confined to a training school.

And Dr. Grygier will receive those white forms of his, those research papers, so that he can give us his study a year or two from now.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what does that do to this section 8, subsection (b) of this Act? What position does it put the judges in, when they are so compromised by the inadequacy of the community facilities that they have to write that they would prefer to send children to Warrendale or Thistleton, but cannot because the community resources are not available?

And in another large group—and I say relatively speaking it is large, because over a two to three month period, I do not suppose there were more than 20 or 25 files from one court—but in another significant group the phrase used, “other community resources not being available,” or, “in the absence of alternative community resources, we think the child needs the treatment and control of a training school.”

Now the implication was clear in this—and in discussion with one or two of the judges it was borne out—that it is a simple fact that they have no alternative, that there are no alternative community resources. The community agencies fail. The judges would like some kind of therapeutic environment other than a training school, but there simply are not any such agencies, so in goes the child to the training school.

I therefore say, Mr. Chairman, that with all the best intentions of the hon. Minister this Act cannot work. It is not that it cannot work because he does not want it to work, but because his hon. colleagues on the front benches are determined to frustrate him. Because it is yet another example of inter-departmental chaos and neglect.

Nobody in his right mind in this House could justify the intolerable delay in assisting the juvenile and family court of Metropolitan Toronto to do an adequate job. Nobody in his right mind in this House can tolerate inexcusable delay in not having the report from the interdepartmental committee on emotionally disturbed children. No one can tolerate the absence of all the alternative solutions. The hon. Minister can trot this Act out in every country of the world, but he will persuade no one here, because it is insubstantial. It does not have content. Its key phrase, its indispensable clause, simply does not hold up to scrutiny.

Now that scrutiny was true when Bill Little made his survey, that scrutiny I suggest has been sustained by what we have found in the select committee on youth over the last two years. It has been sustained in what I learned today from the very simple perusal of the evidence—without in any sense looking at names, just looking at reasons for committal.

Now let me emphasize then, that what I think this hon. Minister has to do, and he will forgive us on this side if we force him into protesting that he is not a shrinking violet or a wallflower, what this hon. Minister has to do is somehow to persuade his hon. colleagues that they make his Act untenable by their inflexibility. We would think it almost conspiratorial if one did not assume that an effort was being made.

I congratulate you again on the appointments. I recognize the energies and the genuine intent of your staff. But I say that the reason that the Act will not work in the long run and the reason that we are being frustrated in so many areas, is that training schools do not belong in The Department of Reform Institutions, that there should not be training schools at all, that we should have a sufficiently sophisticated government apparatus to set up homes and therapeutic centres in a variety of departments, Education or Health, to encompass these children. Until that time, Mr. Chairman—on a philosophic as well as a pragmatic basis—we shall have to continue opposing this part of the hon. Minister's estimates in total.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Chairman, because of the very thoughtful amount of study that must have been put into the hon. member's remarks, I think he is entitled to some comment.

I found his discussion very interesting, certainly very thoughtful. I was a little surprised though that the hon. member uses such words as “hollow” and so on, because to suggest that the Act itself is “hollow” and is of no consequence, I think is an exaggeration.

Mr. S. Lewis: That is wrong.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Well, the hon. member only quoted one clause. The clause of the Act states that:

Upon the application of any person a judge may order in writing that a child under 16 years of age at the time the order is made be sent to a training school where the judge is satisfied that—
and three conditions must apply. Three conditions, not just one:

(a) The parent or guardian of the child is unable to control the child or to provide for his social, emotional or educational needs. (b) The care of the child by any other agency of child welfare would be insufficient or impractical. (c) The child needs the training and treatment available at a training school.

Now of course, Mr. Chairman, I am fully familiar with the argument that there is an implication in this Act that if there are not other facilities available there is no use telling a judge that he should not send him to a training school. Now if we wait for all of these things, Mr. Chairman, I submit we would never get anything done. To suggest that the Act is a "hollow" one and would not accomplish anything, merely because we have not got all those facilities which the hon. member suggests we need and which have not really been established as yet, I think is a slight exaggeration.

The Act is a good Act. If it is found after a research that is being done on it that there are, in fact, other kinds of places for the youngsters rather than training school, then this will become apparent in the research. The research being done now, as the hon. member knows, is in co-operation with the judges, and it will tell us just how much value there is in this philosophical argument. That is all it really is. There has been no proof at all that there are so many other kinds of places which will be better for a youngster.

I really think it is a matter of everybody grasping for straws. They see a difficult problem with these youngsters and they say the training schools are not helping as many as we would like them to help. So let us try something else, and you grasp at various ideas.

I will deal for a moment with the idea that it should be in some other department. We have gone into this before. I will just dwell on this for a minute or two because we have repeated this every year.

One of the reasons that have been argued in favour of keeping it within one department is, in the first place, that you are dealing with a ministry concerned only with correction. Unless, of course, the hon. member tries to make the point, and I think perhaps he was touching on this, that we should not even consider this as correction. I think I could point out to him—I will not trouble the House with it at this time, I have some rather learned papers on this from learned people—that as a matter of fact they should be dealt with by corrections departments rather than welfare departments. There are some legal implications involved, and so on. I will not bother going into that detail, but perhaps I might add one more fact to this.

There is already a shortage, as the hon. member knows, of professional staff. All we would be doing by taking away this portion

from Reform Institutions and putting it into another department is to have to find more staff, because obviously there is staff in our present department which does work for the adult institutions as well as the juvenile institutions.

For example, our rehabilitation officers in many instances handle both youngsters and adults. We are short of staff in that respect. We are short of rehabilitation officers. If we set up the training schools in another department we are going to be that much shorter. So in this respect it would not be helpful. Even if we were able to provide this staff it would require additional cost to the taxpayer, which may prove entirely unnecessary.

Insofar as the comments of Judge Little and the comments of Judge Arrel, I have a high regard for both these gentlemen and we have consulted them on many occasions on some of our mutual problems.

I agree there are great gaps in our diagnostic facilities. I think it would be an insult to the intelligence of the hon. members of this House to suggest that there are no such gaps. There are only so many things you can do at one time.

This is something that at the present time is under very serious consideration, as to just what the solution is to this particular problem. We have, and I have repeated this before, decided in our department that we are not just going into any programme willy-nilly. It has got to be based on proper research. I am sure the hon. member will agree that is the way to do it.

Until the proper research has been done on this programme—and I am sure the hon. member will agree that the programme we have started in connection with this Act or in connection with the juvenile court judges is one which is going to be very helpful. As I did say, and the hon. member quoted last year, out of this research will come some more definite, more factual information than mere opinions.

He has pointed out, for example, that Judge Little has stated that at least a third of these youngsters should not be in training schools, and on the other hand Judge Arrel has said 50 per cent should not be in training schools. I mean, I am sure the hon. member must agree, that this is no way, this is no basis, on which to set up any kind of a definite programme. It has got to be done properly.

It is because of these statements, one of the factors in setting up the new training

schools Act and the system of research in connection with it, was to establish as far as was humanly possible to do so, just what are the "other needs." And until we have definite research on this, there is no use just taking opinions — random opinions — from people, no matter how well intentioned and intelligent they are, because they could be wrong.

We want to make sure that when we do establish any kind of a programme that it is, as I say, based on research. The hon. member has stated that when he was doing some study on the forms which the judges are now filling out as part of the research programme, the judges had some reservations about sending approximately 40 per cent to training school.

Mr. S. Lewis: I said a significant percentage. I believe, although I did not count them, that it would amount up to 40 per cent.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I think the hon. member will agree that: Firstly, the Act was only proclaimed in November and this is not sufficient time. Secondly, I think that when the hon. member talks about the judges expressing reservations, my honest opinion is, no matter what system you are going to get, judges who have a feeling for this work are always going to express reservations. They are always going to concern themselves with the problem, "Am I doing the right thing for this child?" And if we had a variety of 100 different kinds of institutions for youngsters there would still be, in my view, this expression of reservation.

I am sure every serious-minded judge, no matter what sort of case he has before him, wonders whether he is doing the right thing for that youngster. And no matter how elaborate the system, I am sure that eventually they still will be expressing "reservations." All I can tell the hon. member is that this Act is a good Act. If there are any gaps at the moment insofar as other places where a judge may wish to send a child, hopefully, if the research will prove that there should be such other places, we will establish them. There is no reason to ignore the Act because of that.

As a matter of fact, if for no other reason, and I am not saying that is the only reason, if for no other reason than the fact that we are able, through this Act to get the facts that we want, this in itself would be a good reason for its existence.

I say to the hon. member that we are doing research on this, and the research will be properly done. When we have the results of that research—when it is decided by people who should know and do know about these things, that we require other facilities—that is the time to attack the problem in that fashion, and that is all I can tell him.

Mr. S. Lewis: There is a certain circuitous futility about it all which frustrates members on this side—I suppose it frustrates the hon. Minister as well—because of the old argument that when it has been established that alternative facilities are required, we will move into this field and the Act may help to establish that.

Let me say categorically, Mr. Chairman, that it has been established—in the records of this House over the last five years, in the minutes of the select committee on youth over the last two years—that alternative facilities are required for disturbed delinquent children.

Surely that is not an object of endless discussion and negotiation. It was raised in the context of this Act because it was posited by the hon. Minister last year, and by his associates, that this Act would weed things out; that we would not have to send such children to training school, because they would have the other facilities. We made a point then and I simply repeat it tonight on the basis of much more thorough evidence. We did not have it last year.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am agreeing with the hon. member, except the point I was trying to make is—just to say "We need other facilities," does not tell us "how many" and "what kind," and this is the point I am trying to make. When we do this research we will know: Should we be expanding the training schools to the extent of the programme we have in mind now? Or should we not? Or to what extent? How many of these children actually should not be in training schools?

Now, of course, we know now there are some children in training schools who could probably be better handled by some other type of institution, but "how many" is still a matter of a mystery, and it may for that matter still be a year from today. We do not know. But again I appeal to the hon. member to understand the position this department is taking, that this is what should be done as a result of proper research. And with great respect to the debates which have taken place in this House, and all the great contributions made and also with great respect to the select committee on youth, which has done

a wonderful job in this matter, I am sure he will agree that this is still not proper research in the real sense of the term. This is what we are trying to do—the research.

Mr. S. Lewis: I do not agree. I simply think that the research is there; that it is patently obvious that the alternative facilities are required. If the hon. Minister wants us to set it out, if he wants us to say we should have five more Warrendales geographically located by region across the province, that there should be another six boys villages; that every mental health clinic should have an outpatients department; that there should be group homes scattered across the province; that the money given to children's aid societies to build special facilities should be extended to other institutions under The Children's Institutions Act—if the hon. Minister wants us to point one by one to the alternative facilities, there is enough resourcefulness on this side of the House to do it.

I am saying to the hon. Minister through you, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a question of there being a few children in training schools who might be more adequately served elsewhere, or that these 33 per cent or 50 per cent figures are random opinions. If there are a significant number of children in training schools who should not be there, then it is conceivable that they are being irretrievably damaged by their present environment.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Oh, I do not agree on that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Well, the hon. Minister may not agree, but certainly it is true if they are significantly disturbed children. I am sure changes have been made, but the Galt training school I visited last year could not have pretended to handle adequately even five of those 116 disturbed girls—not in any sense adequate. They did not even have any trained personnel in the field of the social sciences and related services. That may be having very damaging and harmful effects on these youngsters.

I realize the dilemma, I realize the problem, but it is not simply a matter of saying—cavalierly—that we have a shortage of staff, or that we will simply move them from this department into another department.

Our contention is that the crisis is of the government's own making and that it is not sufficient to come in here year after year and say, "We are having problems staffing the social services. We don't have enough beds. We don't have enough places. We haven't yet done the research."

In fact, the hon. Minister is over-compensating for the inadequacies of his own department and his own Cabinet colleagues. They may be inherited inadequacies; there may be insensitive members who sit with him on the Treasury benches, but he is heading for difficult times. In truth the whole question of social service personnel and building the premises for these children and for these kinds of social problems is heading for very difficult times.

I only hope there comes the point when his colleagues and all the members who work on him and influence him, will collectively realize that some of us in this House—let me say, Mr. Chairman, that at least 12 or 13 members in this House have realized with a sense of drama that could not possibly come from this Legislature alone, just how critical the shortages across the province are. And there is no answer in saying that the Act was recently proclaimed and we have not yet gathered sufficient evidence.

I will not belabour it, I do not want to pursue it with the hon. Minister any further. But I present this to him as he knows, in good faith. I hope the work he has undertaken continues, but I suggest to him that something powerful has to be done to jolt those colleagues of his. He is a short man, he is a stocky man, he is a vigorous man. I suggest that he shake them a little—without an undue use of force—but shake them a little.

Vote 1903 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This concludes the estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, because of the great number of individual highway improvements made in 1965, my review of some representative ones will be abbreviated in the extreme. However, each hon. member was given, early in January, a copy of a 12-page report detailing some of the new construction and reconstruction carried out until the end of December, 1965. Nevertheless, a few additional statistics are ample evidence of the total amount of improvement and expansion effected during the 1965-1966 fiscal year. For example, before the end of the 1965 calendar year, some 395 miles of paving and more than 100 structures had been completed on King's highways. In addition, the paving of more than 350 miles and work on not less

than some 85 additional structures was at various stages of completion.

A feature of the routine normal programme of improving and, where necessary, expanding the capacity of existing King's highway mileage was the reconstruction to four lanes of some of the more heavily-travelled sections in southern Ontario. New four-lane sections, totalling almost 30 miles, were completed at points on Highway 2, at Windsor, Trenton and Brockville; on Highway 3 at Fort Erie; Highway 8 at Stamford; and on Highway 10 northerly from Cooksville and Brampton. On Highway 11, the widening to four lanes from Orillia northerly was extended as far as the Severn River.

Among the more spectacular and, of necessity, costly projects, initial work was begun in August on the controlled-access Lakehead expressway, which holds the promise of so many benefits for the cities of Port Arthur and Fort William. Late in October, the department awarded the first contract for work on a similar expressway to serve Kitchener-Waterloo and the surrounding area, this work being preparatory to the awarding of the first major contract earlier this month.

On the Queen Elizabeth Way, work was under way at several points. As part of the continuing programme to widen to six lanes those sections carrying heavier traffic volumes, a start was made on the six miles westerly from the Mississauga Road. Farther west, reconstruction of a section in the vicinity of the Highway 25 interchange, including a substantial expansion and modification of the interchange itself, was completed. Two new interchanges, for the Vineland and Jordan sideroads, were well advanced and resurfacing of the south lanes between Niagara Falls and Fort Erie was completed.

On the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, more than 30 miles of two additional lanes were placed in service on sections that previously had only two lanes. In western Ontario, by mid-August, the new south lanes for east-bound traffic had been opened to traffic over the whole of the 20-mile section from east of Kent Centre, just east of Chatham, easterly to the Kent-Elgin county line, representing the completion of four lanes throughout western Ontario.

In eastern Ontario, two new lanes for westbound traffic over the 11 miles between Iroquois and Highway 16 were opened to traffic in October. Grading of the north lanes from Iroquois easterly for 17 miles to the Aultsville sideroad, west of Cornwall, was all but completed, and a paving contract

awarded. With the opening of these additional lanes, the only two-lane mileage over the full route of the freeway will be between Gananoque and Long Beach, west of Brockville.

Over that distance, a new four-lane section is rapidly taking shape on an improved alignment north of the present route. Grading of all four lanes easterly from Gananoque for 4.5 miles will be completed this summer and, with the awarding of a final grading contract this year, grading will be in progress throughout the remainder of the 25-mile route.

Within Metro Toronto, the first section of Ontario's key freeway to be widened to a basic pattern of 12 lanes—the six miles from Highway 400 easterly to Hogg's Hollow, just east of Avenue road—was placed in service in mid-December. This has proved, I am pleased to say, an unqualified success.

Work on widening other sections to 12 lanes was also in progress from Hogg's Hollow easterly to Victoria Park avenue and, west of Highway 400, from Wendell avenue to Kipling avenue. At year's end, the next stage closest to completion was the extension of Highway 400 southeasterly to a new interchange connection with Jane street as an integral part of the overall project, which will be placed in service in 1966.

The first stage of Ontario's newest freeway, number 406, a four-mile section within the city of St. Catharines, providing convenient connections with the QEW, was placed in service in December.

On Highway 403, a two-mile extension within the city of Hamilton was opened in July. Work was also in progress over an additional two miles westerly to the Mohawk road interchange.

Still farther west, construction of another section of this same new freeway, known as the Brantford bypass, was far advanced before the end of the year. It is expected that the bypass, six and one-third miles long, will be placed in service in the summer of 1966.

On October 15 the new Macdonald-Cartier bridge across the Ottawa river linking Ottawa and Hull was officially opened. The \$9.5 million expenditure required for the main structure was shared equally by the provinces of Ontario and Quebec and the federal government. Cost of the Ontario approaches, estimated at more than \$3 million, was borne by The Department of Highways.

An additional section of the Ottawa Queensway, from O'Connor street easterly to Concord street, was opened in November,

thereby providing a much-needed second crossing of the Rideau canal in that vicinity.

On Highway 17, between Ottawa and Arnprior, a wholly new 10-mile section known as the Carp bypass, which cuts some four miles off the mileage, was opened in November.

Another major project in progress in 1965 was the multi-million dollar Quinte skyway bridge and related work on the new highway connection with the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. By the fall, steel girders were being placed atop the supporting concrete piers that cross the Bay of Quinte at a point near Deseronto.

Returning to western Ontario for one further example of how widely dispersed was the total programme of highway improvement in 1965, a new north-south highway to bypass Sarnia on its eastern limits was constructed. Only the finishing touches remain to be applied in 1966.

On the main route of the trans-Canada highway, reconstruction and new construction was under way in 1965 over a total of some 60 miles at various points. Included in the programme was work on a section of Highway 15 near Bells Corners, close to the western limits of Ottawa; bypasses for Madoc on Highway 7 and Beaverton on a new section of Highway 12; the resurfacing of 30 miles of Highway 103 between Waubesa-shene and the junction with Highway 69 at Footes Bay; an 11-mile section of Highway 17 beginning some 60 miles north of Sault Ste. Marie and extending northerly to Mica Bay on Lake Superior; mileage between English river and Ignace, west of the Lakehead; and, still farther west, from Kenora easterly.

Because of an uninterrupted programme of construction and reconstruction, over the past decade in particular, there are now only some 240 miles out of a total mileage of 1,453 comprising the main route of the trans-Canada highway through Ontario that do not meet or surpass the high standards set by the federal government in order to qualify for subsidy. As the details I have just given of the work in progress in 1965 illustrate, this remaining amount of mileage is being steadily reduced with all possible dispatch.

The most impressive project to be placed in service in northwestern Ontario in 1965 was the new 85-mile section of Highway 11 between Atikokan and Fort Frances, officially opened on June 28 by the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts). Before the end of the year, approximately two-thirds of the work

of paving this new section of Highway 11 from the Seine river easterly for 34 miles had been completed.

West of Fort Frances, reconstruction of a seven-mile section between Emo and Barwick is well advanced, while, to the north, the first contract in a long-range programme to substantially improve Highway 71 was awarded in July, this being for the reconstruction of 8.5 miles from Nestor Falls southerly.

On Highway 105, the north-south highway linking the Red Lake mining area with trans-Canada Highway 17, work was in progress under five contracts totalling more than 50 miles. As the result of a sustained and uninterrupted programme to reconstruct this highway over its 110-mile distance, reconstruction has now been completed on all but 36 miles at the southern end. Over the whole of that mileage, grading, now in progress, will be completed this summer, when paving will also begin.

In the same general area, on Highway 72, connecting Sioux Lookout with trans-Canada Highway 17, reconstruction was being carried out on not less than 26 miles.

The most notable project in the realm of resource roads was the new 80-mile section between Ignace, on trans-Canada Highway 17, and Savant lake, on Highway 599, opened to traffic in November. The effect is to provide a through route of more than 215 miles between Ignace and the mining community of Pickle Crow and points farther north as Highway 599 is being extended northerly year by year.

East of the Lakehead, a noteworthy highway improvement got under way in October when a contract was awarded for the reconstruction of Highway 614 southerly from Manitouwadge for nine miles. The award signalled the beginning of a programme to reconstruct, over the whole of its 37-mile length, this highway which serves one of the province's major base metal mining developments.

The drive was continued to complete the extension of Highway 101 from Highway 129, south of Chapleau, westerly to Wawa, and thus to trans-Canada Highway 17. Grading, drainage and granular base work over a total distance of some 37 miles was carried out under four contracts. The work remaining to be done on some 25 miles should be completed and the whole of the route opened to traffic in the fall of 1966.

The Sudbury-Timmins highway route was likewise the scene of considerable activity on several different sections. Contracts for 40

miles of clearing were awarded, the greater part of this work having been completed before the end of the year. Four grading contracts covering 31 miles were also in progress and, in addition, paving of more than eight miles of a newly-reconstructed section of Highway 544 in the vicinity of Cartier was completed.

Work on another new road, from Smooth Rock Falls northerly to Pinard-Fraserdale, a distance of 45 miles, was sufficiently advanced by the fall to permit opening to traffic at that time. The new road provides access to several remote Ontario Hydro generating stations.

While the improvements I have just detailed and, equally, the host of others which were effected in 1965, distributed equitably over all parts of Ontario, to which I have made no reference, are of obvious interest to the hon. members and all those communities benefiting from them, I would like to point out that in this case we are dealing only with those completed or which were begun in 1965. Similarly, later in my remarks when I shall be speaking about some of the more important upcoming work in 1966, we will once more be limited for the greater part to one fiscal year.

The transportation requirements of this booming province are expanding so rapidly and so substantially that the necessity for long-range planning is becoming more evident and more important. What is of far greater significance at this juncture than the immediate programme of highway improvement and expansion in the near term is the continuing development and implementation of ever more sophisticated procedures for long-range planning of the highest order.

The degree of importance which The Department of Highways attaches to highway planning, in the broadest sense of that term, was underlined in my estimates address last year, when the main topic was the notable progress that had been made in the field of planning. More specifically, there was a detailed outline of the background leading up to the decision by the department to implement what are known as area highway planning studies, and the way in which these are carried out. As I informed the hon. members at that time, these studies will cover every part of the province through which a King's or secondary highway passes, the province having been divided into 19 study areas for this purpose.

In addition to the origin-destination surveys, traffic counts, road inventories, land

use, speed and functional planning studies make their contribution to the overall examination. It is to be noted that all roads which are deemed significant for the planning of improvements to the King's highway system are considered in each study. The only exceptions are roads and streets in the larger urban centres, where we rely on the municipalities themselves to collect the data required in carrying out their own urban transportation studies, a subject to which I shall refer again in a moment.

In October, the department presented the findings and recommendations of the second and third such studies to be completed, namely, the eastern Ontario highway planning study and the one known as the London area study, respectively. The favourable reception accorded in each case was similar to that given to the presentation of our pilot study of this type, the one identified as the Niagara peninsula highway planning study.

At this time, three more such studies are at an advanced stage and should be completed before the end of 1966. These are the southwestern Ontario study, embracing the counties of Essex, Kent and Lambton; the Brantford area study; and the one identified as the Ottawa-North Bay Highway 17 corridor study. To give the hon. members an indication of the rate at which this overall study project is progressing, I am pleased to advise that preliminary work preceding the launching of three similar highway planning studies is under way. These are referred to by these titles: The Kitchener-Waterloo area; the Parry Sound area; and the Owen Sound area, which covers all but the southwestern corner of Dufferin, the whole of the counties of Grey, Bruce and Huron and the northern portions of Perth and Wellington.

A most important aspect of this radically new type of study on an area basis conceived by The Department of Highways is the way in which this form of approach to planning has contributed to direct development of a regional nature, rather than development which is purely local and limited in that sense. In that connection, a factor which has emerged as one of the keys necessary for worthwhile success is land use studies, conducted with the most up-to-date techniques available. This observation logically leads me to turn to the transportation studies which the more progressive cities and larger towns have been carrying out for the past few years, with, I might say, the utmost stimulation—financial, through a 75 per cent subsidy, and otherwise—from the department.

Sound and sufficiently broad land use

studies are the foundation upon which intelligent, meaningful urban transportation planning by the municipalities must be based. Accordingly, the department is giving maximum encouragement to the municipalities to stress this aspect of their urban transportation studies.

As I have emphasized so strongly on each occasion when the findings and recommendations of an area highway planning study have been presented, there is nothing fixed, settled or final about these recommendations. They are never offered as representing the ultimate solution to any particular problem. Instead, I have stated in the clearest possible language that the next stage will be for the department to sit down with the representatives of the municipalities concerned to discuss with them how their own road plans can be most effectively integrated with our proposals.

Mr. Chairman, I have digressed in this way only to make the point that it is precisely this type of flexibility of viewpoint toward planning on the part of the municipalities which the department wants to see adopted and the development of which it is encouraging to the hilt. The urban transportation studies by the municipalities will accomplish their maximum potential only if the municipalities endorse, as an established procedure, the policy of reviewing their studies from time to time and updating them as required.

Those municipalities that do review and update their transportation studies in the light of altering conditions, such as changes in the way land is being used and the resultant effect on traffic volumes and patterns, can make realistic adjustments in their previous plans. In turn, such modifications can significantly affect the department's area highway planning study concerned. From this, the very real benefit to the municipalities in constantly reviewing their studies should be abundantly clear. In this connection it is heartening to report that several cities are at the moment in the process of updating studies previously completed.

An excellent example of the application of good road planning techniques and modern management methods may be seen in the needs studies which the counties have been carrying out, assisted by a 50 per cent subsidy from this department, and which have recently been completed.

The studies will, by providing a current guide to the requirements for each county road system over the next five to ten years, enable the counties, together with the department, to prepare five-year construction programmes in which the funds available will be

directed to the areas of greatest need. Without going into detail as to the techniques and procedures being employed, I should observe that a major objective of each needs study is the identification of what would constitute a desirable county road system.

Ideally, the counties will now move toward the adoption of these desirable systems. I am happy to report that the results of the studies, in the great majority of cases, indicate this to be the intention of the counties. The degree to which each county achieves the objectives defined for implementation through its study will determine the measure of overall benefit for that county and, as well, the county road systems on a provincial basis.

The county needs study could never have been carried out with such success had not the counties themselves recognized the value to their respective road systems of such a study. This recognition, in turn, resulted in their positive support throughout all stages. I wish to take this occasion to acknowledge this contribution and to thank them for it, for being, in this instance, as I like to put it, partners in progress with the department.

Further to the explanatory comments I have made in the House relative to the introduction and subsequent enactment of The Local Roads Boards Act, and also my remarks in the course of presenting last year's estimates on the progress made in this sphere, I am now pleased to provide an up-to-date report.

Thirty-six boards were formally established prior to June, 1965, and became operative in that year. Since that time, 41 additional applications have been received and are being processed. It is anticipated that most or all of these will be in operation this year.

It is a point of interest that of the 36 established boards, 29 are in former statute labour areas and seven are in townships in which there was no previous form of organization. The 41 new applications represent 25 former statute labour boards; the other 16 will be entirely new organizations.

It would be impossible in my remarks this evening to indicate, even in the briefest type of outline, the scope of the progress made by the department in 1965 in the realms of highway planning, design, maintenance and research. However, there are some examples in the fields of maintenance and research to which I shall now briefly refer.

In May, 1965, the department announced it had retained a firm of consultants—specialists in their field—to carry out a new type of survey of maintenance procedures which

would include an examination of all aspects of the department's management of maintenance methods and operating practices. Some of the factors to receive special attention, it was stated at that time, were cost accounting, new methods for defining and establishing workloads, and performance measurement.

The decision to have this survey made, believed to be among the first of its kind to be undertaken by any government agency in Canada—indeed, it is possible that nothing similar has been done to date—was based on the most impressive results which similar surveys have produced for state highway departments pioneering in this respect in the United States. Prompting this type of initiative was the increasing portion of the total annual budget of the department required for maintenance purposes, both for King's highways and for subsidies to the municipalities.

The first phase of the survey project, including a review and evaluation of the management of maintenance practices by selected municipalities, has just been completed; the results already obtained are such that we will likely proceed at an early date to the second phase.

The survey has indicated that there appears to be worthwhile opportunities for improving the maintenance function through the provision of adequate training programmes effectively presented. To that end, a study was made of what appears to be required for instruction of this type, both now and in the future. Indications of the lines along which other changes not related to training might be explored have also been given.

Another milestone of vital importance for the greater efficiency of maintenance operations occurred last July when two-way radio systems became operative in the department's administrative districts of Sault Ste. Marie, Fort William and Kenora. With the completion of the installation of the department's own equipment in these three districts, all 18 of the department's districts now have such systems, more than 700 mobile units being equipped to use the system. Two-way radio has proven invaluable for the department's maintenance forces, most strikingly in emergency situations created by blizzards, wash-outs, storms and accidents of all types.

So far as can be ascertained, no other highway department in Canada has the equivalent in two-way radio systems. In fact, it would appear that few highway departments in the United States can compare in this respect, this being another instance of

why The Department of Highways, Ontario, is regarded as one of the most progressive anywhere.

While research has long been an integral part of the overall operation of the department, it assumed new dimensions in 1965, especially in the field of what may be described as problems of an intangible nature associated with traffic and highway planning. An example of the latter is the effort being made to develop more accurate methods of predicting the type and volume of highway traffic that will result from the expected further growth of tourism in coming years, so that the necessary amount of highway expansion can be planned accordingly.

So as to develop improved design criteria for pavement and bridges, the related analytical studies will be carried forward, as will the field observation of performance under traffic conditions. These studies are closely associated with the consideration currently being given to the interrelationship between the vehicle sizes and load limits permitted under our laws and the service behaviour of roads and bridges.

The department's own testing facilities, designed and built by it expressly for this purpose, will continue to be used to test exhaustively, over a 1.5-year period, the effectiveness of rust inhibitors in reducing the corrosion of auto-body steel caused by salt used in winter maintenance. In this comprehensive project, other factors related to metal corrosion are being investigated throughout the test period.

There are several other examples that could be mentioned, but these should be sufficient to indicate something of the scope of the total research programme. Some of the problems will be studied by departmental staff, others assigned to universities participating with the department in the Ontario joint highway research programme, and some, where circumstances dictate, to consultants.

The overriding consideration in the department's scheduling of work in the 1966-1967 fiscal year, within the budget I am about to present, will be, as in the past, the judicious application of the funds available to ensure the greatest possible improvement in the level of service rendered by Ontario's total road network. In that network, as I have stressed many times in expounding the total roads concept which guides the department in its planning and construction programmes, the King's highway mileage and municipal roads and streets complement each other.

Before submitting a tabulation of proposed expenditures, I am pleased to inform the House that, in accordance with the policy of this government and a recommendation of the 1965 public accounts committee, we are submitting a new format for these estimates that has been considerably revised. The submission in this new form will provide the hon. members with substantially more information than in previous years. Instead of three votes, as formerly, there will be 11 and the analysis of expenditures will be set forth under 50 items.

Of special interest to the House is the new grouping of expenditures according to broad types of service rendered, together with supplementary information helpful to an understanding of the purpose served by the respective expenditures.

We shall continue our efforts to improve still further the form of submission of future estimates, to the end that the greatest amount of relevant information will be made available in terms that may be readily understood, sir.

The following table will provide a comparison of the estimates for the forthcoming fiscal year with the one now ending: King's highways—construction 1966-1967—\$159,329,000 (1965-1966—\$142,178,000). King's highways—maintenance, \$56,713,000 (\$51,505,000). Municipal assistance, \$153,750,000 (\$137,315,000). Commuter rail project, \$9,625,000 (—). Administration, \$5,848,000 (\$5,175,000). Gross expenditure is \$385,265,000 (\$336,173,000). Less: refunds account for \$12,000,000 (\$6,780,000). Net expenditure is \$373,265,000 (\$329,393,000).

Previously, in this type of abbreviated breakdown of the budget the heading of municipal assistance has included road subsidies, direct aid, and special forms of assistance in unincorporated townships. However, in recent years, expenditures which have come from the King's highway account on projects of direct benefit to the municipalities have risen to the point where they now represent a sizeable proportion of the funds voted in this category.

For this reason—and so as to more correctly indicate something of the degree of financial aid now being extended to the municipalities—we have this year, under the heading of municipal assistance, also provided for budgeted expenditures under connecting link agreements and construction agreements (special)—the type covering the new controlled-access urban expressways and other work on municipal streets closely associated with King's highway routes.

Under "direct aid"—by far the greater part of which is devoted to the development road programme—we have provided a record \$19 million, up \$2 million from last year.

The total financial aid budgeted under the heading "municipal assistance," namely, \$153.75 million, represents more than 41 per cent of the total budget. Nevertheless, even that impressive percentage falls far short of the full measure of help since it does not take into account any of the other most substantial expenditures on other projects of direct benefit to the municipalities, such as the Ottawa Queensway, Highway 403—both the section now in use in Hamilton and the Brantford bypass, nearing completion—Highway 406 in St. Catharines, and others.

Indeed, under the total roads concept which this department has translated into a positive programme, we expect that financial aid of all types for the municipalities will continue to increase as the department works more closely with them in their efforts to solve pressing road problems.

The estimates for my department for the coming year include an amount of \$9,625,000 to cover the initial phase of the government's rail commuter project.

As the hon. members probably will recall, the government's decision to launch this project was announced to the House on May 19 of last year by the hon. Prime Minister. I had the privilege at that time to acquaint the House of some of the details that were contemplated in the proposed service.

I will not burden hon. members with a review of those details or the background leading to the decision, except to say that the project grew out of the investigations of the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study.

Instead, I will briefly outline the developments that have taken place from the time of the announcement.

Because of the thoroughness of the preparation leading to the government's decision, it was possible to invite tenders for equipment 22 days later, and on August 12 it was possible to award contracts.

Because of technical developments in the equipment construction field, it was decided to alter our equipment concept to provide the service with a better selection that would result in a more efficient and more economical operation.

Instead of operating with all trains hauled by locomotives, there will now be nine self-propelled diesel-car units of a new design

that will operate economically during off-peak periods and supplement locomotive-hauled trains during peak travelling periods.

I might say that these self-propelled units were obtained at a considerably lower price than the cost to purchase any comparable units now on the market.

Because of the purchase of these self-propelled units, we were able to cut back on the number of locomotives from ten to eight, and the number of locomotive-hauled cars required was reduced from 48 to 40.

The contract for the locomotives was let to General Motors Diesel Ltd. on a bid of \$2,828,328. The contract for the 40 coaches and nine self-propelled cars was let to Hawker Siddeley (Canada) Ltd. on a bid of \$4,309,840. Deliveries of all equipment are scheduled to be completed by the end of this year.

While the locomotives are a standard model of 3,000-hp rating, specially equipped with auxiliary electrical generators for lighting, heating and air-conditioning, the coaches and cars are of a new design that lends itself to operating economies while maintaining a high degree of passenger comfort and convenience.

All of these units are 85 feet in length, but with a considerably lower weight ratio than any rail commuter equipment now being produced on this continent. The coaches will weigh 57,200 lbs., and the self-propelled cars, including 385-hp Rolls Royce diesel propulsion units, 70,000 lbs.

These low weights will allow considerable savings in operating costs.

I am happy to say that because of the more economical operation of these self-propelled cars, it will now be possible to provide hourly service during Sundays and holidays, instead of the originally considered 90-minute service.

During the past five months, on-the-ground surveys have been carried out to determine a selection of desirable station locations in the areas that we indicated would be included in the service.

The decisions on these matters involve operational considerations, patronage accessibility, population growth prediction, availability of parking space, interchange facilities and land acquisition costs, to name but a few. Within the next few weeks, this aspect of the project will have been concluded.

Meanwhile, architects have been at work drawing up designs and specifications for

station buildings, platforms, and other construction aspects involved in the installation of stations.

Canadian National Railways, which will operate the service for the government under a contract, has assigned a special staff to handle the commuter project; these people have been preparing plans for modifying the line to handle the service. These modifications will involve track relocation in certain station areas and installation of new signal facilities to handle high-frequency passenger traffic.

Station and right-of-way construction is scheduled to commence early this spring.

After the delivery of the equipment, a period of trial service must be carried out before the inauguration of service early in 1967, as projected.

As a matter of interest to hon. members, the creation of this service involves almost 1,200 separate work assignments of a major nature. Every one of these requires decisions at the highest level because they all have to be dovetailed into an interlocking project programme designed to bring the service into operation in the shortest time possible.

The detail of work required to carry out the great majority of these assignments is formidable; if it were not for the high degree of co-operation and rapport established between government and railway personnel, it is doubtful that the project could be launched within the time limits originally considered.

I appreciate that this has been a résumé covering progress in the broader aspects of the project; the main highlights. I am sure that there are details on some of these aspects that would interest some hon. members and I will be pleased to accommodate their questions.

Among the more ambitious undertakings on which major work will be done in 1966 will be two tunnels under the Welland canal. On the Thorold tunnel, the contractor is making good progress on the \$14-million-plus contract awarded last September. Here, time is of the essence as certain stages must be completed before the opening of the canal to navigation this spring. The present schedule is that tenders for the western approaches will be called this summer.

In March, tenders will be called for the first major work on the St. Catharines tunnel under the canal, the preliminary work having been completed in 1965. Tenders, which will be for the tunnel itself and a considerable amount of associated work, will be opened, it is now expected, early in May.

The announcement last December by the St. Lawrence Seaway authority that it has under consideration construction of a new 8.5-mile section that would bypass the city of Welland has made it necessary for The Department of Highways to hold in abeyance the plans it had developed for additional crossings of the canal. In the case of a tunnel planned for Welland, this planning was at a most advanced stage.

Following immediately upon this announcement, the department began additional studies to gather the necessary data for crossings at new locations should the federal government, through the seaway authority, decide in favour of the alternative or bypass route. These studies have been given a high priority because of the urgency of the matter for the municipalities concerned—and, indeed, for the general area. The department is endeavouring to maintain the closest possible liaison with the authority.

The \$159,329,000 budgeted for capital construction will ensure an impressive volume of work being in progress in all parts of Ontario in 1966, both on a number of larger, more spectacular projects, and for the improvement of existing sections of highway.

On the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, there will be no let-up in the drive to open additional lanes over the small amount of mileage on which there are as yet only two lanes. As early as possible, paving of the north lanes between Iroquois and the Aultsville sideroad, west of Cornwall, will be underway for fall completion, it is expected. The eastern end of this section joins with previously completed four-lane mileage extending to the Quebec border.

On the new four-lane section of the freeway being constructed on an improved alignment north of the present mileage between Gananoque and Long Beach, west of Brockville, grading of four lanes over the whole 25-mile distance will be in progress in 1966. In addition, it is proposed to award some nine miles of paving from Gananoque easterly, where the grading will be finished this summer, including the new connection to the Thousand Islands bridge. Exclusive of work on sections within Metro Toronto, it is planned to award contracts for this freeway having an estimated value of \$9 million.

Major work on the widening of sections of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway within Metro Toronto will be continued, the new work proposed being valued at \$5.6 million.

Major work will be in evidence on the Quinte Skyway, the Ottawa Queensway and

the Kitchener-Waterloo expressway—for which the department awarded its first large contract this month—the work involved on the latter being valued at well over \$4 million.

Widening of the Queen Elizabeth Way to six lanes from west of Highway 10 westerly for 5.5 miles will be completed. It is expected that it will be possible to begin work on the construction of service roads on both sides of the QEW between Hamilton and St. Catharines, as an integral part of the continuing programme to further control access on this highway between Hamilton and Niagara Falls.

Work is also scheduled to start on the reconstruction of the interchange for the QEW and Highway 27 and related improvements.

On Highway 403, in the vicinity of the western limits of the city of Hamilton, the extension of this freeway westerly from Mohawk road for 3.5 miles to Hamilton drive has been scheduled, the cost of which new work is estimated at \$2.5 million. Farther west, the Brantford bypass section of Highway 403 will be completed this year.

In the same general area, on the new highway being constructed between Brantford and Simcoe, to be signed number 24, work will continue; it is planned to award a paving contract from the junction with Highway 53 southerly to Scotland.

Work already in progress will go forward and new work will be awarded on the Beaverton bypass, which project will result in a notable improvement for one of the main vacation routes, much of the mileage forming part of the route of the trans-Canada highway.

New work scheduled at various points on the main route of the trans-Canada highway is valued at \$3.7 million, the greater part of this mileage being in northern and north-western Ontario.

Elsewhere in northwestern Ontario, a high volume of work has again been scheduled. On Highway 105, two new paving contracts will be awarded to complete the reconstruction of this highway over its 110-mile distance.

Work on the 60-mile extension of Highway 631 southerly from Hornepayne to a junction with trans-Canada Highway 17, near the town of White River, will go forward under two contracts, one for grading and granular base from 6.5 miles south of Hornepayne southerly for the next eight miles, and the other for clearing from 15 miles south of Hornepayne southerly for 12.5 miles, both contracts to be completed this year.

On the closing of the present "gap" on Highway 101 between Wawa and Highway 129, south of Chapleau, the work to be completed in 1966 under contracts already awarded will see the opening of this new 80-mile link in the fall of 1966.

The start of additional work with a value approaching \$1 million is scheduled for the new Sudbury-Timmins highway, to be signed King's highway number 144. It is planned to award two contracts for grading and/or granular base over two sections totalling 16.5 miles between Highway 101 and Gogama and a third contract for a bridge over Bailey creek, north of Benny.

The first phase of the reconstruction of Highway 614—southerly from Manitouwadge for nine miles—will be in progress under a contract recently awarded, and a second contract for clearing of a widened and improved right-of-way for the next 9.5 miles will be awarded.

The projects I have mentioned specifically are, of course, only representative of the aggregate programme of highway improvement and expansion which will begin or be continued in the 1966-1967 fiscal year. So as to amplify and substantiate most forcefully that statement, I shall cite only two or three statistics to make the point. The first is this: Over and above the projects I have just identified, the capital programme calls for a start to be made in 1966 on more than 320 miles of sections of King's highway that require either reconstruction or expansion, the work to consist of grading, paving or a combination in each case. The same programme has scheduled the replacement of 40 structures. The estimated construction cost alone to complete that programme is \$35.4 million.

The second statistic is: Still over and above this, resurfacing of an additional 95 miles of highway that does not require reconstruction has been provided for, requiring an estimated expenditure of two and one-third million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, while I have taken longer than desired in presenting these estimates, the hon. members would agree, I am confident that a proposed expenditure approaching \$400 million merits their most careful consideration, for which purpose detailed information should be provided to them. Accordingly, I have made a conscientious effort to document the advanced planning procedures followed by the department itself in determining the needs of the King's highway system and, equally, given evidence of how equitably the programme of improve-

ment and expansion has been dispersed in every part of the province, and how this will again be the case in the coming fiscal year.

In the course of doing so, it has also been my pleasure to furnish other examples of the progressive spirit that characterizes The Department of Highways and its overall efficiency.

At the same time, equal emphasis has been placed on the leadership and financial aid which the department is giving to the municipalities generally on an ever-increasing scale, to the end that the total road system of this province—in which the King's highways and municipal roads complement each other—will make the maximum contribution to the economic growth of Ontario and the well-being of its people.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, as I rise once again to take part in the debate on the estimates of The Department of Highways, may I first congratulate the hon. Minister for his fine presentation.

May I at the same time, through him, thank his many departmental officials and staff for the co-operation we on this side of the House have received from them during the past year. We do hope—or should I say we know—that in the ensuing year they will be as helpful.

Now, Mr. Chairman, once again, as I did in 1965, I had intended to take the hon. Minister to task for not having provided us with a capital construction programme for the 1966-67 fiscal year well in advance of these estimates. This year, Mr. Chairman, he has done so; but I think it was more by accident than intent.

Mr. Chairman, you may recall that in 1965 I suggested that The Department of Highways present its estimates in a more logical manner so that one may be able to find answers in the public accounts more readily. I would first like to thank the hon. Minister for making a start on that reorganization this year. Instead of three votes, in which we approve \$373 million, if we had followed last year's method of presentation, we now have 11 votes. However, this reorganization has not gone far enough. There should be a much more detailed and minute breakdown.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to read from the report of the standing committee on public accounts, on June 10, 1965:

As a result of its deliberations your committee places before you the following recommendations. Included in this list of

recommendations are some from last year's report which we feel should be repeated. In regard to the estimates. The estimates should include, in addition to the proposed expenditure for the forthcoming fiscal year the following, the presentation to be made in columnar fashion: (a) approved estimate for the last completed fiscal year; (b) actual expenditure for the last completed fiscal year; (c) the approved estimate for the current fiscal year.

A second item:

The estimates and accounts of the province should show more detailed classification of what is now called maintenance, so that the cost of the purchase of office equipment, the purchase of supplies and other categories of expenditures should be immediately apparent.

A third point:

Your committee wishes to commend the present policy of providing greater detail of expenditure in the estimates and accounts by increasing the number of individual votes. We recommend that this policy be continued and expedited with particular reference to The Department of Highways.

Mr. Chairman, I would normally hesitate to suggest improvements, but to me it would be logical to have individual votes for freeways, King's highways, secondary highways, development roads, new constructions, repairs, winter maintenance, general maintenance. I would say it might be difficult to condense the department's estimates into less than 20 votes. For example, we should know the awarding date of a contract, the starting date, the completion date, the original bid price, the final cost price, the cost of overruns, the reason for overruns. We should know the contracts that were not completed within the contract time, the reason for granting an extension. We should have all the details.

The annual report does give some breakdown, but it does hide more than it shows. It reminds one of an iceberg, ten per cent visible.

Mr. Chairman, the estimates for this year ask for a total of \$373 millions as against \$329 million last year. This is an increase of some \$44 million, or some 13 per cent. However, if you take into consideration expected normal salary increases to the departmental personnel and also increases in the cost of construction and add to these the factors of normal population growth of the

province, plus the annual inflation factor, you find that in constant dollars we are actually spending less per capita in this department than we did last year.

So regardless of what the hon. Minister may have said in his introductory remarks, the plain facts are this department has not kept up with the times, is not keeping up with the times, is not keeping up with the normal growth.

Not only has road building failed to keep pace with the needs of the province, but the backlog of highway deficiencies has been increasing very rapidly. Studies have shown that large portions of the King's highway system and secondary roads are seriously inadequate for today's traffic. To rehabilitate the highways of the province, to a satisfactory level of—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: I am apparently getting through to you fellows.

To rehabilitate the highways of the province to a satisfactory level of service would entail new construction, replacement and stopgap work on roads and bridges costing well over \$2 billion.

In addition to the abovementioned, traffic congestion in many urban areas testifies to many deficiencies in our highway system, that is in our road and street networks. Insufficient shoulder width on our highways; deficiencies in width and load-carrying capacity of many bridge structures; poor surface conditions; bad curves; insufficient sight distance. These are but a few of the many inadequacies of our road system.

Really, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to real planning, this department should not be one step ahead of the times, it should be miles, yes, many highway miles ahead of the day. It should not merely be trying to catch up; it should not be a follower, it should be the leader in the economic growth of Ontario. It should be the catalyst to the economic growth of all parts of the province so that the slogan, "Province of Opportunity" would be meaningful.

Let us look at the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, or Highway 401 as it is better known. In spite of all of the ballyhoo, it is still not completed. From a start in 1947 to today, 1966, it is still an incomplete four-lane concrete ribbon, let alone much work done on making this road what it was intended to be, that is a limited access freeway. In fact the original estimate for the complete construction of Highway 401 was \$150 million. The

final figures will be over 20 times that amount, close to \$3 billion. It will be well over five years more of waiting before the name Macdonald-Cartier limited access freeway may apply. Nineteen years to date is much too long a period of time to have built this roadway. This is an average of only 27 miles per year. If this is the best a Tory government can do: Shame!

Yes, Mr. Chairman, double shame to have penalized western Ontario and eastern Ontario by depriving them of this means of communication for so long a period of time. If this government were as concerned as they claim to be about the overall growth of the province the eastern end of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway would have been completed years ago. The only conclusion one can come to concerning this department is that its policy is built on political expediency, not necessity. In fact it is common talk that the definition of a highway is that it is the shortest distance between two Tory ridings.

The department has had numerous projected studies, five-year plans, ten-year plans, 20-year plans, updated plans; but it never seems to do things in a whole—only in part. A bit of road here, another piece there, and so forth. Why not, Mr. Minister, take the bull by the horns—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Chairman, at this stage—

Mr. Newman: I have just one paragraph.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Then you are all through; fine!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, why not take the bull by the horns, get down to the job and complete within, say a five-year period of time, all of the needs of the province for the next 20?

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Now you can move the adjournment.

Mr. Newman: No, I have just one short paragraph here.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): We know how you feel.

Mr. Newman: Funds can be borrowed and then all of this can be repaid out of revenues derived from the users of the road, registration and fuel taxes and so forth. Unless such a policy is adopted, highway and roads construction may become the chief bottleneck, the tourniquet, preventing a continued and accelerated economic growth in all parts of Ontario. Just look at the overall growth of the province, Mr. Minister, and the areas of slow growth have been those that were poorest serviced by highways.

I have more remarks, I would prefer to make them tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report that it has come to a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Wednesday, we propose to move certain second readings which will include government bills as well as private bills, and if there is any time left in the afternoon we will go on to and continue with the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, before the debate adjourns can the hon. Minister indicate what second readings will be coming before the House?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: No; any of them may be called.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.35 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 2, 1966

Charitable Institutions Act , bill to amend, Mr. Cecile, first reading	1069
Statement re Ontario educational capital aid corporation , Mr. Allan	1072
Plant Diseases Act , bill to amend, Mr. MacNaughton, second reading	1072
Crown Timber Act , bill to amend, Mr. Roberts, second reading	1072
Expansion and improvement of privately owned woodlands , bill to provide for, Mr. Roberts, second reading	1072
Discrimination in employment because of age , bill to prevent, Mr. Rowntree, second reading	1076
Telephone Act , bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	1081
Gasoline Handling Act, 1966 , bill intituled, Mr. Simonett, second reading	1081
Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act , bill to amend, Mr. Simonett, second reading	1082
Law Society Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1082
Conditional Sales Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1086
Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading ..	1086
Change of Name Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1086
Judicature Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1087
Devolution of Estates Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1087
Licensing and regulation of nursing homes , bill to provide for, Mr. Dymond, second reading	1087
Summary Convictions Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1096
Coroners Act , bill to amend, Mr. Wishart, second reading	1096
Co-operative Loans Act , bill to amend, Mr. Stewart, second reading	1096
Greater Niagara general hospital , bill respecting, Mr. Bukator, second reading	1096
Township of Toronto , bill respecting, Mr. Mackenzie, second reading	1096
City of Brantford , bill respecting, Mr. Nixon, second reading	1096
Canadian national exhibition association , bill respecting, Mr. Cowling, second reading	1096
Town of Weston , bill respecting, Mr. MacDonald, second reading	1096
Police village of Baden , bill respecting, Mr. Reuter, second reading ..	1096
City of London , bill respecting, Mr. White, second reading	1096
Town of Burlington , bill respecting, Mr. McKeough, second reading	1097
City of Sudbury , bill respecting, Mr. Sopha, second reading	1097
Board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Windsor , bill respecting, Mr. Thrasher, second reading	1097
Township of North York , bill respecting, on second reading, held	1097
Motion to adjourn , Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1097

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 2, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome, as guests to the Legislature today, students from the following schools: In the west gallery, Fairview public school, Cooksville and Maple Grove public school, Barrie.

Petitions.

Presenting reports of committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS ACT

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Charitable Institutions Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the legislation substantially increases the capital grants to those private organizations to construct or purchase buildings to be used as charitable institutions. Under the former legislation, the provincial grant was 50 per cent of the cost of new construction up to a maximum grant of \$2,500 per bed. This now has been increased to \$5,000 per bed. If an existing building is purchased, rather than constructed, the province may grant the full purchase cost up to a maximum of \$1,200 a bed.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), notice of which has been given. Has the actual separation of the company and the bean board been effected? If so, what is the name of the new company?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, a partial separation has been effected in that there are now two separate boards with different personnel.

Complete separation will be made as soon as is practical after the audit, which is now in progress, is completed.

I want to make it abundantly clear that it is intended to turn back the company and the plant to the growers, just as soon as it is possible, after the audit is completed and the necessary arrangements are made for such to be done.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister? Has this partial separation reached the point where the board has actually rented additional facilities, beyond what it had previous to the government's action in this area?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the new bean board has acquired facilities in the co-op medical services building in London for their premises.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, one more supplementary question? This being so, would it then follow that the growers' money is being used to rent this building and to furnish it?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: No, it does not follow that it does, Mr. Speaker. The cost of renting the facilities, in which the new board find themselves in the co-op medical services building, is being paid by the farm products marketing board for the time being.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): I have a question for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts).

Would the hon. Minister outline what steps are being taken to meet and control the wolf problem in areas where the deer population is being destroyed? And is the wolf bounty being increased to encourage trappers and others to help solve the problem?

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, the question put by the hon. member has some of the elements of that famous one addressed to a husband by a prosecuting attorney, "Have you stopped beating your wife? Answer

yes or no." But I am sure that the hon. member is not endeavouring intentionally to put the department into that kind of a straitjacket. We have in the department, stationed across the province at various strategic points, predator control officers. They work with the farmers and trappers in the use of the best techniques and equipment available to meet any local problem involving predation by wolves. These officers, in addition, keep a close watch on wolf populations themselves and are available to act on the complaint of individuals. There are some 25 of them across the province.

The wolf bounty at present is \$25. It has been at this level for a number of years. Some years ago, the bounty was increased to \$40 for a period and then was brought back to the \$25 figure because it became apparent that the number of wolves taken did not increase. The amount paid out for wolf bounties for the current year is estimated—or will be by the time this month is out—at about \$60,000.

With regard to the deer situation at the moment, I am glad to be able to inform the House that reports received from field officers, in flights over some deer areas, indicate that the condition of the deer population is more satisfactory at this time than it has been for a number of years. We are making efforts to interest sportsmen of the province in the pursuit of wolves and coyotes as game animals. By use of motorized toboggans as means of transportation, and the development of techniques by our staff to locate packs of wolves and coyotes, hunting of these animals has become a popular sport in several parts of the province.

The district forester for North Bay district, where my hon. friend's riding is included, informs me the local predator control officer, Mr. Len Côté, is centrally located at Marten river and that recently some deer-feeding areas have been provided in the district that the gentleman opposite represents. Encouragement is being given to trappers to take more wolves in their traplines. The pelts this year are bringing worthwhile prices—\$15 and better in some cases—and that, of course, is in addition to the bounty.

I understand also that the deer kill in the last hunting season in Nipissing was somewhat better than in the previous year. Incidentally, some Americans make a point of going into the Nipissing district a little later in the winter, and they do a certain amount of aeroplane hunting for wolves. They co-operate with our department on information, and I believe last year they took somewhere

between 20 and 45 wolves during their forages in the Nipissing district.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett): What is the position of The Department of Energy and Resources Management in regard to the present proposal of the Trans-Canada Pipeline Company to build a pipeline to bring western natural gas through the United States as opposed to an all-Canadian line?

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, I might say that the application of the Trans-Canada Pipeline Company is presently being heard before the national energy board. Our main concern in Ontario is to have an ample supply of gas at the best possible price, and of course, we are not taking any position as to what route they follow.

Mr. Smith: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the hon. Minister. Is he satisfied that the supply of natural gas will be enough in northwestern Ontario without this new pipeline?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: Yes, we are informed that the present pipeline can supply all the needs in northern Ontario at the present time; and, of course, if this line does go through the northern United States, it will be serving an area in north and northwestern Ontario.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). Will the hon. Attorney General investigate the following charges made by Mr. Ray Taggart, president of teamsters local 879 in Hamilton: (1) that striking teamsters have been injured during the past few weeks by a non-union driver crashing through picket lines on the advice of police; (2) that trucks on the highways now have major mechanical defects which affect steering, brakes, lights and tires; (3) that The Public Commercial Vehicles Act is being violated by the use of trucks for the hauling of freight, which normally would not pass the scrutiny of the authorities?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member was good enough to give me advance notice of his intention to ask the question. I have already commenced investigations. I am not prepared to give a complete answer, although the question asks: "Will the Attorney General investigate?" To that I would certainly

answer "yes." I could add further that my investigations have been underway.

I do know and can inform the House that there are provincial police officers at the scene and their purpose there is simply to make certain that there is no breach of the peace. I shall investigate to see if the charge suggested, that they have been exceeding their instructions and authority, is so. My advice so far indicates that the situation is orderly; and also, as far as I have been able to discover, no trucks have been leaving the scene or proceeding on the highways with mechanical defects of a serious nature—which is indicated here.

I am investigating the matter of the PCV Act violations, as alleged. I hope to have further information for the hon. member as soon as I continue those investigations.

Mr. Gisborn: Thank you. I assume the hon. Attorney General will let me know what he finds.

I would like to direct a supplementary question to the hon. Attorney General: To what extent has the regular highway patrol been reduced because of the diversion of the provincial police to picket line locations?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, having had no warning of this question—and it is the type of question that requires investigation and study—I do not think that there would be any appreciable difference. Certainly some officers, if they are engaged in one duty, have to leave another; but I cannot answer that question more fully at the moment.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan).

Is he in a position to report on the government investigation of a greater than normal number of transfers of truck licences since the commencement of the teamsters' strike; and can he also confirm his assurance that sales tax will be paid on all such transfers?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, as I explained to the hon. members on February 15, the retail sales tax branch has been investigating motor vehicle transfers as it has done for several years. On those transfers which are found to be taxable, the purchasers will be assessed. There has been no change in the application of The Retail Sales Tax Act on such transactions, so that transfers of a type similar to those which attracted tax in 1965 and before

will be taxable now, either on the fair value of the sale or on the rental.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, perhaps my supplementary question should be directed to the hon. Provincial Treasurer, but the last time I queried him on this point he indicated that they had information from The Department of Transport that there was a greater than normal number of transfers and they were looking into it. Is the hon. Provincial Treasurer in a position to comment on that aspect or should I ask the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett)?

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, I think it is our responsibility. The Department of Transport inform us of the transfers and we take it from there, which we are doing. I would say that there have been a greater than normal number of transfers.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given.

When will the regulations under The Medical Services Insurance Act be published, in view of the fact that the public are now purchasing policies?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the regulations under The Medical Services Insurance Act will be published before the end of this month.

Mr. S. Lewis: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does the hon. Minister not recognize that under The Insurance Act of this province private insurance companies would not get away with advertising policies without giving their substance?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of that.

Mr. S. Lewis: Then why not?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Because it is not necessary.

Mr. MacDonald: What is the hon. Minister going to do about it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: What you are getting is published in the bill.

Mr. S. Lewis: The regulations were not published.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: The regulations have nothing to do with the policies.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Allan: Mr. Speaker, in my Budget speech of February 9 I outlined how the province of Ontario would obtain funds generated by the Canada pension plan. I stated at that time that we propose to make funds available for the purchase of debentures issued by municipalities and school boards for the construction of schools and through the universities' capital aid corporation for the purchase of debentures from universities.

I stated further that the rate of interest to be charged to municipalities and school boards would be based on the cost to the province of the funds available under the Canada pension plan.

The Minister of Finance of Canada advised me by wire on February 28 that the amount available to Ontario from February collections of the plan was \$20,110,000, and that the rate of interest set for the borrowing of this amount was 5.29 per cent.

It should be understood that this rate will fluctuate from month to month in accordance with the market rate of issues of Canada having a maturity of 20 years or longer.

I would also like to inform the House that it is proposed to introduce legislation to set up a Crown corporation to be called the Ontario educational capital aid corporation. This corporation will have as its object the purchase of debentures of municipalities and school boards issued for the construction of schools. The rate of interest to be charged by this corporation will be very close to our cost.

Hon. members will fully appreciate the great benefit that this government is passing on to the municipalities and school boards in making funds available at favourable interest rates for the total cost of the construction of schools.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

THE PLANT DISEASES ACT

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways) in the absence of **Hon. W. A. Stewart** (Minister of Agriculture) moves second Reading of Bill No. 18, An Act to amend The Plant Diseases Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CROWN TIMBER ACT

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests) moves second reading of Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act.

Hon. A. K. Roberts (Minister of Lands and Forests): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I should say just a word on the principle of this bill dealing with the management of licensed areas. There are a number of provisions designed to improve the management, including the utilization and control of the Crown timber under licence. Provision is made to ensure that persons acquiring licences in the sale of Crown timber by public tender will be in a position to fully utilize the timber. Also, provision is made for cancellation of licences where there has been inadequate cutting operations or inadequate improvement of the licensed areas on transfers.

Provision is also made for bringing the maximum amount of district cutting licences into line with today's dollar values, respecting cutting of scattered pieces. There are also additional provisions respecting withholding of the annual cutting approval and to strengthen the requirements respecting annual plans and returns.

In view of the changing methods of timber operations, including the mechanization and transportation, new standards of scaling are required and the qualifications of scalers must be raised. As a result, the issue of new pulpwood scaler licences will be discontinued, but existing pulpwood licences will be renewed. Hereafter the new scalers must qualify for all species. The penalties for unauthorized cutting of Crown timber, the hauling of unscaled timber and other similar offences against the Act are being modified to provide for a greater flexibility in levying penalties. I might say that this bill would, Mr. Speaker, be referred to the committee on natural resources, mining and wildlife.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

PRIVATELY OWNED WOODLANDS

Hon. Mr. Roberts moves second reading of Bill No. 22, An Act to provide for the expansion and improvement of privately owned woodlands.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I would like to point out that from the earliest time, the farms in

southwestern Ontario have normally had associated with them a woodlot, which in days gone by was used to provide the fuel for those living on the farm, either in the main home, or in those of the people who had to take part in the farm labour.

Naturally, over the years these woodlots have fallen into considerable disuse, as other fuels have come to be used, which were more convenient and less associated with the hard work of going out in the wintertime with a cross-cut saw and providing the fuel.

It is also true that the utilization of these woodlots for maple products has fallen off considerably in the last few years, and it is only in the exceptional case where a maple bush has been maintained. This is still an economically viable unit.

These woodlots have been maintained, first by the desires of the farmers themselves—who hate to denude the landscape of the trees which are so useful in conservation practice—and in many instances by local bylaws which would forbid the farmers to strip the land of the trees so that it could be turned to normal farming purposes.

It seems to me that through the years, the farmers of southern Ontario have subsidized the general conservation efforts of the province, by maintaining these woodlots at little or no profit to themselves, when otherwise they might have been converted into ordinary farm land. The farmers have done this year after year, but it is just in the last few years that the cost of labour has really removed from the farmers the chance to make some money out of the woodlots themselves.

Too often they have succumbed to the suggestion from a visiting lumber dealer that a group come in and simply cut off all the useable trees, take one good log out of the base, and leave the tops littering the landscape. So that really the usefulness of these woodlots has been reduced considerably, just in the past few years.

It is for this reason that I welcome most enthusiastically this type of legislation, which will permit The Department of Lands and Forests to enter into an agreement with the individual farmer, as I understand it, and actually perform the rather expensive work needed to properly manage these small woodlots. The alternative is that the woodlots would disappear.

One suggestion on the principle of the bill is this; that the farmers, even though under this enactment will be provided with considerable assistance—after all, they al-

ready get the trees for reforestation at a nominal rate, and in many conservation areas, a lot of assistance in planting them. But I would suggest that the government go considerably further than this in the future, and actually subsidize the farmer for keeping on his land, which would otherwise be very useful for farming purposes, a woodlot which for many years is going to have very little return as far as the farmer is concerned. He is subsidizing the conservation efforts of the whole province, in his inability to chop down the trees and turn the land into the regular fields that would be worked with his farm.

So I welcome this legislation. I feel that it could go further and it will go further in the future, if we are going to encourage our farmers to maintain even larger woodlots.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Along with the hon. member for Brant, I welcome this legislation as far as it goes, but quite frankly I am puzzled to know exactly how far it goes in terms of meeting the broad problem faced in this province in restoring the forest cover for conservation purposes; if for nothing else, to the extent that has been indicated by some authoritative studies in the past.

I recall, for example, that the Kennedy report of 1948 indicated there were between two-and-a-half and four million acres in the province of Ontario stripped of their forest cover and which could be put back into economic production again, only if there was some artificial reforestation, supplementing any efforts nature might be able to contribute towards this end. Indeed, nature's contribution in many instances has been to produce a scrub second growth which is of no economic value.

In addition to the two-and-a-half to four-million acres that the Kennedy report was referring to—as the hon. Minister knows we have tangled on this issue a number of times during estimates of his department—in 1953, The Crown Timber Act absolved all existing licence holders of responsibility for regeneration on those properties which they had cut over prior to that year.

In other words, the Crown accepted this obligation. Presumably the management programmes from 1953 on are going to meet the obligations for that period and for the future. Whether or not they are doing so is another issue not relevant to today's debate.

But today's debate, or this issue, raises the question that we have two-and-a-half to four

million acres, as indicated by the Kennedy report. We have an added acreage of what may be astronomical proportions, reclaimed by the Crown as their obligation for regeneration.

The question on which I would like some clarification—I pose it now and perhaps we can get back to discussion in questions and answers when we get to the committee stage—is: What proportion of the original two-and-a-half to four million acres is privately owned land? In other words, what proportion of that objective spelled out by the Kennedy report is being met, somewhat belatedly, by this kind of legislation?

It seems to me that it would be wise for us to see what proportion of the job we are tackling, and what proportion still remains neglected for some future action.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a few comments relative to this bill. As the hon. member for Brant stated, we in this party think this is good legislation. However, I do not feel that it goes far enough.

One of the most urgent concerns as far as the farmer is concerned, and, indeed, conservation is concerned, is the future of the farm woodlot. There has been a rapid disappearance of the farm woodlot over the past number of years, particularly in western Ontario, because of the high price of land. No longer is it economical to leave, let us say, 10, 20, 30 acres in woodlot cover, because the price of land is such that it actually gives the bigger return if it were taken out of woodlot production and put into crop production or something comparable to it.

So we have the situation where much of the countryside has been denuded because it just has not been economical to keep the tree cover. The woodlot exemption clause of The Assessment Act is just not a sufficient incentive to maintain tree coverage.

The pattern of farming in Ontario has traditionally included a farm woodlot and this has been so for a number of reasons. No. 1, it used to be a good source of fuel. Farm people used to use for fuel the trees they had in their woodlot. This is becoming less important all the time. And then there was lumber provided for building purposes, for the sale of logs and pulpwood and the production of maple syrup. There has been a firm belief that for the wellbeing of agriculture and for the country as a whole approximately 10 per cent of the land area should be in forest. This has been borne out by studies that have been conducted in Europe,

and in a number of other countries. All of these studies point to the fact that 10 per cent is a reasonable percentage when it is applied to the forest cover in any given land area.

In recent years, this thinking has resulted in practices that have certainly not lived up to this standard.

Wood for fuel is not common now, as I stated before, on the farm, but the demand for land has risen so sharply that it has resulted in the increase in land value.

In eastern Ontario, where pulpwood outlets are available, farmers are looking at the monetary return. In western Ontario, the situation is one in which the demand for hardwood logs, and quite often the demand for any type of logs, has been fairly great, so the farmer, in order to capitalize on a monetary gain, has cut a lot of logs and reclaimed the land that was previously left in forest. This has resulted in a situation that has continually shrunk the acreage of farm woodlots in the province of Ontario.

We have had a number of cases where this denuding process has followed the change of ownership in a particular farm. Where a farm, particularly when it has been left in an estate, is just sold, the new owner comes along and the first thing he does is take off the bush. In a good many cases, this has resulted in a farmer partially paying for that farm, even up to as high as 50 or 60 per cent of the original cost of the farm. One of the big factors, it would seem to me from what I have read, in the dust bowl that was created in western Canada during the 1930's was the fact that all the prairie farmers had successfully cut off all or most of the trees in the countryside. As a result, there were no shrubs or tree cover to hold the soil, nor to maintain the water level. Subsequently, the land, when it was subjected to drought and wind conditions, practically blew away.

As I pointed out before, scientific and thorough studies in Europe have indicated that 10 per cent of the land area should be in forest cover. Under this particular bill, the government, as I understand it, plans to bear the cost of planting these trees under a private contract with the farmer or the owner. But it seems to me that here is a great gap; this might be very well for one owner, but what happens when that farm is transferred, and when that owner is no longer in possession of that particular farm or woodlot? The situation could be that a farmer would make an agreement with The Department of Lands and Forests for the planting of trees under this bill and meet

all the provisions year in and year out, until such time as he decided to sell. Then someone else, upon whom the contract under this bill would not be binding, could come along and remove all that tree cover.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It would be binding; it would go on the title.

Mr. Gaunt: It would be binding on the new owner?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: It is placed on the title, yes.

Mr. Gaunt: I thank the hon. Minister for the clarification. I had not interpreted it as such under this Act. That being so, I welcome it; I think that is a good addition. But I say that even more encouragement should be given to farmers and plantation operators to encourage them, even beyond the limits of this bill, to plant more trees and fulfill the requirements that we so obviously feel we need but have not, up to this point, done much about. If we feel that 10 per cent is too high, we should, for all intents and purposes, stop talking about it. If we feel it is a fairly reasonable percentage, and we should be meeting it, then I think we should be doing even more than we are doing in this bill to fulfil that purpose.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): If I may be permitted to say a word on this bill; I feel that this is a most historic day. I think when the history of this province is written on some future day it will be looked upon as a day when there has been a move made to preserve one of the greatest parts of our heritage this province has—that is, our forest industry in rural Ontario.

I want to extend the warmest congratulations of rural Ontario to the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests for his farsightedness in bringing in this bill. I would agree completely with those statements that have been made here this afternoon by hon. members of all parties in this House, in its worthiness. Quite frankly, those of us interested in conservation recognize the importance of forest cover. And I think it behooves all of us interested in rural Ontario to recognize the importance of preserving all of our natural resources if we possibly can. One of the ways to do it is, of course, through the planting of more trees.

I am particularly interested in the bill from the standpoint of the hardwoods industry and the furniture industry of Ontario, particularly that area represented by the hon. member for Huron-Bruce.

We have had numerous communications from time to time about the source of supply for this furniture industry as time goes on. It seems to me that this bill is a move toward fulfilling the requirements for generations yet unborn who will have the opportunity of reaping the harvest of our trees that will be planted through this bill.

I am pleased to note the emphasis that has been placed on the maple syrup industry through the Ontario food council and ARDA. We have placed special emphasis on the maple syrup industry in this province. Frankly, I think that it is an industry that we can develop to a far greater extent than we ever have in the past. There is no question about the desirability of the product or the demand for the product; we would hope that with the special emphasis being placed on it, there will be new impetus given to its sale.

In regard to the question that was raised by the hon. member for York South concerning the amount of land that should be put back into forestry, I must confess that I am not up to date at the moment on the Kennedy report. I would say this for the benefit of hon. members of the House: The federal government and the provinces, through ARDA, are conducting a complete land inventory right across Canada. The province of Ontario is, of course, involved in this to a very great extent.

To me, it is a most worthwhile cause. I think we should examine very closely the amount of agricultural land that is available and see, as far as possible, that we preserve that land for agricultural purposes. At the same time, we should be made aware of the land that is naturally adapted for the use, growth and planting of such trees as they are contemplated under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, may I on behalf of rural Ontario, again congratulate the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests for the farsightedness of this bill.

Mr. I. W. Thrasher (Windsor-Sandwich): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to commend the hon. Minister for bringing in this bill.

Last year in Windsor we started an organization called Trees Unlimited. This is a huge success. We had a group of students plant 8,000 trees in the provincial park and I am told that these trees are nearly all growing. This year we are going to try to duplicate the number of schoolchildren planting trees. I think this should be encouraged across the province.

I would like to concur with the hon. member for Huron-Bruce in suggesting that ten

per cent of each farm-owner's land total be put into woodlots. This has a twofold purpose: One, it encourages birds, which in turn keep down the insects; and two, it controls the water table that is so badly needed in our province.

I think that owners should be encouraged to plant trees. I am a little alarmed about the number of dead elm trees that are in our woodlots and I would like to ask the hon. Minister about what he intends to do to help get rid of these dead trees that line the highways in the province of Ontario. I think that we should do something to help the owners cut these trees down so that the disease that is going through our province can be curbed.

Again I commend the hon. Minister and wish that he would do something about the elm trees.

Hon. Mr. Roberts: Mr. Speaker, in winding up the debate on second reading I would like to express my personal appreciation for the apparent unanimity in the House on the motives and the progress that we hope this bill will bring in this particular field.

I would also like to assure all hon. members that we want to get the best possible out of this. It is my intention that this bill should go to the same committee as Bill No. 21, and already I have had suggestions from individuals and from some organizations as how to best develop this theme—as outlined in the remarks on first reading. We will certainly welcome suggestions and aid at the committee stage in getting the best possible type of legislation and arrangement by way of agreement to bring about what I think will be a very definite improvement in the growth value in the province in this field.

The hon. member for York South did raise some general questions and I can assure him, and assure the House, that our sights are now raised high for reforestation and I will be able to give to the House, on my estimates, a pretty detailed statement to illustrate how far we are going by actual contracts in the licensed areas to assure continuing and adequate and thoroughly technically planned reforestation.

In regard to the acreage on private lands, I did say in my earlier statement that we hope to rehabilitate an estimated 7.8 million acres of private forest in southern Ontario. Of this, about 2 million acres is idle land requiring tree planting and 5.8 million acres is woodland in need of silvicultural treatment and management to bring it back to a more productive state.

Mr. P. J. Yakabuski (Renfrew South): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support The Woodlands Improvement Act, 1966, I feel that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has already reflected the feelings of most of the hon. members of this House when he spoke a few minutes ago on it. I want to go on record as supporting it because it will be of great benefit to the part of Ontario I come from. I might add that the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests is to be complimented on the introduction of this bill, because it is going to be remembered for many generations.

The Opposition possibly say that we are not going far enough but this, like many of the other pieces of legislation introduced here, has to begin somewhere. The hon. Minister has made a wonderful start, and, I repeat, is to be complimented on it.

I think it is good proof of the fact that the hon. member for St. Patrick is doing a tremendous job in the portfolio of Lands and Forests. When he was appointed to that department there were many—possibly from the northern parts of the province and from the Opposition benches—who felt that this was a disastrous move on the part of the government, but I think that he has proven over the short period that he has been with that department that he can adapt himself to any surroundings or to any circumstances.

I think it proves too why up in Ottawa the Pearson government took a lawyer and made him Minister of Agriculture. I only hope that move turns out as well as the move of putting the hon. member for St. Patrick in The Department of Lands and Forests for Ontario.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I have just a brief comment. I understand that conservation comes under the hon. Minister's department and I would hope that consideration would be given in implementing the principle put forward in this bill that the natural habitat of wild game will be preserved and given due consideration when this type of promotion is taking place.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

DISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT BECAUSE OF AGE

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour) moves second reading of Bill No. 35, An Act to prevent discrimination in employment because of age.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, rising to speak on the principle of Bill No. 35, may I say that I am quite happy to see the hon. Minister bring in a bill of this type. There may be parts of the bill I do not agree with on the basis that I do not think it goes far enough, but I do think that over the last six years nearly everyone in this House has agreed that this had been a problem. It just points out the speed at which this government moves when it has taken it six years to move on this. I know back seven years ago, in fact, even the former Premier spoke on this and said that this was something that was needed.

As I say, we are happy to see it come in. When a bill on discrimination in employment because of age is brought in it should protect all the people rather than picking out a segment of our society. I am thinking of the group of people which I feel has been discriminated against for a good many years; and that is the people 65 to 69, who will still be discriminated against even when this bill comes in. This group of people are finding it very hard at the present time to get jobs, although our economy is very buoyant. I would hope that before we get final reading on this bill that the hon. Minister of Labour will see fit to at least include this group from 66 to 69 in this bill.

There is another area, and that is the people under 40. When you apply for a job you can be discriminated against as much at 35 as you can at 40. So I do not feel that there should be any age set up in this; there should be just discrimination in employment because of age. I do not think we should cut it down as close as he has it.

One of the biggest problems we found over the years was the newspaper advertising, and I see he has left this out completely. Even a Social Credit government in British Columbia at least brought this into their bill, and their bill does call for penalties on advertising for age.

I hope that the hon. Minister will see fit to make these two changes, to make this a real bill as far as discrimination in employment is concerned. I can say for our party that we will certainly support this bill; it is a move in the right direction. The only thing is that we do not feel that we have moved far enough yet.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I would like to express a very strong word of commendation to the hon. Minister of Labour for bringing this bill forward at this time. During his term of

office he will have a lengthy list of achievements in every aspect which comes within his jurisdiction.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Is his term coming to an end?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No, he still has a number of items to attend to.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): You have already set aside March 2 for the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests; are we now going into March 3 for the hon. Minister of Labour?

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: In the fullness of time, he will have checked off a long list of achievements.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Well, let us have a commendation week.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. J. P. Roberts (Prime Minister): We would support the hon. member if there was anything to commend.

Mr. MacDonald: We bring in things your backbenchers support, and then you kill them.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Mr. Speaker, in contrast to the remarks that the hon. member just prior made, I doubt whether he will find a jurisdiction in the world that has the package deal of anti-discrimination laws which exists in the province of Ontario. There is no jurisdiction—either in Canada, in any of the 50 states, or in any of the states or nations of the world—that has this package deal. I would be very happy to have any hon. member, in due course, point out any package that is any better.

Mr. S. Lewis: In almost all of the western European countries, sex is part of the human rights code; it is omitted in this code.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order! I would ask the members to remember that we are on second reading of this bill, and I think the remarks that have been flowing back and forth across the floor during the past few minutes have very little to do with the principle of the bill. I would ask any member wishing to speak to the bill to stick to the principles involved.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: I am talking to the very broad principle, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Sopha: So was the hon. member for Scarborough West.

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Yack, yack, yack.

Mr. MacDonald: We have the ducks with us.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: We are presently in the course of training and retraining programmes, so perhaps some of the problems which are currently with us will not have to be met in the future. But there is nothing—I know this from personal experience, in having spoken to many people—there is nothing more disappointing, or more of a blow to personal pride and prestige, to a man at 45, than to be told that he is too old. I am only 46 and I feel I am just beginning. I am delighted now that this has been brought in at this time. I promise the hon. Minister of Labour that I shall vote with him on this bill, and I hope that my words will help everybody make it unanimous.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word of commendation for the hon. Minister of Labour. I can assure you that I have no interest in singing, "For he's a jolly good fellow," but when something comes up that is really worthwhile, I believe we should have something to say about it. I certainly would like to congratulate him on this bill.

This matter of discrimination in age employment has been a matter I have been interested in since I entered this House. I have had several discussions with the hon. Minister on it and I am very pleased that he has seen fit to make a move in this direction.

The select committee on aging, of which I have been a member, has also been very interested in this phase of employment. We found many elderly citizens who brought up this question as we went about this province, and I am sure that most members of the select committee would join me in saying that this, very definitely, is a problem.

The hon. member for Hamilton East has brought out the point that there are still points in regard to this bill which need to be added. I think that the hon. Minister of Labour has these points under consideration but I do believe that this is a real giant step forward and I would like to congratulate him on this bill.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Speaker, of course we on this side will support the second reading of this bill, but we do not feel that there is a real principle involved in it in relation to the human rights code.

The hon. Provincial Secretary congratulates the hon. Minister of Labour for bringing this piece of legislation in. I think it is belated. I would like to congratulate my colleague, the hon. member for Hamilton East, who has put a bill on the order paper for six consecutive years to bring about what we consider should be a bill to provide against discrimination because of age. I think there are some questions that need to be answered in regard to the principle involved in the bill, and I hope the hon. Minister will inform the House before it goes to a vote.

Certainly the restrictions on age that have been mentioned—between 65 and 40—are not understandable in any sense of the word. Why does the hon. Minister bring in a separate bill to provide against discrimination in regards to age? Why can it not be part of the human rights code we have in the province? And certainly the absence of any reference to advertising, in regard to age and applications for employment, is a very important point, because here I think is where we find the real problem.

You pick up the paper and almost every job, every want ad, starts off with "don't apply if you are older than 35," or "you must be 20 or 22." Certainly this deters a lot of able-bodied people from going to apply for a job. And certainly, I am sure that a lot of employers would hire people in the age bracket from 40 to 65, or 69, if there was not that deterrent there. If they made their application and were in good shape, they would be given consideration. But the strong deterrent, in advertising for help, stops people from applying. I would hope that before the bill goes to its final conclusion, to become legislation, the hon. Minister will reconsider and let us make this part of the human rights code, and make it a fully fledged bill called "No discrimination against age."

Hon. A. Crossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, I do not want to join in the chorus, as the Opposition may say, of commending the hon. Minister, just for the particular purpose of joining in a chorus. I think, of course, that he is to be commended for this legislation; and I think that is probably why the Opposition will vote with the government in this particular case.

However, I would like to get the record

straight. I think the hon. member for Hamilton East is quite worthy of the credit being paid to him by his colleagues for bringing in a bill as a private member a few years ago. The only thing is that I would like to make sure that the record will not show, as they are attempting to show, as the hon. leader of that party (Mr. MacDonald), I think, suggested a few moments ago, that all of these good things emanate from his party alone. At that particular time, when the hon. member for Hamilton East brought in his bill, the member for St. Andrew [Mr. Grossman], a Progressive-Conservative member of this House, also brought in a like bill. So all these good things do not necessarily emanate from the NDP.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to make a brief comment on this. This is a magnificent little interjection. We have talked about "in the fullness of time." It is true the hon. member for St. Andrew, I believe in advance of an election year, in 1958 or 1959, put a bill on the order paper.—

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The same time as your member.

Mr. Gisborn: You really stepped quickly that day.

Mr. MacDonald: —and at that point apparently he had got sufficient clearance from the Tory party that this would not be regarded with abhorrence. So he dared to be a Daniel, if not an Allan, and put it on the order paper. It is interesting to note that seven years later the thing has come to fruition. That is the speed at which this government operates. The backbenchers bring in things, and the Prime Minister kills them or lets them lie for seven years. This is the kind of thing that happens in trying to get progressive legislation. It is nonsense to hear the hon. Provincial Secretary rise and talk in broad terms about the human rights code, while ignoring the fact, for example, that many of the countries of the western world have a human rights code that will not tolerate discrimination on the basis of sex. You have none in there yet.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: No one has a better package.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: How you wrap the package is not the important thing; it is what is in the package. You are more interested in the tinsel and the floss on the outside than the content.

Mr. Speaker: Order! Order! I think this debate is getting completely away from the principle of the bill. I will have to ask the members to terminate their remarks in that respect.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have terminated my remarks.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on this bill. From the first day I entered this House, I have spoken in every Throne debate concerning age discrimination. I am most pleased that the hon. Minister has finally listened to the appeals from this side of the House. The hon. Provincial Secretary has mentioned the fact that no jurisdiction in the world has brought down any type of legislation similar to Ontario's.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I talked about a package of anti-discrimination in respect of all aspects. I would be glad to see the inside of any other package that is better than in the province of Ontario.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, the hon. Provincial Secretary has mentioned that no jurisdiction in the world has brought down any package. May I tell him that no jurisdiction in the world has had Opposition parties that have fought so hard to stir this government to bring down this package? We have had to prod, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge at least six years in the House; I am fairly sure that long before I had set my feet in this room other members had attempted to see that this government act on some type of legislation that would, at long last, eliminate discrimination because of age.

Mr. Speaker, it was not only the hon. members from the other side and the hon. members to our left who have introduced bills in this House; my party has also introduced a bill in this House concerning this very item.

One of the other points I would like to bring up is that this bill does not go quite far enough, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that an individual at 65 still does not receive old age security. This bill should, for this interim period, be extended so that no one would be denied the right of a pension immediately after they no longer were covered by this Act. One of the things that I would like the hon. Minister to eventually clarify is—will this affect the federal government? The Canadian vocational training programme number five, refuses to accept individuals for retraining when they reach a certain age. This makes it a disadvantage to that individual who is

attempting to get retraining so that he or she may once more be employable.

We, on this side of the House, will support this legislation, but we want the hon. members opposite to understand that this legislation originated on this side of the House and it was only after a lot of prodding that we were able to get the government to act.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to those of my colleague from Windsor-Walkerville. I think comment has been made today about the human rights code. The government has prided itself on the progress it is making in that field. I would like to add here, Mr. Speaker, my views. This government does not move, so far as human rights and the protection of the individual are concerned, until it has to. It is a pragmatic government. So far as this particular bill is concerned, my hon. colleagues have already set out the fact that it does not go as far as it should; this is the very point that was brought up some time ago when the human rights code was amended in the last session.

At that time I said, and I repeat, that this government does not move as it should. If it really had the rights of the individual at heart it would not have to wait until public opinion shoves it and makes it do something. I have heard how many years our party has fought to see that something like this is brought forward. Since it is here, you would think the government would have gone all the way and made sure that nobody, no matter what his age was, no matter what his condition, would suffer because of his age.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I can understand the observations of various hon. members of the House with respect to the merits of this legislation. I am delighted to have them all join with me, because we will all be part of advancing this bill, in a unanimous fashion, as I expect it will be, by our subsequent endorsement and passing of the motion which I made.

I do not object to everyone taking credit for this bill, because I do not think that this is the kind of subject where I would ever claim all of the glory connected with it. I think this is good legislation. I think that all of the hon. members of this House, in their hearts, would want to join in supporting second reading of the bill in that fashion.

I have never taken the position with respect to legislation that my department or I had all of the answers; I hope I never will take that position. I do not think that all of us

have all of the answers to these things, but I think it is important and sufficient to say that so long as we are trying to do the things that are going to serve the needs of the people of this province, then with good advice and good ideas from everyone, we will be able to advance under the leadership which this government has been able to give toward a solid and stable province in which to live.

On introducing the bill, I made some observations, and I dealt with the matter in principle at that stage. But the essence of the bill which is before us is to assure the people of this province a full measure of equality of opportunity. I think we have to look at the broad principles when we are looking at this kind of legislation, but this bill is specifically designed to prohibit discrimination in employment in connection with the hiring, treatment, separation and so on, which might exist against persons, and we have put in the age limit from 40 to 65.

It must be obvious to hon. members of the House why the period starting at age 40 was commenced, because there are certain factors that exist in the early years of one's life during which maturity has not been reached. I do not think that I need elaborate on this, but the point is there. Nobody in the House has mentioned the fact that the Act is not intended to take effect until the age of 40. They have made reference to the after-65 age group.

The fact is that for many of the same reasons that exist for the before-40 group, or up until the 40 group; the after-65 group may or may not have certain attributes and characteristics attached to them.

With respect to the period after 65, I do not have a closed mind on this subject. I think I would like to suggest to the House that we adopt the bill in its present form. I, for one, will be very much interested in the application and the results of the bill during the coming year. From that we will gain some knowledge and experience; if we then find that there is a real need for that age limit to be extended, I can assure the House that I will be the first one to agree that something should be done and will be part of the effort to do something about it.

I think for many reasons, that must be apparent to all of us, that the age period to which the Act applies and is intended to apply, namely, 40 to 65, is reasonable in its application.

The name of the bill—I am sorry the hon. member for Woodbine (Mr. Bryden) is not here because he sent me a note the other day saying: "Goodness, is there not some better

name for the proposed legislation?" I am inclined to agree with him on this, if we could get something more constructive or more positive-sounding. I will say that I think this is dramatic legislation—dramatic spelled with a small "d." I think it is entitled to the best name that we can find for it. It may be that at a subsequent date during this session I might even suggest a change in the name of this bill.

Reference was made to Programme 5 with respect to the federal government. The inference and suggestion was that certain of the retraining and training programmes sponsored by the federal government, or in which the federal government participates, involved a limit as to the age at which one could enter and take advantage of the course. I am sure that in the name of common sense and of reasonableness, some appropriate adjustment can be reached with the federal government and I will speak for our own government. We on our part will make the appropriate representations and see that, in cases where some good will ensue by opening up the age limit at the top—and I repeat what I said, "and where some practical good will ensue"—that a reasonable interpretation of the conditions will be made by the federal government. We will advance that.

The hon. members will recall that it was under my ministry that the age limits were taken off with respect to apprenticeship, and I think in some degree the arguments which have been advanced on this point today have merit.

I do not have too much to add to what has been said. I think we are all really, certainly our government is, directing our attention to a target. It is a target which involves stable government, against which this province in which we live becomes one of the most desirable places in which to live and work and in which to have one's family—all of it designed for a happy and productive life.

I would hope that hon. members of the House would support the second reading of this bill.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Davison: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Minister would comment on the advertising part of it? I am really interested in that and I wonder why he does not feel that it needs to be in.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: With the permission of the House, Mr. Speaker, a review of this type of legislation and the results of its operation in other jurisdictions has indicated that

there has been some considerable trouble with respect to this matter.

Our human rights commission which will administer this legislation has had considerable success on the basis of an educational approach to the objects which we are trying to attain and my intention—and I am glad the hon. member reminded me of this because I would like to record my intention and the intention of the government on this point. It will not be included in the Act this year. We will go by stages and it will take a single stage effort. Against the experience that we have during the coming year we will immediately move one year hence to deal with any weaknesses that develop on the count of advertising.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE TELEPHONE ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 36, An Act to amend The Telephone Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE GASOLINE HANDLING ACT, 1966

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management) moves second reading of Bill No. 37, The Gasoline Handling Act, 1966.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few comments on this particular bill. I assume that the intent of this bill is going to be carried out in the regulations. In my own community during the past two years a situation has arisen about which the hon. Minister could possibly give me some clarification.

There have been two serious train wrecks near the centre of my own community, one of which had gasoline tank cars aboard, and adjacent to these tracks is a gasoline storage depot. The seriousness of this was certainly very evident a few months ago when there was a half-million-dollar train wreck with some 38 box cars piling up and bursting into flames in front of this gasoline storage area.

I would ask if it is the intention through the regulations on this Bill No. 37 to make provision to have these gasoline storage areas put outside the built-up areas of communities? The particular storage tanks in question do not even have the earth protection around the base and the residents of this area are quite concerned.

Also last year, we had a near tragedy in the town of Aylmer. Fortunately no one was killed, but a great portion of that town was destroyed when a gasoline tanker burst into flames. I wonder in this regard, too, if the regulations are going to be more restrictive concerning the handling and the trucking of these inflammable products along our highways. Possibly the hon. Minister could clarify this for me.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, our department already regulates the transportation of all fuels and we inspect the equipment and beyond that there is not too much we can do. I realize that accidents can happen, and how you control them is a very difficult thing to know.

As far as storage areas are concerned they do come under our regulations. I do not know of the particular case the hon. member speaks of, but I would like to check it out with one of our inspectors and see if it does come within the regulations as set down by this Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE ONTARIO NORTHLAND TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ACT

Hon. Mr. Simonett moves second reading of Bill No. 38, An Act to amend The Ontario Northland Transportation Commission Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE LAW SOCIETY ACT

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General) moves second reading of Bill No. 39, An Act to amend The Law Society Act.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Speaker, will this bill go to the committee on legal bills?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Yes. All these bills which bear my name will go to the committee on legal bills.

Mr. Sopha: I wonder if members of the law society, the authorized heads of that corporation without share capital which never holds an annual meeting, will attend to defend the principle of the bill?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think I said on first reading of the bill that there had been presented to my attention, and to the attention of the department, a proposal to amalgamate The Barristers Act, The Solicitors

Act, The Law Society Act, and that this matter had received considerable study and attention, to the extent that legislation had been drafted in fairly complete form.

It was decided that this work would continue and I certainly would expect that legislative proposals will be received before the next session, in any event. But for this year, in order to enable the law society to deal with claims against the compensation fund, in order to get on with that which is causing some concern with delays, we decided to confine ourselves to this simple amendment of delegation.

But I think I can assure the hon. member that there is a complete revision of The Law Society Act, The Barristers Act and The Solicitors Act in contemplation and in progress.

Mr. Sopha: In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the bill contains a very bad principle. It infringes the well-known rule of law that the hon. Attorney General will understand—*delegatus non potest delegare*—which is sanctified by perhaps a 1,000 years of experience.

At the risk of being ostracized from my profession, I say here that one never knows quite what is in the mind of the benchers of the law society, because that august body never holds a meeting to inform the shareholders of what it has in its mind.

It can write letters to the Minister of Justice about a judge without getting authorization, it can do all sorts of things in respect of the governance of the profession, but apart from the luncheon that is held at the time of the mid-winter meeting of the Bar association, one never has any contact with the governing body.

At least a corporation having share capital trading on the Toronto stock exchange holds an annual meeting to which shareholders may come and make their complaints. Perhaps being a barrister of more than 10 years standing in the profession—that is the critical time limit in the statutes of the province—I might be forgiven for making some complaints about the governance of our affairs.

It is strange and yet amusing to one who pays attention to such things that the lawyers write the laws for the medical profession, for the dental profession, the pharmaceutical profession, for the chiropractors and all sorts of other professions, and in each of those statutes the lawyers come to the conclusion that it might be a good idea if those professions were governed on a regional and geographic basis.

The only thought that never has occurred to the lawyers is that it might be a good idea for the lawyers to be governed on a regional geographic basis.

Suffice it to say that the manner in which the governing body is elected has tended to preserve the hegemony and the power and the governing of the profession in the city of Toronto. But one must hastily add that more than half the lawyers practising in the province reside and carry on business and earn their livings in the city of Toronto.

Now we come to a point where the benchers of the law society have seen fit to approach the Legislature through the hon. Attorney General to inform the Legislature apparently, as this bill does, that the task of disciplining lawyers has become too onerous for them. Probably it is a question of the devotion of an adequate amount of time to dealing with that important subject which, as a lawyer, I say unhappily has become one that has distracted the lawyers with increasing frequency in recent years.

One cannot ascribe any reason for the fact, the unhappy and well publicized fact—I am not giving away any secrets when I say here, that it has become a fact that more lawyers are stealing more money and there is nothing cheapskate about them. When they go south with money, they go south with a lot of it. Often we are lucky to catch them at the door of the aircraft or perhaps persuade them to return from Israel or obviate the escape of one to Brazil, as we happily did.

I do not know that we got the money back from him or whether he had it in a satchel to take to Brazil. But apparently the job of disciplining them has become now too burdensome and they come to the Legislature and say, "We want the power to delegate this to somebody else."

Hon. Mr. Wishart: May I—on a point of order—point out to the hon. member that this amendment as proposed has nothing whatsoever to do with the matter of discipline of a member of the legal profession.

Mr. Sopha: Well, that is what it says.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: No, it does not. It is dealing with payment of claims made against the compensation fund. Section 53.

Mr. Sopha: I beg your pardon. It is part and parcel of the same thing.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: It is not discipline. This is simply adjudicating upon the validity of a claim. This is a very different thing from disciplining the members.

Mr. Sopha: I do not want to be accused of corrupting language, but it is part and parcel of the very thing I was talking about. These claims arise out of the very things I was describing to the House and which have led to many lawyers being disbarred.

But however you want to look at it, I am merely saying to Mr. Speaker, and through him to the hon. Attorney General, that it is a bad principle for lawyers who ought to know, who ought to be schooled in the common law and its development and the protection of the citizen that it involves, that they ought not to breach common law rules established over long periods of time.

Let me illustrate: In the case of Mehr, employed by the nationalist government of China, and whom they disciplined themselves—disbarred, erased his name from the rolls—he had the tenacity and the courage and the money to take them to the supreme court of Canada.

They discovered up there that the lawyers who were judging him—the jury—changed every time they had a meeting to deal with it. A different group was assembled at the table.

Mr. Justice Cartwright all but said, You would think above all people the lawyers would know better. And that fits this bill. The lawyers ought to know better than to seek to establish a principle that is within this bill. And out of that to come here and ask the Legislature to give them power to do something which is in contravention of ordinary natural justice.

That is all I am going to say at this point. I am happy to hear that somebody from the law society will come before the committee in order to justify this grant of power to it. That will be a rare pleasure indeed. I hope to hear that. I, for one, think it will be a rare pleasure to see them face to face, because it is not a pleasure that is given very often. You can see them at the head table at that lunch on the 1st of February, because they buy you a lunch and report to you on how they governed your profession. But you cannot get much closer than that.

At the risk of becoming an apostate in the profession, I had better sit down before my judgment so fails me that I say something more about my brethren.

Mr. Speaker: Shall the motion carry?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I think before the motion is put I should like to say to my hon. friend that it is always a delight to hear him being so erudite and with such

a great command of the language. I think it is a pleasure to listen every time he rises to speak. Sometimes, though, his words ramble somewhat from the subject, and certainly on this occasion, I think, from the principle of this bill.

The section which is being amended has to do only with the compensation fund and the question of payment out of moneys in the satisfaction or partial satisfaction of claims made against the fund. Now I do not want to wander from the principle of the bill either, but I think the hon. member is aware that his profession and mine is the only profession that pays money for such purpose to a fund, out of the individuals' respective pockets. I read recently—I have not got the figures before me—that something well in excess of \$1 million has been paid within the recent two or three years in satisfaction of claims. It is a sad commentary that there were defalcations to such an amount.

However, Mr. Speaker, on the question of *delegatus non potest delegare*—one cannot delegate further a delegated power—I would draw the attention of the House, and particularly the hon. member for Sudbury, to the fact that the subsection we are amending is subsection 10 of section 53, which reads:

The benchers may delegate any or all of the powers conferred upon them under this section to the discipline committee or to any other of their committees that they consider appropriate.

This, may I point out, has stood on the statutes of this province since 1953. The hon. member, if he has been aware of it, has suffered under it, if that is what he is complaining of. This power has been in the Act—

Mr. Sopha: They never had to discipline me.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is not discipline. My point is that the section delegating the power has been on the statute since 1953. The subsection we are amending is just being enlarged so that a committee, or a referee, of the benchers may get on more quickly with the disposition of settlement and payment of these claims. That is the principle of the bill.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I think that the remarks of my hon. colleague from Sudbury bear careful consideration. I think, too, that the hon. Attorney General perhaps has captured the tone of the afternoon in mutual patting on the back. He is patting our profession on the back and, taking perhaps a leaf from his colleagues' books in patting

themselves on the back for the wonderful legislation they are bringing in.

I wonder if we lawyers can really be quite so smug about being the only profession that takes money out of our own pockets to compensate people who might have been hurt by our colleagues? I would suggest, sir, that we have to be a little careful in taking too much credit for that step, because someone might care to listen to the words of my hon. colleague from Bruce (Mr. Whicher); he has stated a couple of times in this House that perhaps all lawyers should be bonded, then the lawyers would not have to dip into their own pockets to pay for their defalcating brothers.

This is a matter of very serious concern and there have been a number of people who have unfortunately lost moneys through the defalcation or improper acts of lawyers who believe—whether rightly or wrongly, probably most of them wrongly—that they have not been given a proper hearing and that the consideration given to them has not been a fair one.

Since this is a voluntary scheme the rules are made by the benchers. The rules are made by the discipline committee and there is no appeal. Anything that an impugning client might ask from this fund is given not as of right, but as of grace. The rules are rules that are made from time to time to suit the purposes and if one feels themselves aggrieved there is no court of second recourse. There is no source of appeal at all. They have to accept what is being given as of grace, not as of right; and if they do not get anything as of grace, they are just out of luck.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that even though the system that presently exists is far less than perfect, that this section would seem to me to allow the possibility that it will be even less perfect than it is now. At least under the present system the power of delegation from the group of benchers, there are some 60 of them, is given to the discipline committee, some ten members of the profession. But this bill would allow only one member of the profession to sit in almost complete judgment upon every one of these applications; and remember, sir, the application is made not as of right, but as of grace. The question is often asked of a client who comes forward and says, My money has been stolen by a lawyer: Do you come to us with clean hands; were you involved in some scheme that you would rather not talk about; were your motives proper, were you charging too high rates of interest? All sorts of questions get into this.

It is not a question of trial of rights or wrongs, it often gets to a question of trial of morals.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: To an extent.

Mr. Singer: To an extent. But it often does, and I have read, and I am sure my friend, the hon. Minister has read, some of the reasons that have occasionally emanated from the discipline committee in regard to some of these decisions.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Does the hon. member think that 25 per cent of the requests for payment out of the fund are of the fashion he criticizes?

Mr. Singer: I would say that some of them are. I would not want to fix a percentage. But it has occurred to me several times, over the years since this fund has existed, to question whether or not we should be quite so smug in saying that our profession is doing the noble thing when we set our own rules and there is no appeal to this fund as of right. It would seem to me that if a person believes they are aggrieved that they should as of right—if it is worth doing at all it is worth doing properly—they should as of right have a recourse to a fund.

Now having gone this far, I say the system we presently have is something less than perfect. To take this additional step, Mr. Speaker, would put in even a greater danger. At least among ten members of the profession, ten benchers, ten members of the discipline committee, there is room for a certain substantial amount of collective thinking. If as this amendment allows, one person can be delegated, a referee, it is quite conceivable that one man could become very arbitrary. It is for these reasons, sir—and with substantial regret, it does not fill me with any great pleasure to oppose a suggestion made by the leading colleagues in my profession—for these reasons, sir, I have great reservations about this amendment to The Law Society Act and I have grave doubts as to whether or not I can support it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I could wind up the debate, perhaps, with a very brief statement—

Mr. Speaker: I must inform the Minister that with the indulgence of the House he may. He has already spoken twice on the bill which normally gives anyone the right to speak only once. The member for Sudbury spoke twice so I thought that the

Minister should be allowed to speak twice. With the indulgence of the House he may conclude the debate, if there is no one else who wishes to speak first.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Speaker, on the principle of the bill, which is a very limited one to extend the delegation powers of the benchers of the law society to referees to deal with matters relating to the compensation fund, the significant point is that it is to be referees who are members of that society, but not of themselves benchers, as I understand it.

I think that the point that needs to be remembered on the principle of this bill is first of all, that the law society of Upper Canada is a public body incorporated by public Act of this Legislature and by the Act, this Legislature, in its wisdom, has given wide powers of self-government. The effect of the grant of those wide powers of self-government over many years has been, as the hon. member for Sudbury has stated, in a large degree to insulate the law society of Upper Canada from any public comment on its affairs.

It is quite true that many of its affairs can be found out and ascertained by members of the public, but the only disclosure which really takes place is to the members of the profession itself and to that extent I do not think that the law society is a body responsive to public opinion at this time.

I would therefore join with the hon. member for Sudbury in requesting that members of the benchers of the law society should attend the standing committee where this question will be discussed, because it is an obvious recognition of a long-standing fact that there has been a substantial and serious delay in the administration and grant of payments out of the compensation fund. Obviously, the benchers of the law society assume that by this method of delegation they overcome this serious fault in the administration of the fund. I think it would be most helpful when this bill is referred to committee that not only the legal members of the standing committee be present but all those who are not lawyers be present in order that they can ask and find out the way in which the compensation fund is at the present time administered. I share very grave doubts as to whether or not by a simple power of delegation to referees the defects and the defaults and the inability of the benchers to deal adequately with the claims that are made against the fund will be solved by the provisions of this bill.

I would hope that before the debate concludes the hon. Attorney General would give us assurance that the benchers of the law society, or their representatives, would appear before that committee.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence and that of the House, on that point I should like to say that I sat very still after the hon. member for Sudbury had spoken waiting to see if anyone else wished to speak and you had actually put the question and had said, "Carried," by the time I got my feet, so I thought that I was closing the debate when I spoke the second time. Then new points were raised, sir, and I did ask your indulgence to speak again. I trust that this time I shall close the debate on second reading.

I would point out, first of all, that the amendment proposed, if the hon. members will read it, will indicate to them that the delegation is to a committee, or to a referee, only for the purpose of making a report back to the benchers or to a committee of the benchers for dealing with this one subject of claims against the compensation fund. It is not delegating the disposition—

Mr. Singer: But there is no hearing before the committee. No evidence would be heard by it.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: This is simply for a referee or committee to study the matter and report back. The benchers are elected from across the province. True they are not elected on any territorial basis, but they are widely scattered and to have a full committee of the benchers sitting—which has had to be the case in the past—takes time, causes delay and people complain at the great time they have to wait to have their claims dealt with.

The principle of this bill is intended to obviate and avoid that delay. It is only, I repeat, a delegation for the purpose of reporting back to the committee so that it may get on more quickly with its work.

The hon. member for Sudbury, I am aware—I think this is no secret—is seeking election to the benchers and I trust that he will be successful. Perhaps I may say that I have supported his nomination and I feel sure that he will be a great addition to that august body and may bring about some of the changes that he urges upon the House today. One of those changes—perhaps I should not put it that way, I should point out to him and to hon. members of the House that I, by virtue of this office which I hold as the chief law officer of the Crown, am a bencher

for life. This is one of the things that the hon. member may change, but I shall be present at least, and I shall try to persuade—and very seriously I say this—members of the benchers to be present at the committee; and the hon. member for Sudbury may be a bencher at that time.

I would ask the House to realize that the principle of the bill is to avoid delay in the settlement of these claims. It is a power which has existed—the power of delegation—which we are simply expanding. That is my last word on the subject.

Mr. Speaker: All those in favour that the motion carry will please say "aye."

All those opposed will please say "nay."

In my opinion, the "ayes" have it.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CONDITIONAL SALES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 40, An Act to amend The Conditional Sales Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE BILLS OF SALE AND CHATTEL MORTGAGES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 41, An Act to amend The Bills of Sale and Chattel Mortgages Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CHANGE OF NAME ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 42, An Act to amend The Change of Name Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, on Bill No. 42 I have a brief question to ask of the hon. Attorney General.

In the past, has the Provincial Secretary not been the Minister responsible for vital statistics and registrar general and all that group of statutes? Is this not a change in government policy that the Attorney General takes this Act under his wing?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I would not deny that the Provincial Secretary might be the Minister under which the vital statistics section comes. I think as a law officer of the Crown I perhaps might have a right to propose legislation in any department. I would

not want to assert that too strongly, but I am sure that the hon. Provincial Secretary will not take umbrage at my carrying this small bill forward.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, considering my first remarks not as a speech—and this is not going to be a speech either—I just want to wonder out loud whether this does not presage a realignment of responsibility insofar as the enforcement of law and looking after certain statutes is concerned. And if, as my suspicion directs me, this is what it begins to mean, I wonder why the government has not told us really how they are going to realign the whole field of administration of justice?

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE JUDICATURE ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 43, An Act to amend The Judicature Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE DEVOLUTION OF ESTATES ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 44, An Act to amend The Devolution of Estates Act.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, in connection with Bill No. 44 the principle I suppose relates to the specific sections, but I wonder if we are going to get a principle within the foreseeable future where we will have somewhat uniform system of succession duties or estate taxes. As the hon. Attorney General knows, recently the federal government has seen fit to change its whole basis of taxing estates and it does it on the basis of an estate tax. Our system here seems to be, in keeping with so many of our legal precedents, about 50 years behind the times.

The incongruity between the taxing rules and orders insofar as Ontario estates are concerned, in contrasting the federal system and the provincial system, is obvious; and my hon. friend knows this full well. It would seem to me that he would be doing the citizens of this province a very great service if some time in the immediate future he would introduce into this House an estate tax Act for Ontario which would bring us in line with the same taxing principles, the same basis, and the same reasonable exemptions as exist in the federal statutes.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I do not think I am called upon to say a great deal at this

moment. I trust I am winding up this debate on second reading, but I wonder if the hon. member for Downsview is attempting to lead me now into another field which he might consider trespassing, this time on the field of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). The principle of this bill simply has to do with devolution, not taxes.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

NURSING HOMES

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health) moves second reading of Bill No. 45, An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of nursing homes.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, I have some observations and comments to make on this bill. I suggest to the hon. Minister that this Act was inevitable as a product of the great and effective public criticism of the last many years. And it is rather ironic to note that it had a very stormy passage to its final destination—being caught, as it were, in the eddies of departmental ambitions and disagreements between Health and Public Welfare.

In fact, Mr. Speaker—I am sure the hon. Minister will correct me if I am wrong—I suspect that this Act is in a sense a compromise by The Department of Health. Last year we had an Act which extended the rehabilitation services under The Department of Public Welfare after an internal struggle. This year The Department of Health receives its fulfilment with a nursing homes regulation Act.

I think Professor Krueger would have enjoyed analyzing what happens between these departments. Basically, there are, I think, several areas of criticism of this bill, pertinent and important. The first thing I want to say, and I expect hon. members of the Opposition will fully agree, is that in many respects this is a shocking Act to bring before the Legislature.

I do not think that in my short time in this House there has ever been an Act so bereft of content and so completely contingent on the regulations. There is literally nothing in the essential phraseology of this Act which cannot be totally overcome, destroyed, undermined or perhaps bulwarked by the regulations, depending on what the hon. Minister will do.

Earlier this afternoon, the hon. Minister said to me in reply to a question that the regulations have nothing to do with policy.

Well, let me suggest to him that in this Act, the regulations are the policy.

The regulations relating to nursing homes cover the classification procedures, the exemptions from licensing, the construction, repair and safety, the management and the operation, the inspection and the reporting, the treatment, care and discipline; they designate the people who will do the inspecting and licensing and, in all, Mr. Speaker, are fully the substance of the bill.

And yet again, for the umpteenth time, this government puts this kind of bill before the House on second reading and gives no hint whatsoever what the regulations are going to be.

It would make the bill laughable were the bill not so important. And one of the things that worries us is that if the regulations are to be modelled on those which originally came forward when nursing homes were within the jurisdiction of The Department of Public Welfare, if the new regulations will be modelled on the regulations of just a year ago, they have already been rejected. They have already been repudiated by reputable groups in the field and by the Association of Nursing Homes Incorporated.

After all, they are the people who have to work within the confines of this Act. So we do not have the regulations and the regulations which may come forward are already suspect.

I suggest that this is particularly serious when we recognize that fully 67 per cent of the nursing homes in the province of Ontario operate homes of under 20 beds. Therefore, the regulations become fundamental to the operation—and not a whisper as to what they might be. So that is the first basic failing in principle.

The second basic failing is that the Act again leaves in an area of considerable uncertainty the precise definitions involved. There were certain grants given to nursing homes under The General Welfare Assistance Act—financial requirements from The Department of Public Welfare. What relationship will those financial grants have to the regulatory features of The Department of Health? Because the Department of Health regulates and audits the books. In addition, we have, completely separate, The Homes for Special Care Act operated by The Department of Health. What relationship will the homes for special care have to the nursing homes Act presently before us?

And yet this whole question of aging, Mr. Speaker, has just been dropped in the lap of

The Department of Public Welfare. How will the hon. Minister reconcile the division of authority in this field at precisely the point when public policy is to bring aging into another department? I think the bill belongs in his department, but I think there is tremendous interdepartmental confusion.

There is no definition of sheltered homes; no definition of boarding homes; no recognition of chronic care; no recognition of convalescent care. No definition of all the major areas affected. Maybe we cannot have the definition until the regulations are promulgated by this government, but I certainly think it is a labyrinth of confusion to put that kind of bill before the House without in some way prefacing it with an explanatory statement, or at least giving us an inkling of the regulations.

I often wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether in this province we should not have what is now becoming characteristic of so many of the states in the United States—a prime ministerial committee on aging, or something analogous to it, so that the great changes in emphasis characterized by different departments can somehow be brought together and we can somehow have some overall purview.

The third point that I want to make is that on the hon. Minister's own admission to the press, the Act will in part be inoperative for several years because of lack of personnel. The fact is very simple, and I am sure the hon. Minister will admit it: Large numbers of nursing homes will not be able to meet the regulations of this Act when such regulations are forthcoming, because the nursing homes simply do not have the required personnel.

The hon. Minister has therefore said publicly that he may give provisional licences, which is an odd way to run legislation, or that he may wait four or five years before a nursing home is formally and permanently licensed under this Act.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is a very basic flaw since the personnel aspect is crucial. I want to remind the House that in the Ontario welfare council study of nursing homes in the province of Ontario, it showed that only 22 per cent of them had registered nurses, 15 per cent had registered nurses' assistants, and the other 63 per cent were dominated on a staff basis by practical nurses.

Now let it be pointed out that practical nurses are trained under The Trade Schools Regulation Act within The Department of Education, but The Department of Education exercises no supervision or control over the

curriculum. The Department of Health does not recognize the practical nurses school; the college of nurses does not recognize them, and the registered nurses association of Ontario does not recognize them. So that in fact if, as everyone assumes, the major personnel areas are to be filled by registered nurses' assistants we have a real personnel crisis in no uncertain terms. As I say, at the present time they occupy only 15 per cent of the staff of nursing home care.

Now to follow up in terms of what that crisis means: In the city of Metropolitan Toronto, for instance, let me tell hon. members what the needs for 1970 are. For registered nursing assistants in the field of active treatment, long-term care and mental hospitals, the needs are for roughly 1,700, and at our present rate of turning these people into the field we will barely meet the requirements of the year 1970 for active treatment hospitals, long-term care and mental hospitals alone.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we simply will not have the surplus of registered nursing assistants required to fill the new nursing homes licensed and regulated by this Act. The homes will be strapped by those regulations, they will not be able to function adequately and the hon. Minister obviously has to put before this House some kind of formula.

At the moment the only areas in Metro Toronto doing training for registered nurses' assistants are the Toronto centre, which has a day course of 120 and an evening course of 70; and there are a few hospitals, six or seven, which turn out a handful of registered nurses' assistants. But the numbers in terms of the entire province would literally have to be doubled to meet the upgraded requirements of this bill. Unless I have missed the words of the hon. Minister over the last year, there has been no suggestion in this House where the extra personnel will come from.

I would suggest to him strongly that one of the sources they might come from is through implementing training courses under the adult retraining programme, section 3. If the hon. Minister implemented a crash programme using section 3 of the training programme, he might conceivably fill the requirements under this Act.

That brings me, Mr. Speaker, to the final criticism of the principle as it now stands. What this Act wants to do, apart from overcoming the furore relating to unhappy conditions in these homes; what this Act wants to do is to relieve the tremendous pressure on active treatment beds in certain areas of

the province by providing proper discipline and regulation and inspection of nursing homes. The hope surely is, as it was under The Homes for Special Care Act, to move people from active treatment units into convalescent, chronic nursing home units and thereby relieve the pressure.

Now I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that will not be achieved by this Act because we do not have the personnel, we do not have the required number of homes, and we do not even yet know what the precise provisions are. But there are two areas where it could be achieved and I want to lay them before the Legislature now.

First, Mr. Speaker, this Act should have contained a provision for Ontario hospital insurance to be extended to cover approved chronic care cases in the new nursing homes regulated by the Act, extended in large part to include such people so that we could have had the pressure taken off the active treatment beds.

And second, Mr. Speaker, and this is of equal importance, the government should fill the gap, particularly in the crowded urban areas, by undertaking a network of non-profit government-sponsored nursing homes. Now, that is not new to the hon. Minister. It is an idea which has been considered by the select committee on aging, it is an idea which was advanced vigorously by the Ontario welfare council's report. It is the only way, I submit, Mr. Speaker, to make this Act effective and operative. Otherwise we again have a sorry piece of governmental window dressing.

We all know why the Act is before us. The Act is the result of a public clamour; but it could have been much better, I suggest. It could have been much more substantial. The lacks in the Act; the absence of so much of the important principle, makes it a less impressive document than it could well have been.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments in relation to this bill. I think the case has been very well put by the hon. member for Scarborough West and my remarks would serve at this time to more or less underscore what he has said. I would certainly agree with him wholeheartedly in the matter of the framing of the bill. It is more noted for what it leaves out rather than what it includes. It certainly is a bare framework under which we are supposed to judge the relative merits of the bill as it applies to licensing and regulation of nursing homes throughout the province.

As far as I am concerned, I have maintained a very active interest in this particular field. As a matter of fact I have a resolution on the order paper, standing in my name, that deals with this area in part, to the extent that provided nursing homes are licensed and regulated according to provincial standards OHSC coverage, under those conditions, should be extended, as the hon. member for Scarborough West has so ably said, to chronic care patients, which would relieve the pressure on the active beds.

However, it would seem to me that notwithstanding the fact that the nursing homes association in the province wanted and has asked repeatedly for this kind of legislation, they will have certain fears and doubts when they take a look at this bill. Nothing is spelled out in precise terms. We are actually looking at a bill that tells us only that the province is going to inspect in some fashion and license in some fashion the nursing homes across this province.

I am certain that the nursing home operators will rest a little uneasy when they take a look at this bill because I would presume that, as has happened before in this House, in a number of cases, as they relate to various sections throughout the bill, the regulations will actually contradict the principle of the bill. This being so, certainly the nursing home operators across the province will have some justification for resting a little uneasy.

It would seem to me that if the province—and I want to say once again that I fully support the principle of provincial licensing of nursing homes and the provincial inspection of nursing homes—but having said that I feel that the province, and indeed the hon. Minister when he brings in an Act like this, should have consulted with the nursing home operators and nursing home associations. I hope that he did this; if he did—

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Does the hon. member want me to write that into the bill, too?

Mr. Gaunt: No, I am just saying that I hope that in drafting this bill there was some understanding between yourself and the nursing home operators as to what the regulations would be under this bill; because obviously we have no idea what they will be, and if the nursing home operators are as much in the dark as we are in this House, then certainly they have cause for a little concern.

The point that I made about extending

OHSC to approved chronic care cases, provided nursing homes are licensed and inspected, would seem to me to point up the case that in this province we must utilize all the health facilities within the community. I had always hoped that when the province undertook to licence nursing homes and inspect them this would be a principle which would be borne in mind when the drafting of such a bill was in process within the department.

However, I am a little bit concerned that this has not been the case in the drafting of this bill. I feel that the hon. Minister is taking a rather timid look at this particular problem. Indeed, the nursing homes across the province have not been up to standard. I think the operators themselves—and certainly their association has realized this—have realized that there are a great many cases where nursing homes are providing service, but that service is not up to standard. I think that we have all seen newspaper headlines—some of them spectacular headlines—relating to incidents in nursing homes, and have pointed up the lack of care and the lack of cleanliness and the lack of standards generally within the nursing homes in the province of Ontario.

The association feels very keenly about this particular matter and they have pressed the hon. Minister, and indeed the government, for a number of years to bring in legislation of this type. Having done that, I would presume that they had the feeling that a bill of this type would have been more precise in nature, it would have spelled out in more detail what was inherent in the bill. Before I take my seat, I just want to say that we do support the principle of the bill, but certainly many of the comments and many of the points that the hon. member for Scarborough West made were very valid and I think the hon. Minister of Health should give them due consideration.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, I just want to add a few remarks to what has already been said. In the explanatory note, the hon. Minister says:

The programme will be administered by the department with the co-operation of local boards of health and other local agencies.

I suppose that is going to be taken care of in the regulations, because it is not taken care of in the Act. What concerns me very much, the way this Act is phrased, is the pretty strong suggestion that there is going to be an additional burden thrust upon the local

municipalities. If the local municipalities, local agencies and local boards of health are going to be required under the regulations to employ additional staff to do additional work, then the local taxpayers are going to have to pay more money.

I think this adds credence to the remarks of my colleague, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce, and to the remarks of the hon. member for Scarborough West. Surely we should know at this stage what the hon. Minister has in mind.

In addition to all of the other points that have already been made in this debate, sir, I suggest that this government owes it to the municipalities to say to them clearly in their legislation, "We are going to require you to do this much more and to raise this much more taxes." Surely the burden of municipal taxes is getting so heavy now that the municipal taxpayers are about to, at any moment, rise in revolt. Here we are sneaking in another additional tax burden on them through the back door, and there is no explanation at all as to how it is going to be done.

No one need repeat, Mr. Speaker, the number of times it has been urged that the province exercise control and establish standards for nursing homes, but in bringing in the bare bones of an Act, that is only going to be rounded out by regulations which we have not seen and which we are not going to be able to discuss and debate publicly, I suggest the government is shirking its duty. It is shirking its real responsibility and perhaps has something to hide when they are not prepared to bring before us the principles on which they propose to take action.

I think the hon. Minister owes us a real explanation as to all the points that have been raised, and owes to every municipal taxpayer a clear definition as to how much additional burden the province is going to put onto the shoulders of such taxpayers, keeping in mind what the hon. Provincial Treasurer did just a few days ago.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the principle of this bill, I do so fully realizing that one could agree on the principle of the bill and sit down; it is simply that the government has decided that they are going to license nursing homes. But that is the only principle involved in this bill, because the government has not seen fit to enunciate any policy whatsoever with respect to the way in which the privilege of operating a nursing home will be granted; the

standards which will be required; the philosophy behind their decision to license nursing homes; the interdependence between nursing homes and homes for the aged and public general hospitals; the way in which there will be co-ordination between these very pressing needs for a co-ordinated policy in our community among the three types of care provided particularly for those who are chronically ill. The government has not seen fit to explain, either in the preliminary statement made by the hon. Minister at the time of first reading of this bill, or so far in this debate, any of the basic policies which animate the government in bringing this legislation before the assembly.

I think that it needs very strong emphasis that this bill is the complete abdication by the government of its obligation to bring into this assembly legislation which embodies the principles and policies of the government. All one need do is to read those sections of the bill which are provided in the bill before us and then read the powers which this assembly is asked to grant to the Lieutenant-Governor in council to pass regulations. The powers of the Lieutenant-Governor to pass regulations are to include classifying nursing homes and residences; exempting nursing homes; respecting the construction, establishment, alteration, safety, equipment, maintenance and repair of nursing homes; the management and operation of nursing homes; and many other facets of the administration of nursing homes and the way in which the government sees the nursing homes as part of an overall system for the care of the health of the citizens of the province of Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister will recall that we attempted at the outset of this session to have a standing committee appointed to deal with regulations, and I would suggest that never has there been a more crying need for some committee of this House to have an opportunity, even if it is necessary to wait a short time, in order to review the regulations which the hon. Minister must, of necessity, put before the public in order to carry out any of the provisions of this Act.

I would hope that, at least, the hon. Minister would give assurance to this House that those regulations will be published during this session of the House so that if any member of the House cares to comment either during the estimates of the hon. Minister or at any other appropriate time, we will have that opportunity to comment. I would hope and request that, in the

remarks which the hon. Minister is going to make about this bill now on the close of this debate, he will in fact enunciate the policies of the government with respect to the position, in the health scheme of this province, of nursing homes for the citizens of Ontario.

I need not reiterate the remarks which have been made by others, except to emphasize the crying need for some method by which persons who are chronically ill, and who recover some measure of their health and are moved from one institution, such as a public hospital or a hospital for chronic care, to a nursing home, and perhaps from a nursing home to a home for the aged, can in fact conveniently and easily be moved from a home for the aged back into a nursing home, then back if necessary into a hospital for chronic care—so that the needs of those sick persons, depending on the state of their health at any time, can be adequately and effectively dealt with in one of three or more types of institution. This, at the present moment, is one of the great lacks in the scheme of health care in the province of Ontario—that there is always a constant and continuous battle to get a person moved from one type of home into another type of home, or into a chronic hospital, for care. And the only person who suffers in the delays which are attendant upon such moves is the elderly or chronically ill person. This particular aspect of the policy of the government, in now deciding that it will license nursing homes, is one that deserves comment by the hon. Minister during this debate.

It has also, Mr. Speaker, been clearly pointed out that, in the case of nursing homes, there is no known way in which a non-profit nursing home can be incorporated and organized and receive public assistance in the construction of the home or in its operation. Reports have been made which indicate the possibility that, under The Charitable Institutions Act, it might well be possible to do so; but I think the fact that it has never been used for that purpose, while it has been used for the purpose of supporting the construction and operation of homes for the aged and other types of charitable institutions, speaks for itself. It must be considered that under The Charitable Institutions Act and, so far as I know, under any other Act of this Legislature, it is not possible to have a non-profit nursing home.

Many of the criticisms of the nursing homes derive from this very fact; that the nursing homes in the province of Ontario are operated for a profit and have a very great need to be solvent; that they are faced with

the need to provide care for many people who are welfare cases, who are dependent on inadequate grants or allowances made to them by welfare agencies of the municipalities or of the provincial government; and therefore that they are unable to provide other than a very low standard of care for the patients in those homes.

I know that at the present time it is perhaps popular to criticize the operators of the nursing homes, but the operators of the nursing homes are fulfilling a need in the community. They are fulfilling it to the extent that it is possible for them to do so under very difficult financial circumstances and with little or no, or indeed inadequate, support from the government or the municipalities.

I think that for these reasons it is essential that the hon. Minister make a very extended explanation to this House of why he should bring into the Legislature a bill which, in essence, simply provides him with the power of licensing nursing homes but does not in any way indicate to this House the way in which he intends to exercise that power, grant the privileges inherent in the grant of a licence, and inform the House as to the way in which nursing homes will fit into an overall scheme for the care of the health of the citizens of this province.

We will support the principle of the bill, because we think it is long overdue. We are shocked by the inability of the hon. Minister to give any of the basic terms of the policies of this government to achieve the end which I assume the government wishes to achieve in placing this bill before this assembly.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on second reading of this bill, but the hon. member for Huron-Bruce and the hon. member for Riverdale touched on a situation where the operators of many of these nursing homes are quite nervous and quite concerned, because the regulations have not spelled out just what they will be faced with, in requirements.

In my own riding, I have several nursing homes, one of which has almost doubled its rates during the past few weeks. This, I think, is basically because they are still uncertain what they are going to be faced with; they are jumping the gun and raising their rates now. We, of course, all realize that costs are going up, but I think this is the prime reason; and I would hope that the hon. Minister can spell out these regulations very quickly.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the principle of the bill is very simple, and is in-

cluded in the bill. The principle of the bill is to regulate and license nursing homes in the province of Ontario, to set standards of establishment, maintenance and operation. Those are the principles of the bill, Mr. Speaker. It is a very simple bill, although it is far-reaching in its implications and will provide a very great deal—and will have to provide a very great deal—by way of regulations.

I want to put the mind of the hon. member for Scarborough West at ease. This was not because of public pressure, or his pressure, or anybody else's pressure; it is a logical extension of our experience gained under The Homes for Special Care Act. Nor is it evidence of any rivalry between the departments; nor is it any compromise; nor anything else. It is something that has needed to be done for a long time and has weighed very heavily upon us. If I recall rightly, when I introduced the bill, An Act respecting homes for special care, I spoke about this and said at the time that I hoped there would be a logical extension into all of the fields of nursing home care.

The place of the OHSC in this, of course, is very simple. The OHSC works under an agreement between two levels of government. It covers hospital care—in-hospital care—and the government of Canada has made it very clear to us that this does not extend to care in nursing homes. OHSC has given temporary approval to a certain number of beds in nursing homes, as auxiliary hospitals, to provide chronic care in areas of our province where there is not enough of this facility publicly owned and operated. But I emphasize that these are temporary licences, and they are steadily being dropped as public facilities come into operation.

This is as far as OHSC can go because of the fact that it is a bi-governmental arrangement and not something that is controlled entirely by our province.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister permit a question?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I—

Mr. Speaker: During second reading I do not think it is the custom to ask questions.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: No, I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker. I sat quietly here and listened to all of their statements, so I think this is my day in court now.

The hon. member for Scarborough West said too much is left to regulation; but the principle of the bill I maintain, sir is outlined

specifically in the bill. The regulations are required to look after the administrative detail, the day-to-day operation of the job; and if you will check this bill with the nursing care section of The Homes for Special Care Act, it is not at all unlike that, and much was allowed us by way of regulation in respect to this.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that government by regulation is not the best type of government; but I also recognize that the practical problems inherent in certain legislation make it necessary that we do have a certain amount of government by regulation. As I said on many occasions, when we have gained the necessary experience from this type of operation, we will not hesitate to bring it into legislation.

I think we are running a very great risk of tying ourselves too inflexibly by trying to dot all the i's and cross all the t's, by putting into legislation all of the things that the hon. members would like—

Mr. S. Lewis: Give us a few i's to dot.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Would they like to speak again, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. A. E. Thompson: (Leader of the Opposition): Yes, I would.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Well, they can, at a somewhat later date. With respect to the grants from Public Welfare in relation to this bill; Mr. Speaker, Public Welfare will provide payment for those patients who come within their sphere of influence; but they will be housed in homes, nursing homes licensed by provincial licence. This is the only difference. We believe that the nursing home is essentially a health facility and, as such, should be under the control of Health. But that does not mean to say that Health must find the funds to pay for the care of those people who are kept in our homes for special care. Welfare, just as they pay for many patients coming within the purview of our care in other facilities, will continue to pay for them here.

The relationship of nursing homes to homes for special care: The homes for special care and the patients in them are a very direct responsibility of government. They are patients who have been under the supervision and within the care of The Department of Health, some of them for many years, and have been discharged to homes for special care. In many cases The Department of Health stands in *loco parentis* to these people because many of them have no homes, have

no relatives. The communities from whence they came have forgotten that they ever existed and therefore we feel a responsibility to them; this too was explained when The Homes for Special Care Act was brought in.

Within The Homes for Special Care Act too we have made provision for sheltered care because of the unique situation inherent in this, because of the type of patient that is housed in these homes. We have not made provision for boarding homes or sheltered care in this Act because this is, we believe, a welfare situation and not particularly a health situation.

We are concerned with nursing homes from the standpoint of health. The health of a person in a boarding house is of importance to us, but it does not take general or particular legislation from The Department of Health to look after it. The medical officer of health has authority within The Public Health Act now to inspect boarding houses, and homes for sheltered care can very well come within the interpretation of this boarding homes Act.

Now as for convalescent and chronic care we believe the patient who needs convalescent and chronic care needs hospital care and they rightfully come within the purview of the Ontario hospital services commission. Again I repeat, the OHSC have certain nursing homes, licensed or approved for receiving patients who are still covered and still protected by OHSC but they are approved as temporary hospitals and not as nursing homes, although they may still go under the name of nursing home.

The hon. member for Scarborough West stated that I told the newspapers that the Act was inoperative, or he stated the Act would be inoperative, because of lack of personnel, basing the statement on one purported to have been made by me. I did not say that it was because of lack of personnel that provisional licences were to be granted. I said it was because of the fact that certain nursing homes could not immediately come up to the ideal standards, and that if they could reach the minimal standard of establishment maintenance care, then we would give them a provisional licence. We still intend to do this, giving them a reasonable length of time to reach the ideal.

The licence will be good for a year at a time, it will be reviewed and the progress that those homes have made towards coming up to the ideal will be considered. If they have made reasonable progress, then their provisional licence will be extended. All things will be considered when the licence

is up for renewal and it will be our intention to press forward steadily to have them come to the ideal standard just as quickly as possible. I stated when I spoke to the newspapers that this period of time might be from three to five years, and I quoted the state of Michigan which was one of the states which had brought in quite a good piece of legislation regulating nursing homes. They found by experience that it took five years to give the homes an opportunity to come up to standard. My staff believes that this can be brought about in three years. I do not think that we want to make it too flexible in this regard either, because we want to ensure that those who are trying to elevate the standards of the home will be given every opportunity.

Now he also spoke about practical nurses, and practical nurses do provide a very good service in nursing homes. There is nothing wrong with practical nurses. Now I want to make very clear, Mr. Speaker, before this House—and I think my feelings about this are on the record and have been for a long time—the school to which the hon. member refers as the only one producing practical nurses. It just happens that this is, as far as I know, the only formally established school, and a school which I would remind this House from which I withdrew its licence shortly after I became Minister of Health because of my concern for the quality of training it was providing. I still hold that concern, and I do not recognize and will not recognize their graduates, because I do not believe they are adequately trained to do the job that their title would lead us to expect.

But a very great number of the practical nurses working in various health facilities today have a right to call themselves this, not by virtue of graduation from any school which claims to give them a diploma for this, but because of the fact they have learned in probably one of the best schools—the school of experience. Learning the job oftentimes in general hospitals, many times in chronic care hospitals, some of them in our own Ontario hospitals, several of our ward aides have left our service and have gone into practice as practical nurses and are doing a very excellent job.

I do share the hon. member's concern because of the number of RNA's that we should have; ideally I think that we should have most of our nursing homes staffed by RNA's and this would be our aim. But here again I think we have to be somewhat cautious at least in not forcing this regulation immediately upon the nursing homes.

Our experience in homes for special care has given us a good deal of knowledge. We have learned that there are some 560 nursing homes, or places known as nursing homes, in the province. Four hundred and forty-five of those applied to be licensed under The Homes for Special Care Act and 205 of them have been licensed.

Now it was this experience alone, Mr. Speaker, that led us to the conclusion that something had to be done to introduce uniformity of standards across the province, because many of these homes that we had found it necessary to reject were licensed municipally. This pointed up to us the difficulty of continued dependence upon this type of licence. We have 205 homes licensed under The Homes for Special Care Act, providing 2,200 beds for our patients. From our knowledge so far it would be our feeling that about 150 of the nursing homes in the province will not under any circumstances be able to meet even the minimal standards and therefore they will not likely become eligible for licensing at all. It is expected therefore that about 400 nursing homes will form the core of the nursing home system in the province of Ontario, but the number of beds that they will be able to provide is unknown at the present time.

The hon. member, for Scarborough West I believe it was, did point out that the average was under 20 beds. With this I would be in agreement, although I am quite certain he is aware of the fact because in his own municipality this has become quite a project. There are several very large nursing homes being established now and they are giving us a little bit of concern because of the very size of them. Many of us feel that homes of their size are far too big for nursing homes.

The programme will begin and our licensing will come into force on January 1, 1967, because many of these homes are municipally licensed now and the municipal year begins on January 1.

It is expected that the licence will be \$10 per year; it is a nominal licence. A provisional licence, as I have stated, will be given to all those who can meet a basic minimal standard.

An annual review will be carried out, I repeat, on application for renewal of the licence to see what progress is being made.

Inspection will be done by local medical officers of health, and I think I can put the hon. member for Downsview at ease because this is not going to put an intolerable or any burden upon the local taxpayers.

In the health units where we already give support financially this is considered part of a basic public health programme and will therefore be eligible for support under their presently existing arrangements with us.

In the cities and large towns where they have their own health setup which is not eligible for financial support through government they have been doing this anyway. I am quite certain that the hon. member will recognize this has been done well in those municipalities for a long time, and indeed my staff have been advised by the medical officers of health here that they will likely save money as a result of this central licensing and control by laying down standards and providing for them a consultant service from head office.

We will have a staff—expected to be 10 people—who will provide counsel, consultation service and a few inspections when it is necessary and when we have been asked to provide them by the local medical officer of health.

Mr. Singer: It is a good trick; they do more work and it costs less money.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: This is right. They will not have more work; they are doing this work now and they are doing it very thoroughly in the large well-organized municipalities. They will not have any more work.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Huron-Bruce says that we should have consulted the nursing home operators. We did; we consulted them a long time ago.

Mr. Thompson: You did not—

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Thompson: I said that you did not consult them regarding the other regulations. I talked to nursing home operators.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, I am not talking about our other regulations; I am talking about this bill. We did consult with the nursing home operators before this bill was written, and we are still consulting with them on regulations. We also consulted with the nursing homes committee of the Ontario medical association. We consulted with the social planning council, which conducted a very extensive study of nursing homes. We

have consulted with all of those people and, as a result, this bill has been prepared.

I think that my hon. friends who have expressed fear on the part of the nursing home operators are not in very close touch with the operators, because they are very much aware of what is going on. Their own organization, the Associated Nursing Homes Incorporated, which has done probably more to elevate the standards of nursing homes in Ontario than has been done by any body in the whole of Canada, has been completely aware of what we have done and has been consulted by us all along the way.

The hon. member for Huron-Bruce outlined a great many faults and weaknesses which we too found when we were licensing homes under The Homes for Special Care Act. It is to correct these faults and weaknesses, and to make sure that the quality of care provided by the nursing homes for those who need it will be of such a standard that it can be approved, that we have brought in this bill, Mr. Speaker. And this is why I believe the hon. members of this House should support it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Minister if this bill is going to go to the standing committee on health?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE SUMMARY CONVICTIONS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 46, An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CORONERS ACT

Hon. Mr. Wishart moves second reading of Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Coroners Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

THE CO-OPERATIVE LOANS ACT

Hon. Mr. Stewart moves second reading of Bill No. 48, An Act to amend The Co-operative Loans Act.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

GREATER NIAGARA GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr4, An Act respecting the Greater Niagara general hospital.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF TORONTO

Mr. A. A. Mackenzie (York North) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr6, An Act respecting the township of Toronto.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF BRANTFORD

Mr. Nixon in the absence of **Mr. G. T. Gordon** (Brantford) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr11, An Act respecting the city of Brantford.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CANADIAN NATIONAL EXHIBITION ASSOCIATION

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr17, An Act respecting the Canadian national exhibition association.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF WESTON

Mr. MacDonald moves second reading of Bill No. Pr19, An Act respecting the town of Weston.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

POLICE VILLAGE OF BADEN

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr20, An Act respecting the police village of Baden.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF LONDON

Mr. J. H. White (London South) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr21, An Act respecting the city of London.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWN OF BURLINGTON

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West) in the absence of Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr27, An Act respecting the Town of Burlington.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

CITY OF SUDBURY

Mr. Sopha moves second reading of Bill No. Pr34, An Act respecting the city of Sudbury.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

ROMAN CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOLS FOR THE CITY OF WINDSOR

Mr. Thrasher moves second reading of Bill No. Pr35, An Act respecting the board of trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools for the city of Windsor.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Speaker, there is a correction to be made on page 9 of that bill. It lists St. Anne's school, 1124 Monmouth road, Windsor, and that should be in the township of Sandwich East.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member could draw that matter to the attention of the House whenever it resolves itself into the committee of the whole.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Motion agreed to; second reading of the bill.

TOWNSHIP OF NORTH YORK

Mr. D. Bales (York Mills) moves second reading of Bill No. Pr36, An Act respecting the township of North York.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Speaker, Bill Pr36 was amended and committed to private bills committee. The bill we have before us is the unamended copy. I have no objection to it, but should we not have the amended bill before us now?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: I do not have any objection to it, either. I notice that the same holds true of order No. 54. The Bill Pr34 is not reprinted either—at least, on my order paper it is marked. We will hold up order No. 56, Mr. Speaker, and will bring it back another time.

Before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow we will deal with the estimates of The Department of Highways, except for our private members' hour from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Sixth report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Reuter	1101
Public Health Act, bill to amend, Mr. Dymond, first reading	1102
St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act, bill to amend, Mr. Auld, first reading	1102
Department of Tourism and Information Act, 1966, bill intituled, Mr. Auld, first reading	1102
Introducing M. Gerin-Lajoie, Mr. Robarts	1104
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	1105
Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1105
Assessment Act, bill to amend, Mr. Davison, on second reading	1118
Recess, 6 o'clock	1127

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as guests to the Legislature today, in the east gallery, students from R. H. King collegiate institute, Scarborough.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's sixth report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr26, An Act respecting the city of Toronto.

Your committee would recommend that the following bills be not reported:

Bill No. Pr15, An Act respecting the township of Pickering.

Bill No. Pr30, An Act respecting the city of Kitchener.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, may I make a brief comment on this report?

One of the sections of the Toronto bill that was thrown out was the section in which the city sought the power to require insurance companies which cancelled fire insurance policies to notify the city clerk regarding cancellations and the reasons for them—indeed, to notify both the superintendent of insurance and the clerk of the city of Toronto.

It was explained that the reason why they wanted this was to discover any inadvertent violation of standards that their inspectors should follow through on and also to gather information on this issue which has been discussed many times in this House—the practice of private insurance companies refusing coverage within certain areas and therefore the fact that these people are left without any protection at all.

Mr. A. H. Cowling (High Park): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: Will the member state his point of order?

Mr. Cowling: The chairman of the private bills committee introduced the report. Now the city of Toronto bill does not include the section the hon. member is discussing. It is not in that bill. It was knocked out of the bill and, therefore, my point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I do not think that it should be discussed at this time, because it is not now a part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Since the section was in the bill and the bill is now being reported, I think that perhaps the member is in order.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for High Park is a professional at attempting closure.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the suggestion was raised that conceivably some other means must be sought to provide insurance for these people. This I would agree is beyond the purview of the bill, because all the city was asking for was that they should have this information from the insurance companies.

Now, I raise the issue at this point with particular reference to an observation I would like to make to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). The superintendent of insurance, Mr. Richards, came before the committee, stated that they had been discussing this problem with the insurance companies, that they were working out procedures, that the insurance companies had indicated that they were voluntarily going to supply this information to the superintendent of insurance.

Now on many of these issues, Mr. Speaker, we have been pleading for action for years and my only view was that the city of Toronto was entitled to have this power until the superintendent of insurance, through his appropriate Minister here, brought in an amendment which would see that this issue was covered.

However, it was thrown out; it was thrown out for a number of reasons. Each member

of the committee who voted against it had his own particular reasons and some of them quite frankly said that they were sympathetic to the objective, but there were certain untidinesses in the section and this is why they were voting against it.

But one of the main reasons why it was thrown out, Mr. Speaker, was the proposition that the superintendent of insurance said that they were working out voluntary arrangements, which might be incorporated in some amendment to the general insurance legislation that would be brought in, and therefore it was not needed in the city of Toronto bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to accept without any further argument or fight on the issue now, the proposition that this was struck out of the city of Toronto bill, but only on condition that we have some assurance from the hon. Attorney General and this government that if the superintendent of insurance is working out arrangements on a so-called voluntary basis with the insurance company that this should be done without delay. Indeed, that such amendments making certain that this provision of information is made available through the superintendent of insurance to anybody who requires it at the city level, should be done at this particular session. I was wondering whether the hon. Attorney General would indicate to us whether there is any possibility of that happening.

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not in the House at the opening of this discussion and I am not entirely certain about what the hon. member speaks. I know that we are conducting studies of insurance matters with a view to certain legislative changes. I do not know what the subject of information is that the hon. member for York South has mentioned. I am not in a position, therefore, to give a blanket assurance at all on any request such as this.

When we have considered whatever the matters are that are before us, we will come forward with a policy to the House—

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, may I clarify the point on which the hon. Attorney General is vague?

In the city of Toronto bill, there was a section in which the city requested the right, under their own bill, to get from insurance companies, when they cancelled fire insurance policies, any notification of a cancellation and the reason why that cancellation has taken place. Without recapping everything

else I said, the superintendent informed the committee that they were meeting with the insurance companies and that the insurance companies had volunteered to do this kind of thing and that it was not needed in the city of Toronto bill because it might be brought in under amendments to the general insurance legislation.

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member. I would give this undertaking: that I will look into the matter myself and see what has been undertaken, if this is so, by the insurance companies and what we may do to see that that undertaking may be carried out.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH ACT

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): moves first reading of bill intituled, *An Act to amend The Public Health Act.*

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, these are very largely house-keeping amendments with the exception of two; one to authorize my department, with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in council, to make regulations governing the sources of ionizing radiation used in commerce and industry, as well as all other sources; the other is to make it possible, by the authority of this bill, to conduct surveys across the province into the incidence of cancer.

THE ST. LAWRENCE PARKS COMMISSION ACT

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): moves first reading of bill intituled, *An Act to amend The St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act.*

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

THE DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION ACT

Hon. Mr. Auld moves first reading of bill intituled, *The Department of Tourism and Information Act, 1966.*

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Speaker, this bill is a consolidation of The Department of Tourism

and Information Act and The Tourist Establishments Act and this Act introduces provisions for the filing and posting-up of rates to be charged in tourist establishments and also for the establishment of parks in connection with enjoyment of historic sites. It authorizes the licensing of information centres by regulation.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to clear up a misunderstanding which appears to have grown out of a statement I made during the debate on Bill No. 45, An Act to provide for the licensing and regulation of nursing homes, in this House yesterday.

I stated The Department of Health did not recognize practical nurses who were the product of a school which operates under the trades school branch of The Department of Education. From this statement it appears to have been taken that The Department of Health does not recognize any nurse education and programmes which come under the jurisdiction of The Department of Education.

This, sir, is not so. Some schools in the province, secondary and/or vocational do offer a course of training leading to registered nurse assistant status. Ryerson institute offers a course leading to registered nurse status. All of these courses are recognized by The Department of Health.

I would also emphasize that The Department of Education and my department have a very close liaison on any programmes for nurse education or the education of other health or para-health personnel. I believe it is correct to say that practical nurses trained in the school to which I referred yesterday cannot be said to be trained by The Department of Education, rather the school is licensed under the trades school branch of The Department of Education.

Mr. MacDonald: I have a question for the hon. Attorney General. Would the Attorney General indicate whether the government will seek the necessary amendments to our laws and regulations to rule out the use of listening devices, such as wired olives in martinis and bugged packages of cigarettes?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Mr. Speaker, when I first read this question, I was inclined to answer it with a question: Has the hon. member been drinking?

Hon. W. G. Davis (Minister of Education): Martinis!

Hon. Mr. Wishart: Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I would point out to the House that this very

matter was discussed at the recent conference on crime, the Attorneys General conference at Ottawa, which was headed by the federal authorities, the Minister of Justice.

The situation, as it developed, is this—this is how it is at the moment: The people who are sophisticated in crime and dedicated to crime and carrying on criminal activities make the fullest use of all these devices. They are numerous, they are most effective, they are small, they are difficult to find, but criminals get their information by the use of such devices. It seems reasonable—and this is the view of our police authorities, I think—to suggest that if we are to combat the criminal who has full access to these devices, the police authorities should have the right to use them also. That is perhaps the only way that the use of such devices can be combated or that the criminal activities resulting from information obtained by the use of such devices, can be really thoroughly and properly combated.

My own view is this; that the use of such devices, if they are to be allowed, by law, be done with the control and direction of the courts. I think if the court gives the right to use such devices, it should be established by an application or by a rule of law or by an application in a specific instance to the court.

The only other alternative as we can see it, arising out of our studies and discussions, is that the possession of such devices by anyone be outlawed by our laws.

I would simply indicate to the House that the matter has been discussed, is being discussed, and will be further discussed. I think I noted in the paper today that a further conference on organized crime, on crime generally, is mooted at the federal level in which the Attorneys General of all the provinces and our police departments will be invited to take part.

But my own view is if these electronic devices are to be used to combat crime, it should be done with the control of the courts.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Attorney General would permit a supplementary question? Is he aware of the fact that the FCC in the United States, within the last two days, has prohibited the use of such listening devices and presumably they are interested in having as effective law enforcement agencies as anybody?

Hon. Mr. Wishart: I had some inkling of this but I have not the full detail of how far they have gone or whether this has

actually become fact. Even if this were so, I would not say that our approach would be the same.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Education a question, which is a follow-up to a question that I asked him on January 28 and which he answered at that time.

What progress has been made in reviewing the extremely low pensions paid to certain superannuated teachers and teachers' widows and when may a definite statement of policy be expected on this matter?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, as was stated on January 28, any consideration given to alterations in the teachers' superannuation fund awaits the proposal that we expect to receive from the teachers federation. I endeavoured to find out for the hon. member before the House this afternoon at what stage these proposals were but I was unable to do so. I perhaps will have this information tomorrow. As soon as these proposals from the federation are presented to the teachers superannuation commission and to the government, we shall make a statement thereafter just as soon as we can.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister has a hope that it may be as early as tomorrow?

Hon. Mr. Davis: The proposals from the federation? No, I do not expect it will be as early as tomorrow. I do not know, I shall try to find out for the hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Is it not a fact that if the government paid the limited amount of money required to increase these pensions out of general revenues, you would not have to wait for the reassessment of the fund that is now taking place? Is that not true, that you could proceed on your own if you paid the money out of general revenues?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Well, Mr. Speaker, I guess it is always possible to proceed on one's own but the teachers' superannuation fund is a fund that the teachers themselves contribute to quite extensively. They have asked that we consider this reassessment and we think that it is appropriate that both matters be considered at the same time.

Mr. Bryden: But these people have been waiting for ten years.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, just supplementary to that, if the hon. Minister would permit, on a point of clarification. Is he expecting that the proposals or the require-

ments for the group of teachers that the hon. member who asked the original question is referring to, will be changed? Surely they are still just asking for a minimum of \$1,200 a year?

Hon. Mr. Davis: Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the hon. member what the teachers' federation proposals will be. All I know is we are told they will include some reassessment that would affect this group of superannuated women that we are interested in.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Speaker, the hon. Attorney General is usually pretty articulate. But he was talking about listening devices and we in the back row did not get that interchange between the hon. member for York South and the hon. Attorney General and I think it behooves the government to put a mike on each of the government desks so we can hear back here.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, put it in your martini.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce to the House a young man who is sitting under the press gallery, M. Gerin-Lajoie, who is Minister of Education for the province of Quebec. M. Gerin-Lajoie is in town today to speak in conjunction with our own hon. Minister of Education to the Empire club. I did not have the pleasure of hearing that address, but I am sure it was a very interesting and a very stimulating one.

My own association with M. Gerin-Lajoie goes back to the years when I was fortunate enough to hold the portfolio of Minister of Education and I really met him first at a meeting held here in Toronto, in either 1959 or 1960. In any event, the significance of that meeting was that it was the first time in the history of this country and Confederation, that the Ministers of Education of all the provinces of Canada had been able to get together and discuss our educational problems on a national basis.

I might say, in addition, M. Gerin-Lajoie is an expert in constitutional law. He has published a volume dealing with constitutional law in this country and, of course, we have had many discussions over these years in various matters relating to The British North America Act and proposed changes, and one thing and another in that area.

I know I speak on behalf of all the hon. members here in extending a very warm welcome to him. Will you stand up, please?

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I beg leave to present to the House the report of The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Public Records and Archives of the province of Ontario for the year 1965.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The ninth order. House in committee of supply. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

(continued)

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, in my comments on the remarks by the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) late Tuesday night, I showed without any shadow of a doubt that this one department of government has let down the people of Ontario in its meek, timid, bits-and-pieces approach. There were only 15 hon. members on the government benches who did not agree with me, so there must have been at least 61 who must have agreed, because they were not present to disagree.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. Newman: It does not matter, there were only 15 on that side who disagreed.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! The member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was so interrupted that I think I should start over again.

Last Tuesday night I showed beyond any shadow of a doubt that this one department of government has let down the people of Ontario in its meek, timid, bits-and-pieces approach to providing for the best and safest means of vehicular communication between all areas of this province. I showed that what is now known as Highway 401, or the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, was originally estimated to cost \$150 million, back in the 1940s. In 1960, the then Minister of Highways, the hon. member for Gren-

ville-Dundas (Mr. Cass), estimated the final cost—this is 1960—at \$2.7 billion. This is almost 20 times the original cost and this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I simply show to the hon. members of this House that in 1956 the state of California built a 209-mile multi-lane freeway in 17 months, not 19 years, and ours is still incomplete with five more years to go. In 1956, the state of New York built a 427-mile four-lane road in the same length of time that it took this department to build the 27-mile Toronto bypass.

When I mentioned \$2.7 billion, I did not include the cost of all overpasses, in order that this highway be called a limited-access road. Unless an accelerated policy is adopted, highways and road construction may become the chief bottleneck, the tourniquet, preventing a continued and accelerated economic growth in all parts of Ontario. Just look at the overall growth of the province, and the areas of slow growth have been those that were most poorly serviced by highways.

Mr. Chairman, you may recall that the other day one of the hon. members in this House mentioned the fact that his portion of the province was not getting the consideration it should have received. He had mentioned that the federal people gave precious little to the poor and depressed people of Ontario. This is the part of Ontario that still does not have Highway 401 completed. This same hon. member has said:

Although we are making progress with regard to main highways, secondary highways, county and municipal roads in our area, I feel that the overall effort is totally inadequate.

This is from an hon. member of your own group, Mr. Chairman. This is the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yakabuski), on page 752 of *Hansard* this year.

May I show the bold and ambitious steps that one of the jurisdictions very close to us has taken? Governor William Scranton of the state of Pennsylvania, in a special message to the Pennsylvania general assembly, has proposed a \$10-billion ten-year highway programme designed to meet the pressing economic needs of the whole state. Ten billions of dollars, Mr. Chairman, over a ten-year period. Not \$2 billion over 20 years. The Governor stated, and I am quoting:

Good highways mean many things to many people. Surely they are a matter of convenience and safety, but as Pennsylvania fights to create economic opportunity

for all her people, good highways mean a great deal more besides. They are the arteries of our economic system.

Build them in time and they pump business, industry, tourism, jobs and prosperity throughout our state. Build them late and it is like pinching off a vital artery in the human organism. Stagnation, decay, lost economic opportunity, will most surely follow.

Mr. Chairman, what is true in Pennsylvania is equally true right here in Ontario. Let us be bold and imaginative and outstanding in our approach to our highways systems.

Last year I took the hon. Minister to task for the dictatorial and inconsiderate approach taken by his department in reference to the Eastwood bypass condemning the hamlet of Eastwood to death. The actual situation turned out to be worse than I had originally pictured it. Allow me to show just what did happen. In the October, 1965, issue of the *Independent Businessman*, the main headline reads:

BUSINESSES NOW THREATENED BY NEW DIVERSION

Just a year ago we reported on these pages that the hamlet of Eastwood, near Woodstock, had been condemned by a sign on Highway 401 which caused traffic to detour around Eastwood. Shortly afterwards The Department of Highways solved the problem by removing the sign.

Then Wally Nesbitt, MP for Oxford, wrote to say, "Your sign problem has been solved." But the community of Eastwood had not had their death sentence commuted. Theirs had been only a temporary reprieve.

The sentence was reimposed with a vengeance on Thursday, September 2, the day before the Labour Day holiday began. That day, signs were put on all of the approaches to Eastwood, bringing tourists to and from Niagara Falls and Windsor.

To the businesses of Eastwood, it was like pulling the plug out of the bathtub. Business dried up; business they could have expected over the Labour Day holiday did not materialize. For instance, on Labour Day, K. Birkett, owner of the Eastwood restaurant, had sales that were \$55 behind the sales of the previous Monday, a normal weekday.

Mr. Birkett's quotes are: "Why did they put the signs up before the holiday, anyway?" All of the businesses were similarly hit by the detour signs which did not need to go up until after the holiday because

no work was done until the holiday was over. But did the detour signs need to go up at all; and in a way that was to destroy a whole business community? These signs were put up a year ago to divert traffic around the railway bridge with a low clearance over Highway 53. The diversion could have been marked simply as "Truck route," for only trucks were endangered by the low bridge. Now Highway 53 is completely blocked where the low bridge was because they are building a new underpass. But did the traffic have to be diverted to bypass the community of Eastwood altogether? The businessmen say it did not. They show on a map how the trucks could have bypassed, as they had suggested on a truck route, and cars could have been diverted on two alternative routes which both would have brought them through the Eastwood community.

But they were not asked for suggestions, nor were they told that the road was going to be closed again. The Department of Highways just turned off the tap.

Talk about arrogance, Mr. Chairman—this is the apex of it. Could not the department have waited until after Labour Day?

Mr. Chairman, the policy of this government in setting up service centres leaves much to be desired. Not only is the policy one that caters only to the major oil companies, but it also has—in instances—a very harmful, depressing and deteriorating effect on the small businessman, the gas station operator and the restaurant owner—small people who were, and we hope, still are the backbone of our free enterprise system.

This year, as in the past, we again have problems with the establishment of the service centre about one mile from Highways 27 and 400—just south of Barrie. Why this service centre would be set up on this site is difficult to rationalize. Just 2.9 miles away at the intersection of Highways 400 and 90 are four service centres; 1.8 miles north of this complex of gas stations, at Highways 27 and 400—a total distance of just 4.7 miles from the new service centre under discussion—are four more gas stations. And 10.8 miles north and east of the new service centre under discussion are eight more gas and restaurant outlets. There once were 12, but four found the going too tough, saw the handwriting on the wall and ceased to operate.

Why this government had to permit this centre to be erected before the town of Barrie, instead of beyond the town, is diffi-

cult to comprehend. If this government were as interested in safety as it says it is, in keeping to a minimum points of entrance and exit, then no service centre is needed in this location. No extra point of entrance and exit is needed at the present points of entrance and exit as the junctions of Highways 90 and 27 already have service centres.

All this, Mr. Chairman, points to the necessity of a review of the service centre policy on limited-access highways. May I, Mr. Chairman, then suggest that, if government policy is to establish service centres on limited-access highways, these centres be located beyond the community situated near the highway and not before the community? The travelling public would have a choice of leaving the road at an interchange to get service in the community at reasonable prices and then, failing to take advantage of this opportunity, be able to get required services right on the highway.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I might bring to the attention of the hon. member who has just interrupted that the United States state departments do not allow any service centres on their limited-access roads; you have to drive off the—

Some hon. members: This is Canada!

Mr. Newman: All right. I am simply trying to point out to hon. members—I do not know whether it will penetrate—it took the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) seven years to realize that age discrimination should have been a policy of this government years ago. It will probably take another seven years to convince you people here that if you are going to put up service centres, put them up beyond the community; not before the community! Let the public have a choice of going into the community first, if they wish. If they do not want to go in, then they can stay right on the road and go into a service centre on the freeway. There certainly is nothing wrong with a policy like that.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Newman: You would have it exactly the same way if you were going the other way on the other side of the road. These are limited-access roads; four-lane limited-access roads, so the policy is good whether you are coming or going.

An hon. member: Can you understand that?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it takes a little while for it to penetrate, but I assume hon. members will get the idea and will see the light of day and have this government change its policy.

Mr. R. J. Boyer (Muskoka): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member does not know very much about that particular highway when he speaks in the terms that he has.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to bring this in but allow me to read this then. I do not know whether it is the local paper or one of the papers from the area—"Service centre monopoly sighted." A Canadian Press report from Toronto. This is the effect of the service centre policy that is set up by this government in this area.

Elwood Smith, president of the superior auto services association, said Friday:

Ontario's major oil companies and the provincial government have joined forces to keep small service station operators out of the big service centres on controlled-access highways. This policy creates a monopoly that will eventually eliminate the small operator.

Surely the hon. member for Muskoka is interested in the small operator.

Mr. Boyer: Of course I am; that is the point. What has just been read by the hon. member has nothing to do with what he said previously.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor.

An hon. member: What is the hon. member for Muskoka getting up for?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I do not think I have to go through explaining the whole policy again. I would suggest to these fellows to get their little slate boards, draw a diagram and see if my suggestion does not have a lot of merit.

Each and every year some member in this House brings up the subject of toll roads. This department says it is opposed to such roads.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Hear, hear!

Mr. Newman: I am awfully glad to hear the hon. member for Kent West making these comments because now that he has made them he will agree with what I have to say. This department says it is opposed to such roads; its policy is that all roads in Ontario should be and are toll-free.

Let me show you, Mr. Chairman, that such is not the case. The Burlington skyway and the Garden City skyway are an integral part of our provincial highways, yet there are tolls on these roads. I know what the hon. Minister will say, as he did last year, and I am going to quote him from page 2543 of *Hansard* on May 4, 1965:

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is the policy of the government to impose tolls only where there is an alternative free facility.

Does the hon. Minister agree with that?

In the case of the Burlington skyway there is a free facility. In the case of the Garden City expressway there is one side by side—a free facility—if you want to wait for the bridge to go down and get across it. Now in the case of the Noden causeway and the Pigeon river bridge there is none. We are not going to impose tolls unless there is at least the option of a free facility side by side.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): There is nothing wrong with that.

Mr. Newman: Nothing wrong with that? The hon. Minister agrees with that, does he?

I have made my comments. Mr. Chairman, the Gardiner expressway, which is far more costly than both the Burlington Bay and Garden City skyways combined, has an alternative free facility and it is right by its side. There are no tolls charged on the Gardiner expressway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We do not own the Gardiner expressway.

Mr. Newman: You have contributed over 50 per cent towards the Gardiner expressway; you certainly have. Nor should there be any toll charges. Is there any difference whether the facility is in Hamilton, St. Catharines or Toronto? The same policy should apply.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): No ships go under the Gardiner expressway.

Mr. Newman: The application of tolls, whether they be at the Gardiner expressway, the Burlington skyway and the Garden City skyway, should all be exactly the same. There is no need for any toll on any Ontario

road. Let us have a real free-of-tolls highway system in 1966 Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, The Highway Improvement Act prohibits the erection of large signs immediately adjacent to a controlled-access highway. Most communities are bypassed by such controlled-access highways so that no idea of their outstanding features can be gained by the motoring public. Since information signs tend to promote the commercial, industrial and cultural welfare of communities, the government should amend The Highway Improvement Act to permit each municipality served by a controlled-access highway to erect adjacent to the highway a sign or signs, the wording, size, layout, colours and construction to be subject to the Minister of Highways, to enable that municipality to inform the motoring public of some of its outstanding features.

Let us never lose sight of the fact that the visitor to our province, to our municipalities and to our tourist areas, contributes in no small measure to our economic growth. We would be remiss if we were to allow a visitor to enter our province at one end, gas up, have lunch, and leave at the other end in one day without placing before him all the inducements which we have to offer, to instill in him a desire to spend a goodly portion of his holiday and his money in Ontario.

It is often said that any type of sign along the highway is a hazard, is distracting and is an accident catalyst. In studies conducted in the state of New Jersey for the three years 1961, 1962 and 1963, on accidents related to traffic volume, environmental features or roadside distractions on the Garden City parkway, it has been shown that the traffic volume ranked first as the major cause of accidents, second came highway construction features, third came highway design features, and official signs, business signs, whether illuminated or not, ranked at the bottom of the list.

This is in a three-year study in the state of New Jersey on the Garden City parkway. The signs, as I have mentioned, came at the bottom of the list as the cause of traffic accidents.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): How many signs are there on the parkway?

Mr. Newman: Oh, there are thousands of them.

Mr. Chairman, with the coming of the Canadian Centennial year and the expected large increase in the number of tourists who will be travelling through the Port Huron-Sarnia, Detroit-Windsor, Buffalo-Fort Erie,

and Niagara Falls gateways into Ontario and onward to Montreal to the World's Fair in 1967, it certainly behooves this government to act on this suggestion. I have failed to mention that there would be the Pan-American games in Winnipeg in 1967, which would also be a tremendous tourist attraction.

The study conducted by the Ontario economic council evaluating Ontario's tourist industry strongly recommends more informative and improved highway signing. The chamber of commerce, in its 1965-66 recommendations, has on page 34 under the heading of "Municipality signs on controlled-access highways," I am reading from the report:

The Highway Improvement Act prohibits the erection of large signs immediately adjacent to controlled-access highways. Most communities are bypassed by controlled-access highways, so that no idea of their outstanding features can be gained by the motoring public.

Informative signs tend to promote the commercial and industrial welfare of communities, so we recommend that the government amend The Highway Improvement Act to permit each municipality, served by a controlled-access highway, to erect immediately adjacent to the highway, two single-faced signs, the wording, size, layout, colours and construction to be subject to the discretion of the Minister of Highways.

Mr. Chairman, no one as yet has predicted a downward trend in highway transportation. In fact, all economists and planners years ago foresaw expanded growth in the use of highways and the development that ensues from their construction.

In North America we talked of a production volume of five million cars a year. Now we have reached nine million and within several years it will be ten; yes, even 11 million cars in one year. Roads will have to be built to accommodate them, unless some other means of mass transport is used.

It is just a few years since piggy-backing of highway freight trailers was adopted. I hope the hon. Minister will look into the extension of this method of transporting goods to the transporting of people, car and all. I am sure that many of the travelling public would just as soon drive their cars upon some type of railway rolling stock and be transported—car, passengers and all—to their point of destination, if the cost of such transportation were not much more expensive than it would be if that party were to drive the same distance.

In the meantime, those who either do or must use our highway system must be inconvenienced as much as possible. Especially is this true in the case of the tourist, whom we all try to entice into our province. The more our highways are used, the greater is the need for roadside rest areas, and I do not mean just a roadside table and refuse container. I refer to a good, substantial rest area, especially along all limited-access roads, and not built adjacent to a service centre. Not everyone can afford, and not everyone wants, to be catered to by a service centre.

Last year I brought to the attention of the hon. Minister the plan of the state of Michigan, a plan worthy of adopting. The rest area, I suggest, should be at least eight acres in size and should have parking for about 50 cars and 20 trucks. It should have rest rooms, picnic tables, grills, safe drinking water, telephones and an information bulletin board, and it should be lighted all night. These areas should be within one hour's driving time away from one another and they should be along the freeway. They could also be off an overpass, so that the freeway would have as few entrances and exits to and from it as possible, for safety's sake.

Mr. Chairman, during the past year many municipalities approved resolutions asking for relief of that portion of cost from real estate taxation for highways, which is not a proper charge for service to real estate. Aware that the province has the exclusive right of taxation of vehicle fuel and registrations, they have asked that The Ontario Department of Highways pay 100 per cent on connecting links, 70 per cent on arterial roads and streets and 50 per cent on all other municipal streets in the cost of land, construction and maintenance.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would the hon. member mind repeating those percentages? I just did not catch them.

Mr. Newman: These are exactly the same as I brought to your attention last year, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I might point out, Mr. Chairman, that was 12 months ago. Is it too much trouble to repeat them?

Mr. Newman: No, not in the least: 100 per cent on connecting links; 70 per cent on arterial roads and streets; and 50 per cent on all other municipal streets in (a) the cost of land, (b) construction, (c) maintenance.

Knowing that the hon. Minister in his remarks last year said the matter of subsidies is continually under review and that increased subsidies are entirely within the realm of possibility, I hope he will be able to inform the House that he has done so.

Allow me to read, Mr. Chairman, from the Sault Ste. Marie *Star* of January 19, on this topic of subsidies and how it has adversely affected the city of Sault Ste. Marie. Its heading is: "Subsidy slashes will hurt the Soo." I am reading from the article:

As a result of revision of policy by The Ontario Department of Highways the city of Sault Ste. Marie may stand to lose over \$500,000 in subsidies. A circular from the department was presented to city council's engineering committee Tuesday. It outlined government policy on the payment of subsidies for municipal expenditures made on roads constructed by private interests in subdivisions. The section of the circular which affects the city most seriously deals with the existing roads laid out by a subdivision plan registered between January 1, 1954 and January 1, 1966. Any roads in this category not up to the department's minimum standards will receive only 50 per cent subsidy from the government. Deputy City Engineer Allan Jackson said that the city has 32 miles of road which comes under this category. It will mean a loss of subsidy of something over half a million dollars, he said. Committee chairman, Alderman Tom Angus, said that most of the roads affected were in the former township areas; in effect we have a larger burden put on us than anticipated at the time of amalgamation.

So it is as a result of amalgamation that this subsidy is going to hurt the Soo to the extent of \$500,000, as claimed by this article. The fact that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto is on a 50 per cent subsidy for roads, plus a 50 per cent subsidy for bridges, plus a 33½ subsidy for subways, causes cities and separated towns some concern. They do not want to deprive Toronto of anything, but would like a similar subsidy in areas that this subsidy may apply.

The city of Brantford was so concerned with the subsidy rate that, at its regular council meeting on February 7, 1966, it passed the following resolution and submitted it to the two hon. members for Brant (Mr. Nixon), and Brantford (Mr. Gordon). The resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the rate of provincial contribution towards municipal roads and highway

expenditures is greater for towns, villages and townships than for cities and whereas the cost of providing and maintaining roads and connecting links to provincial highways is greater in cities due to heavier density of traffic, drainage systems, and so on, and whereas numerous areas designated as townships are in fact urbanized centres greater in area, industrialization and population than many cities it creates an imbalance of distribution of road grants. Therefore be it resolved that the province of Ontario through the Hon. Charles S. MacNaughton, Minister of Highways, be urged to establish a more equitable system of subsidies and road and highway expenditures for the cities of this province.

This same resolution was endorsed by the city of Woodstock on February 7 of this year. So we have two towns endorsing it.

On February 25 in the city of Windsor, the following resolution was adopted:

That the resolution of the city of Brantford be endorsed urging the province of Ontario through the Minister of Highways to establish a more equitable system of subsidies and road and highway expenditures for the cities of this province.

How about more than serious consideration to these resolutions, Mr. Minister? How about some upward revision of subsidies to the cities and separated towns?

Mr. Chairman, just imagine receiving \$249.11 net pay per month, or less than \$60 net pay per week. Can you imagine that?

And hon. member: Terrible; who gets that?

Mr. Newman: Imagine that! \$249.11 per month; less than \$60 net pay per week in 1966! This is what The Department of Highways paid one of its employees in January of this year. The gross pay, by the way, was \$300 per month—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think a point of order may be valid here. This entire matter of wages, affecting The Department of Highways employees concerned in the category that the hon. member is making reference to, is now under the process of arbitration before Judge Anderson. I hardly think it should be reviewed here.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): What does the hon. Minister think about the shameful wages?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is beside the point at the moment.

An hon. member: No, it is not.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, please yourself. It is being dealt with by the appropriate court of the land at the moment.

Mr. Newman: That may be quite true. I want to point out to the House how low are the salaries and wages being paid by this department, and what action employees have to threaten to take because of—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am rising on another point of order, Mr. Chairman, if I may, and I will state it: The Department of Highways has nothing to do with the establishment of salaries and wage scales that the department pays; this is done entirely by the civil service commission, either by negotiation with the civil service association—their bargaining agent—or when those procedures for bargaining and negotiation break down, then the provision for arbitration to which I have made reference becomes the final process.

I frankly do not think that this is a matter to be discussed here. If it is going to be discussed appropriately, it should be done under the estimates of the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan) who speaks in this assembly for the civil service commission. I can repeat that it is being arbitrated at this moment because all the normal processes have been gone through. They failed to negotiate a satisfactory rate, and that is what Judge Anderson is about at the moment.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that the hon. Minister does not have the responsibility for the salaries—in the previous estimates of The Department of Reform Institutions, the hon. Minister (Mr. Grossman) told us that he was not a “shrinking violet,” and that he went to the hon. Provincial Treasurer and fought for his department. Then, interestingly enough, the hon. Provincial Treasurer came in and said that he had never been asked by that particular hon. Minister to have a raise in his salaries in the department.

The hon. Minister of Reform Institutions elaborated at considerable length about his concern in the matter of salaries, although he did say—in fairness to him—that this was a matter between the civil service and the civil service commission.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to interrupt the hon. leader of the Opposition, but my point simply is that if there was any discussion on it a year ago,

it was not undergoing the process of arbitration before a judge of the province of Ontario, and I say that it is *sub judice* to that extent.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to this point of order, really for information from the hon. Minister. As I understand it, this is not really before the court in the sense that the hon. Minister would put it. Surely, the judge has been brought in as an arbitrator but he is not acting in his official judicial capacity.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, he is.

Mr. McKeough: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the point of order, I wondered about this last week when these matters were raised under the estimates of the department of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. I hope that this will be clarified now for the rest of these estimates. Are we going to deal with salaries and wages under every estimate that comes before this House, or should we not deal with them where they are supposed to be dealt with, which is under the department dealing with the civil service?

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the second point of order raised by my hon. friend. Item number 1 in these estimates is “Salaries, \$2,370,000.” Surely, if you are going to require us to discuss these only when the hon. Provincial Treasurer has his estimates before us, then these amounts should be all under his estimates.

Mr. Chairman: I would be inclined to agree with the leader of the Opposition that if we were dealing with these matters generally, they would come under the ordinary expenditure of the department and we could deal with them as such. When we discussed them last year, I do not believe we had Judge Anderson nor an arbitration board and I think, out of fairness, at this particular time, rather than prejudice any decision of the arbitration board, it would be better not to deal with them at this particular time.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, perhaps with a little leeway you have interpreted my remarks. I would suggest that when we look at some particular position and we find that the government is paying \$5,000 for it, we want to know what the terms of reference are about this position and we want to know the kind of people who have applied for it, and so on, because the staff of a department is surely going to make it work effectively. I think in many cases the Minister may appreciate that the Opposition

has had a look at some of the salaries and has not thought them adequate.

Mr. Chairman: Speaking to the other point of order presented by the member for Kent West, I think that basically salaries and wages and so on belong to each department rather than to the civil service and I would be prepared to deal with them under each department. But not on this particular occasion because the subject concerned is now before an arbitration board.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I was only trying to point out to the hon. Minister that salaries and wages as paid—

Mr. Chairman: I had ruled that part out of order. If you will, continue from there.

Mr. Newman: May I quote the comments, Mr. Chairman, which were made at one of the meetings? It has nothing to do with specific salaries, it simply says—I will read the comments made by people—and these are people who have exhausted all patience—

Mr. Chairman: I think this could be prejudicial toward the arbitration award; I suggest—

Mr. Newman: The comment is: "We would be better off on welfare," one angry man said."

Mr. Chairman: This is out of order.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: I continue: "They call it treason, but I call it starvation." That could refer to anything, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: I know the member wants to be governed by the ruling of the chair.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, will you cut me off, if I am wrong?

Mr. Chairman: Will the member carry on with the next point other than salary and wages, please?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, are you suggesting that the critic from the Opposition of the department cannot speak of his feelings on the salaries?

Mr. Chairman: I am merely suggesting, because this is now being discussed under arbitration, that we prefer not to discuss it at this time. That is all.

Mr. Thompson: On what basis are you saying that when something is before arbitration it cannot be discussed?

Mr. Chairman: I understand that this is now before Judge Anderson and it could prejudice the case.

Mr. Thompson: Are you, in all seriousness, saying that if something is before arbitration it will limit the discussion in this House?

Mr. Chairman: I think so, under the circumstances.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, air pollution is under discussion; can I breathe?

Mr. Thompson: It is not before a court; the judge just happens to be the arbitrator in this case.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Mr. Chairman, respectfully, may I suggest that anything that is quoted in the press is in the public domain regardless of any *sub judice* or its being in the courts. If it is in the press, it is in the public domain and we have every right to talk about it in this House, I submit respectfully.

Mr. Chairman: I consider that this particular body is a quasi-judicial body.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, is that your ruling?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: I would have to challenge your ruling on this, with much regret.

Mr. Chairman: That is the member's privilege as the leader of the Opposition and as a member of this House.

Mr. Thompson: Fine. I challenge your ruling, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: All those in favour of the ruling will please say "aye."

Those opposed, say "nay."

In the opinion of the chair, the "ayes" have it.

Call in the members.

All those in favour of the Chairman's ruling, will please rise.

All those opposed, will please rise.

Clerk of the House: Mr. Chairman, the "ayes" are 55, the "nays" 24.

Mr. Chairman: I declare the Chairman's ruling is sustained.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, then may I bring up what The Department of Economics and Development bulletin has to

say concerning salaries generally in Essex, Kent and Lambton counties? I am not talking about The Department of Highways at all, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: Well then, if the member is not talking about The Department of Highways, I would declare him out of order.

Mr. Newman: I am just showing you the economic effects of highways on the three communities, Essex, Kent and Lambton counties. Am I in order?

Mr. Chairman: I think the purpose of the leadoff speaker at this time is to deal with the department generally, if you would.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would I be in order if I told you that \$121 was the average wage in the area there? Would I be in order at all, mentioning The Department of Economics and Development bulletin for November-December, 1965?

Mr. Chairman: I think anything in connection with the wages and salaries under discussion at this particular time would be ruled out.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask for clarification again on your ruling for the benefit of some of the hon. members? As I understand it, you are saying that an arbitration board is a quasi-judicial board and that, whenever we have a discussion of the salaries of a department in this House, we are not allowed to discuss the salaries.

Mr. Chairman: Where the salaries of a department are under discussion by the board, they would not be discussed. Any other salaries of any other department could be discussed.

Mr. Thompson: I just wanted it for the hon. Attorney General's (Mr. Wishart's) ears, so he would hear that ruling.

Mr. Newman: I think the civil servants in the Essex, Kent and Lambton counties will look with much favour at the ruling they received here this afternoon. It is a real shame.

Mr. Chairman: I think if the member looks in May, he will find the same ruling.

Mr. Newman: It is just the Tory muzzle again, Mr. Chairman. It is a shame that you cannot even discuss all facets of this department here in this House.

Mr. Thompson: You are saying that, if we look in May, we would find it. Could you show us where it is in May?

Mr. Chairman: I think I could get that for the leader of the Opposition—where quasi-judicial bodies, under those circumstances, are not discussed.

Mr. Thompson: Would you get this for us then, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Just from the standpoint of personal interest, since the leader of the Opposition has brought this up. The members know that the Chairman's ruling has been upheld, but I will undertake to get this for you.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. If in fact it is not found in May, will you reopen the subject?

Mr. Chairman: No, I will not.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): On a point of order again, Mr. Chairman. The Chairman's ruling is not debatable.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville has the floor.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will leave that topic and go to northern Ontario.

An hon. member: They do not pay them up there either.

Mr. Newman: Well, I understand the pay there is not as bad.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, am I in line in discussing northern Ontario? It is not under arbitration, is it?

Mr. Chairman: If it is under The Department of Highways, proceed.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult for one coming from the southern and more populated stretches of our province to fully appreciate the problems of northern Ontario. But, Mr. Chairman, it only takes a trip to these northern areas to realize that these people have special problems which require special and immediate attention.

The hon. members from these areas will press the case for the north area. However, it does seem strange to me why it takes so

long to build the road from Sudbury to Timmins. Were this hon. Minister as aggressive and as forward-looking as the Governor of Pennsylvania, he would hurry and get the job completed. Only if northern Ontario has more roads can, or will, it ever expect to come close to reaching its potential and fulfilling its destiny in Ontario.

I am told, Mr. Chairman, because of the heavy congested truck traffic and the numerous vacationers towing trailers, boat trailers, or mobile homes, that the narrow, rough, crooked, dangerous Highway 17 between North Bay and the Sault Ste Marie area has one of the highest per mile accident rates. The only answer to this problem then must be the widening of this highway, or making it a four-lane road. Am I getting through to the hon. Minister of Mines? Is he on channel 3 or 4 or 2?

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): I do not believe that is true. That road is good; I have travelled it frequently. I do not think the hon. member has ever been on it. Did he ever get from Windsor up there?

Mr. Newman: Oh, time and time again, Mr. Chairman. I go up at least twice a year.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Funny thing.

Mr. Newman: That is why I make these comments.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, those comments are ridiculous.

Mr. Newman: And as this road is part of the trans-Canada highway system, it must qualify for financial aid from the federal government. Money should not be a deterrent in the building of a wider and safer Highway 17 from Sault Ste. Marie to North Bay. Road-wise, northern Ontario is a "have-not area" that must receive greater and more constructive action; not mere mental consideration.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: A doctor will treat TB, but he does not necessarily have to have it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in this debate last year I asked if it would not be to Ontario's and Minnesota's advantage to have a toll-free bridge between Fort Frances and International Falls, Mr. Chairman; allow me to read a resolution passed by organizations in that area:

Whereas Fort Frances is the gateway to northwestern Ontario tourist and indus-

trial areas, traffic entering this area suffers a continuous marked delay in moving between the United States and Canada, due to an antiquated bottleneck type of bridge at Fort Frances. Built in the year 1912—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Who owns the bridge?

Mr. Newman: What difference does it make who owns the thing? We are talking about the bridge:

Built in the year 1912, privately owned and tolled with rates out of all reason.

And whereas inadequate customs and immigration facilities exist due to the antiquated construction of this bridge, which handled over one and one-half million people and 450,000 automobiles in the past year, causing annoying, frustrating and unnecessary delays to this traffic, including public transport buses,

And whereas this traffic is increasing each year,

Therefore be it resolved that Ontario in co-operation with the state government and the Senate of the state of Minnesota undertake the immediate construction of a toll-free bridge between Fort Frances and International Falls, Minnesota, and that adequate customs and immigration facilities be provided.

This is a text of a resolution, dated January 3, 1965. With the opening of Highway 11 eastward and the completion of the Great River road, traffic will increase considerably. Surely, Mr. Minister, the busiest international port of entry into Canada between Windsor and the Pacific coast is deserving of greater consideration by this province. The state of Minnesota has time and time again passed bills authorizing this construction. Why are you, Mr. Minister, hedging? Let us get this project going.

The opening of the new Rainy Lake causeway had such a marked effect on tourism in Ontario that the number of visitors to the Fort Frances reception centre has gone up from 13,064 in 1964 to 27,356 in 1965. So you can see, Mr. Chairman, that the traffic has increased tremendously in the area. The people should be given consideration in their request.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to turn at this time to a special problem; that is the problem of towns situated along the Canada-U.S. border. Most communities can have bypasses constructed—ring roads around them to facilitate, speed up traffic and take a sizeable amount of traffic off the urban roads. However, cities on the U.S. border—Fort Erie,

Niagara Falls, Sault Ste. Marie, Sarnia, Windsor, just to name a few—have a unique problem. Their problem arises out of the large number of tourists entering and leaving Ontario through their gateway.

These tourists contribute substantially to the economy of the whole province. However an undue portion of the expense of accommodating them roadwise falls on these U.S. border municipalities. Roads that normally would be satisfactory to take care of the urban traffic must be built up, widened and so forth, to compensate for the added traffic burden. Likewise this puts an added strain on roads adjacent to the link roads in that community.

Just as the department has a different subsidy for Metro, it should consider a higher link road subsidy for U.S. border municipalities to enable these municipalities to cope with the road problem that is not of their making and which when undertaken and completed is a greater advantage to the rest of the province than it is to the community bordering the U.S.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he confers regularly with The Department of Transport and I would like to know how close his liaison is with that department. I see he is not paying attention so apparently he does not get along with them too well.

The Department of Highways no longer looks upon itself solely as a road-building department. It undertakes all types of intensive study. It has now become so closely allied with transportation in its many facets that the time has now arrived where it should absorb The Department of Transport and make it a division of The Department of Highways.

When we talk of safety we must take into consideration not only the highway but also the driver and the vehicle, as well as other intangibles. Where the jurisdiction of The Department of Transport ends and The Department of Highways takes over is difficult to delineate, and so, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that The Department of Transport be eliminated by absorption?

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister will go along with that.

Mr. Newman: The Department of Highways cannot function without overlapping in some of its functions with The Department of Transport. This confusion of jurisdiction could easily be overcome. The dog, The Department of Highways, should be wagging the tail, The Department of Transport.

The estimates of The Department of Transport are just four per cent of those of the senior department. The Department of Highways spends over 25 times more than does The Department of Transport. Now that this government is getting concerned with the development of an overall transportation policy, it is only common sense to have just the one department, a Department of Highways and Transport.

Mr. Chairman, may I now turn to highway construction and highway safety. Single car accidents constituted almost one-half of all parkway or freeway accidents. Of all these single-car accidents, 60 per cent of the cars ran off the road. Such startling statistics were true in New Jersey where a three-year study on this topic was undertaken. Surely there must be justification in saying that a large percentage of accidents in Ontario were caused by the driver running off the road. If this is true—and apparently statistics gathered on the accident rate on the Don Valley parkway substantiate this—then is this not a good reason for building in our highways during the construction phase, or adding to the existent roadways, some type of safety feature?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister that the edges of the highways have embedded in them during the construction stage some type of material so that the driver may be able to tell by the tire sound that he is near the edge of the road. On existing roadways I would suggest scarring, roughing or treating after some fashion, the eight, ten or twelve inches of the edge of the road.

I know it will be said that anything done to the edge of the road only narrows the actually travelled portion. Then, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that the first eight, ten or twelve inches of both shoulders of the road be treated after some fashion but be level with the road surface to warn the driver that he is running off the highway.

Failing the adoption of the above suggestions, may I respectfully suggest either painting the edges or applying reflective materials to the edges. I know, Mr. Chairman, some will say that such schemes will not work on snow-covered roads, but today our roads are ploughed either during or immediately after a snow storm so that even if this suggestion may not be practical all the time it would or could be a safety feature for the greater part of the year.

Mr. Chairman, other jurisdictions are using safety features. North Dakota has adopted a resolution recommending the use of a

white stripe on the edge of the pavement. The Ontario chamber of commerce has passed the following resolution concerning white lines on edges of paved highways and I am reading from their bulletin 1965-66:

In this age of super highways and high-speed travel adequate road markings are a prime requisite of safety. When travelling super highways at night a driver is prone to identify his position by a combination of the centre line marking and the right hand border marking of the road, or the distinguishing edge of the road in relation to the shoulder.

Now the two other paragraphs contained are:

Exits from super highways are not properly marked to (a) continue the right hand identification of the lane for through traffic (b) properly define the direction to follow for safe exit. Therefore it is recommended that all exits from super highways be marked as follows—a broken line be continued through the exit to represent the edge of the road for through traffic identification and second that arrows approximately 15 feet long directed to lead an exiting car into the proper lane, the base of the arrows to begin at the broken line representing the edge of the road.

British Columbia, Mr. Chairman, has experimented with reflectors embedded in the roadway, called cats' eyes. These are used to divide a two-lane road. I am told it has some drawbacks but its safety features overcome its disadvantages. The Reflex Corporation of Windsor, a division of International Tools Limited, largest plastic mould manufacturers in North America, has a system of embedding self-polishing plastic reflectors to divide a two-lane road.

I hope the department is seriously considering some of these latest attempts at making our highways safer places to travel on.

California drivers are seeing "Botts dots" before their eyes and they will be seeing them more and more. Botts dots, devised by a Californian named Botts, are slightly raised road lane markers pasted to California highway centre lines with epoxy glue. They are making white painted divider lines obsolete. California is the first state to adopt them. They not only make centre lines easier to see, especially at night, but cut accidents, too.

Reflective markers are being mixed with white ones along California highways. Not only can drivers see Botts dots better, they

can hear and feel them under their wheels as they veer over toward neighbouring lanes. In a two-year test outside Fresno, California, the dots cut accidents by 27 per cent.

Last year, Dr. Morton Shulman, chief coroner of Metropolitan Toronto, brought to the attention of the public that many preventable traffic deaths and injuries were caused by ignoring basic safety rules in constructing the Don Valley parkway—(1) Concrete bridge abutments and lamp posts unprotected by guard rails within a few feet of the pavement; (2) Street slopes which can flip over cars travelling at high speeds unprotected by guard rails; (3) Guard rails not curved away from the roadway.

These are just some of the bad highway designs that cost lives. I am told, Mr. Chairman, that the degree of the side slope on the medians of freeways and the degree of side slope along our highways is another bad feature and a potential killer. I am told that curbs before or in front of guard rails are killers. Guard rails bear the car back on the highway, whereas the curbs pull the car into the guard rail head on. I am told that trees within 50 feet of the side of a highway are potential killers. In fact, any object sticking out on the side of a highway is a potential killer.

Mr. Chairman, I have mentioned a few bad highway design features. Roads engineers long ago discovered that it is easier to build safety in our highways than into our drivers.

I do hope the hon. Minister could inform this House that all Ontario's highways have all the latest safety features built into them, or if they do not, that every effort is being made by his department to overcome these deficiencies.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to comment at some length on means other than highways for the mass movement of people, namely, subways and commuter services. Under the proper vote, I will elaborate.

If I may, I would like to make a few brief comments at this time. Commuter services, be they from one city to another, or be they within the city, the principle I wish to discuss is the same. The hon. Minister has provided for a subsidy of 33½ per cent to Metro's subway system. This subway is to provide a means of transport to Metro residents. The amount of \$18 million provided amounts to approximately a \$9 per capita grant. How about the residents in Ottawa, Hamilton, London, Windsor, Sudbury and other Ontario cities? Not only do these cities receive a 50 per cent smaller subsidy than

does Metro Toronto, but they also receive less in bridge subsidies and because they do not have some type of rapid transit system, no subsidy for the transit system or transport system they do have.

Mr. Chairman, I do not quarrel with the financial assistance given to rapid transit in Metro. All I ask is that other cities in Ontario be given financial assistance for the same purpose in their respective communities, either their subsidy for road and bridge construction be on a par with that of Metro, or that financial assistance be given them in the way of subsidies, so that public transportation in their respective communities can be improved and extended.

Another way assistance could be given them is in the elimination or abolition or rebate of all fuel taxes on municipally owned or operated transportation systems.

Municipal transportation systems have been hard pressed. Many have operated at a deficit and were either subsidized by municipal taxpayers, or had to curtail and limit their services to a point where service was at a minimum. Let us give these systems the same consideration as was given the Metro subway system. Municipalities could lower fares, could improve services and could possibly supply free or reduced services to their senior citizens, were an increase in the subsidy be given them.

Mr. Chairman, as for commuter services, I do hope that the good people of Hamilton, after having presented their case, will be given reconsideration concerning their request for the extension of commuter services from Burlington to Hamilton.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to bring up two other topics, but I will withhold them for the general vote. They were the topic of ring roads, especially the one relating to my own community; the second is the topic of overpasses on 401 and the slowness with which this government has acted in constructing these overpasses.

Between Windsor and London there are 38 crossroads. Twenty-four of those crossroads over 401 are in the Essex county area. Why we in Essex county should have waited and should be penalized in the construction of overpasses, I cannot understand. We had the first section of 401; it looks as if we will have the last portion, and that is the last overpass of the completed Macdonald-Cartier freeway, put up in the Essex county area.

Mr. Chairman, allow me to summarize the various comments I have made. First, I asked that more information be contained in both

the annual report of the department and in the public accounts.

Second, I asked for a greater number of votes with a better breakdown in the estimates.

Third, I asked for speed up in highway construction.

Fourth, for consideration concerning the serious and disastrous economic effects of indiscriminate bypassing.

Fifth, a review of the service centre policy.

Sixth, the elimination of tolls from both the Burlington and the Garden city skyways.

Seventh, reconsideration of the policy concerning information signs.

Eighth, the establishment of more rest areas on limited-access freeways.

Nine, the review of the policy on subsidies by putting all cities and separated towns on the same basis as is the Metro Toronto area.

Tenth, an upward revision of wages.

Eleventh, an accelerated roads programme in northern Ontario.

Twelfth, the construction of a toll-free bridge between Fort Frances and International Falls.

Thirteenth, greater consideration by way of subsidies to communities bordering the United States.

Fourteenth, the assimilation of The Department of Transport into The Department of Highways.

Fifteenth, a greater awareness to the necessity of maximum safety features being built into our highways.

Sixteenth, the elimination, abolition or remission of fuel taxes on municipally owned and operated transportation systems.

Seventeenth, a reconsideration of the extension of commuter services to the city of Hamilton.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that when we return to this House next year, these considerations will have been implemented.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I understand we are close to the private members' hour and I would rather not start for the few minutes to go into my main remarks.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves that the committee rise and report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

THE ASSESSMENT ACT

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East) moves second reading of Bill No. 34, An Act to amend The Assessment Act.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): As a member of the select committee studying the problems of aging, I have had the opportunity of learning of the problems of our senior citizens across this province. The greatest single problem common to most of the aged is lack of money and frequently expressed was a desire for some relief from property taxation. Increasing tax rates have resulted in an almost insupportable burden on the individual required to live on a fixed income.

The proposal I make in presenting this bill does not provide, nor was it intended to provide, the total answer to the financial problems of the aged. But it will relieve to some degree the tax burden on their home property, if the municipality chooses to apply this permissive legislation.

The exemption will only apply to the education portion of property taxes. It permits the council of a local municipality to pass a bylaw authorizing and directing the treasurer of the municipality to credit against the tax payable on not more than one property, and in an amount not to exceed \$150 or the portion of the real property taxes imposed for school purposes, whichever is the lesser.

This relief will be available to a person who

(a) is receiving a benefit under The Old Age Security Act (Canada) or The Old Age Assistance Act;

(b) has, or whose spouse has, been assessed as the owner of real property in the municipality for at least ten of the 15 years immediately preceding the application;

(c) pays the balance of the taxes levied for the year in respect of which the credit is applied for; and

(d) applies therefor on or before the last day of February in the year in which the tax is levied.

A bylaw passed under this section may provide for such matters necessary to the administration of this section as the council deems necessary and the council shall in-

clude in the annual estimates of the municipality such sums as are equivalent to the credits granted under the bylaw.

Over the years prior to reaching pension age, our older citizens have contributed in one way or another to the cost of education—either through direct taxation on property owned by them or through the rents paid by them which their landlord would naturally set at a level to include, among other things, his tax costs.

Several states in the United States of America have already enacted legislation to provide tax relief for their senior citizens, and to give hon. members some idea of the methods used to provide this relief I will give a few examples.

Michigan grants a property tax exemption on \$2,500 of the valuation of an owner-occupied home of homeowners of 65 years of age and over whose incomes are \$5,000 or less and whose homesteads have a state equalized valuation of \$10,000 or less.

The Act is administered by the state department accounting division, which reimburses counties for this exemption. It became effective for the 1966 tax year and it was estimated that it would assist 194,000 homeowners with an average exemption of \$90.

Indiana grants an exemption of \$1,000 in assessed valuation to any resident 65 years of age or over whose total annual gross income from every source plus that of his spouse—if any—does not exceed \$2,250 a year—who has owned and occupied a homestead assessed at \$5,000 or less for at least one year and who receives no other tax exemption.

Massachusetts exempts \$4,000 of assessed valuation in respect to persons 70 years of age and over, who have lived in the state for the preceding ten years, who own and occupy a homestead assessed at \$14,000 or less and whose annual net income from all sources, both taxable and non-taxable, does not exceed \$5,000 for a married couple and \$4,000 for a single person.

New Jersey grants a tax credit of up to \$80 against the property tax on the self-owned dwelling of persons 65 years of age and older who are citizens and have been residents of the state for at least three years and whose annual income does not exceed \$5,000. Here income is defined to include money from whatever source including, but not limited to, realized capital gains and the entire amount of pension, annuity, retirement and social security benefits. It is further provided that no such deduction from taxes shall be in addition to any other deduction

or exemption from taxes to which said person may be entitled.

It is of interest to note that this New Jersey legislation was based upon a 1963 amendment to the New Jersey state constitution which was approved by a vote of 1,165,739 to 406,002. These results indicate that the people of New Jersey were overwhelmingly in favour of providing tax relief for senior citizens and I think this is a reflection of a general attitude. I do not believe that the citizens of Ontario care less for the welfare of their senior citizens than do the people of New Jersey.

Oregon makes provision for tax exemptions for senior citizens with annual gross receipts less than \$2,500. Gross receipts include, but are not limited to, pensions, disability compensation, retirement pay, public welfare and social security payments and receipts from sales or services rendered. A percentage of the first \$10,000 of the true cash value of the principal personal residence of persons 65 years of age and older meeting the income test is exempted, based on the age of the taxpayer or of the oldest of the taxpayers sharing the residence. The percentage of true cash value exempted from taxation ranges from 10 per cent to 100 per cent depending on age with resultant exemptions of \$1,000 for those 65 to 68, \$3,000 for those 69 to 71, \$5,000 for those 72 to 74, \$7,000 for those 75 to 77, \$9,000 for those 78 to 79, and \$10,000 for those 80 and older.

Here provision is also made for tax deferment for those unable to obtain complete exemption and for those with annual gross income over \$2,500.

Wisconsin makes provision for income tax credits and refunds to persons 65 and over, to both homeowners and renters as a relief from property taxes. In cases where household income is \$1,000 or less, such relief amounts to 75 per cent of the property tax in excess of five per cent of household income but not to exceed \$300 in relief. Where household income is over \$1,000, the relief is 50 per cent of the property tax in excess of five per cent of household income but not to exceed \$300 in relief. Household income is defined as the income of all persons related to and living with the exempted taxpayer and income is defined as adjusted gross income plus pensions, social security payments, alimony and non-taxable interest, with gifts and income in kind excepted up to \$300. The same benefits are available to qualified senior citizens who rent.

Property tax liability is assumed to be 25

per cent of gross rent, which is defined as the payment solely for the right of occupancy excluding charges for utilities and other extra charges. In all cases where the amount of property tax relief exceeds the income tax liability, the balance is paid from the state treasurer to apply on the payment of property taxes.

The word homestead is defined in Michigan as being "any dwelling owned and occupied solely as a home by the owner thereof." I presume this definition applies in the other states.

A broad variety of proposed legislation providing tax exemption, tax credit or tax deferment for senior citizens has recently, or is currently, being considered in a large number of states of the USA. In the last two or three years as many as 20 different bills have been considered during a single legislative session—Connecticut, 1963—related to property tax relief for senior citizens and scores of other like bills have been proposed.

I do not know exactly how many such bills are presently being considered across Canada and United States, nor do I know the likelihood of their enactment but there is no doubt that there is a strong trend to find measures to more adequately solve this aspect of the financial problems of our senior citizens.

There is general recognition that:

1. The limited or fixed incomes of many senior citizens is inadequate to meet even basic needs in a period of increasing prices.
2. Property taxes tend to increase at a rate out of proportion to any change in the relatively static incomes of senior citizens.
3. Senior citizens are generally faced with the necessity of meeting sharply increased costs for drugs.
4. Advances in medical science have added years to the life-span without the benefit of employability beyond certain age limits.
5. Many earlier pension plans and social welfare plans at present levels do not provide benefits which are equal to the lowest needs in relation to the present price structure.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge the support of hon. members for this bill.

Mr. R. J. Harris (Beaches): Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the hon. member for Hamilton East for bringing this Act before us today because I am sure every hon. member in the House has sympathy for the

people, and it is well worth a few minutes to consider a bill of this nature.

I have several reasons for participating this afternoon, Mr. Speaker. The most important as far as I am concerned is that, in the historic riding of Beaches—which it is my privilege to represent—I have had a large number of senior citizens write, phone and come to see me on this very question. I realize that there are a large number of these people who are just unable to cope with this increasing municipal tax rate.

Yesterday, when the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) was speaking in another regard—I am very pleased to see him come in—he coined a phrase that caught my ear; something to the effect that the burden is so heavy that we will see the taxpayers rising in revolt. Maybe that is not too much of an exaggeration and I commend that statement.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the principle that my hon. friend from Hamilton East has set out in this bill is certainly a good principle; namely, one that will bring relief to many of our deserving senior citizens who have worked hard throughout their lives to build up an equity in their own home and now—after all their hard work—are in serious danger, in many instances, of losing their home. I noted this morning that Bill No. 25 from the city of Hamilton, which is a private bill, will be before us next week—on Tuesday, I believe—and we find almost the same provisions in that bill. I want to commend the city of Hamilton for bringing this to our attention in that way.

Now there is no doubt that, in the very near future, ways and means must be found to bring relief to many of these people. I am not altogether convinced that either Bill No. 34, or Hamilton's private bill, is the right way to handle this.

Some hon. members may remember that last year in the estimates of The Department of Public Welfare I made a few remarks on this subject and mentioned that these suggestions should be of concern not only to The Department of Public Welfare, but certainly The Department of Municipal Affairs and to The Provincial Treasurer's Department. I would like to quote a few of the paragraphs from those remarks I made last June 17, I think, which will be found on page 4371 of *Hansard*. I said at that time:

Persons over 65 residing in their own homes be permitted to apply for and receive a deferment of their municipal taxes until termination of their ownership by sale

or by death of the owner or in case of a joint or common ownership by the death of both owners and that these taxes which would otherwise be payable be collected by the municipality or by the province following termination of ownership in much the same way as tax arrears are collected.

Now I said "or the province" because it may well be that the burden of financing these deferred payments should be lifted from the municipality to the province. Just quoting a little further, Mr. Speaker:

May I be the first to say that this suggestion involves no sweeping act of public largesse. The province will receive payment of the tax loans, it will cost the municipality nothing and there is obviously no means or needs test involved, it is just a simple mechanism for helping a particular group of our older people who might find it of value.

And I suggested at that time as a first step that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare (Mr. Cecile) and his research people should assess whether there would be enough older people to warrant its execution at that time.

Now again in the area of Beaches, which it is my privilege to represent, I know there are very large numbers of married senior citizens owning their own homes who all of their lives have been extremely thrifty and hard-working citizens but today because of the small income plus old age pension they just cannot maintain their homes and pay the necessary tax, maintenance and all the other necessary living expenses. Again it is only a matter of time until these homes are lost.

As I said at that time, we all knew that the Senate of Canada had been studying aging and that the committee of our hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Carruthers) has been at work on this problem for some time. Also, throughout the province, many groups of the public at large are increasingly directing their attention to the problem of our older citizens. Out of this many new and comprehensive programmes will evolve. However, in the meantime, I would suggest that the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and his department assess the value of this suggestion.

Just a word on reflection, since I made those remarks some eight or nine months ago. It seems to me that if such a course as this were followed, these people to whom we are referring would retain their dignity and would be able to retain their independence. They would be close to their churches and shops and friends; all the things they have been

used to all their lives. In this regard, I know from my own experience that scores of people I know who have had to give up their homes, and who were fortunate enough to get into senior citizens' apartments are still unhappy about being uprooted and shifted away from their lifelong environment.

We are all aware of the many stories we have read and heard through various news media in recent months, and I was very pleased to learn a short time ago that our own Department of Public Welfare is initiating new programmes. They will be, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, setting up a department of aging that will be devoted to helping many of our senior citizens who are faced with problems of this nature. I would like to commend the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and I, for one, certainly look forward to learning a little bit more of this project and hearing more before too many weeks of this session go along.

I would just like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to refer—particularly to those of us who are lay members in this Legislature—to The Assessment Act. I am thinking of section 131 that deals with cancellation, reduction or refunds of taxes where an application to the court of revision for a reduction in taxes may be made and, in particular, I am thinking of subsection (e) dealing with a person who is unable to pay taxes because of sickness or extreme poverty. Of course they can, through this section, obtain relief. There are other areas where assistance may be found for this group of people referred to in this bill we are debating this afternoon.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt in my mind that the tax machinery in Canada, to put it bluntly, is in a mess. The whole structure has to be updated and streamlined. We all know that the Carter Royal commission on taxation should be reporting very soon. We also know that the Smith commission dealing with the many and varied phases of the mixed-up provincial picture will be reporting in the very near future. I mention these reports, Mr. Speaker, because the recommendations that they will produce are bound to touch on the municipal tax structure which, in turn, has a bearing on the problem that we are debating here this afternoon.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again commend the hon. member for Hamilton East for introducing this bill, because it will help to focus public attention on this problem and it is so very, very imperative that we do that. As I pointed out a few moments ago, a method of bringing relief to these people must be found in the very near future.

But I cannot agree with the recommendations as outlined in Bill No. 34, that this is the right way to do it because, among other things, these recommendations would add an additional burden on to the municipality by shifting a part of the taxes on to an already overburdened group of other people in our society. There is every likelihood that it might fall on the already hard-pressed younger people; or on a good many of our middle-aged group.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): They are against the younger working people; they do not care about that.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say something on the principle of this bill which obviously is designed to give relief to the heavy burdens of taxation carried by our senior citizens.

It is interesting to note that it is very similar to a bill that is before the Legislature that was introduced by the hon. member for Hamilton Centre (Mrs. Pritchard)—whether or not she supports it I am not aware; but it is, of course, the private bill from the city of Hamilton. Since the bill before us has been introduced by the hon. member for Hamilton East, it appears that this matter is of great and important concern in the Hamilton area and I, from outside that area, am here to add my thoughts to the principle of the bill which I support.

Having said that, I want to spend a moment to point out the objections to this sort of legislation. Down through the years it has been assumed that all property owners must pay their share based on a fair assessment, and in this Legislature we have taken steps to see that no fixed assessments would be granted and that special exemptions would be reduced to as few as possible. But naturally there has to be some fairness and flexibility to a situation such as this because we are dealing with the old people of this province and their need is coming to the point of an emergency for a number of reasons that I would like to bring to your attention, sir.

The statistics that I have available are based on the special committee of the Senate of Canada that dealt with aging and reported just a few weeks ago. I have not read the full report, but when Senator Croll introduced it into the Senate, he said the theme of the report is urgency—the things that old people need, they need now—and putting it off will not be of any assistance to them.

These old people, and the people who are approaching 65, including many of the hon.

members of this House—and, of course, will eventually include all of us, and we are in a way preparing for the future—but these people who would be included in the bill have come through two world wars and a disastrous depression, during which they have been in many ways unable to provide for their own old age. More than that they find that living on a fixed income is becoming increasingly difficult as they find themselves entwined in the spirals of inflation that have struck our economy since 1945.

The hon. member for Beaches said that the number of people concerned is rapidly increasing. In 1900 five per cent of the population of Canada were over 65 years of age; in 1960, 7.6 per cent; and it is expected that in 1990 still only nine per cent of our population will be 65 years or older.

But here is another interesting statistic and the last one that I will refer to. At 70 years of age, 61 per cent of the men in Canada and 85 per cent of the women have to subsist on incomes below \$1,500. It is my view, and it is a view that I hope would be held by every hon. member of this House, that we should not point to special assistance based on a means test or a needs test to look after the basic requirements of the senior citizens of this province, and it is these people that we are discussing this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, there are two arguments that I feel are strongly in support of the passage of the bill that is before us. The first is that municipal costs have risen dramatically in the last few years and these have had to be supported by rapidly increasing municipal taxation. It is my view and a firmly held belief that the government of Ontario has not met this need.

In education, the cost of the administration of justice, and the administration and provision of welfare, the main burden of the increased taxation in these fields has fallen on the municipal taxpayers, among them the older group that we are talking about this afternoon. The government has not done nearly enough for this group of people or for municipalities in general and it is really irrelevant for us to say that we must wait for the Smith committee and the Carter commission to report.

In one of the last meetings of the private bills committee, a representative of The Department of Municipal Affairs said that the Smith report is sitting waiting upstairs somewhere in this building and that it will not be released—this is what he said—until the federal Carter commission report is released.

It appears to me that the one waiting on the other, this Alphonse and Gaston system, is a ridiculous system indeed, and it may well be—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt? I would just like to ask a question. Did I hear correctly that the hon. member said that a representative of The Department of Municipal Affairs had said this?

Mr. Nixon: At the committee on private bills about a week ago Mr. Yates said the committee report was ready and waiting for the Carter commission to report. It seems to me that the Carter commission—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Well, if Mr. Yates has that information, I would be surprised.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The hon. Minister had better go and see him some time.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: No, he had better come and see me. I shall check that information.

Mr. Nixon: Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I was quite startled when this came from the people sitting at the head table of the committee. That was the way I heard it and the way I understood it, and I would be glad to get more definite information from the hon. Minister when this is available. But my understanding is that the information is available, or it should be available, because the committee has been sitting for a long period of time. For us to wait month after month and year after year for the improvement in the tax position of the municipality is simply not good enough. We have got to take some action now and this bill would permit such action to be taken.

The second argument for the passage of the bill that is before us is that the pensions that are received by our older citizens are inadequate. The \$75 that is at present payable as a federal pension should be augmented by money that could be made available from this House in addition to the \$75, to bring it up to \$100—or more if we could afford it. It appears that as far as the federal government is concerned, the economy is not going to bear it all across Canada at this time. As I said in this House a few days ago, I am sure that under Liberal leadership the economy will burgeon to the extent that this money will soon be available. But this in no way, Mr. Speaker, relieves us in this House of the original responsibility for providing adequate pensions. It is our prime responsibility.

Mr. White: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question? When the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts) and the government of Ontario were trying to get the extra \$25 for the older citizens, why did the Liberal Party not support our endeavours?

Mr. Nixon: If the hon. member who has just interjected had followed the speeches of his own leader during the federal election he would know that the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario suggested that the premiums for the Canada pension plan could be used in this connection. I feel that this is an irresponsible suggestion.

The fact is that there are not sufficient funds made available for the support of our older citizens, and this, coupled with ever-increasing municipal taxation, has put them in a position where more and more have had to go and appeal to the welfare centres of these cities and in fact join the ranks of the people who have to accept such assistance. I do not think this should be necessary.

I do not personally believe that the type of legislation that is before us is the best answer. It is an *ad hoc* solution. If these older people are having some economic difficulties, here is an opportunity that they can be relieved of at least one of their pressing burdens.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of any effort on the part of the government of Ontario to reduce local taxation by assuming more of the responsibility for the services at the municipal level that have to be extended to people, or in the absence of any effort to raise the general pension by this House, I am in support of the bill that is before us at this time and that constitutes an amendment to The Assessment Act.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the second reading of Bill No. 34, I agree with some of the things that the hon. member for Brant has said.

The amendments provide that the municipalities, may, if they want to do so, give abatements to pensioners based on the portion of their property tax that is earmarked for education.

Of course, the principle entailed in the bill is one that this party has been in favour of for many years. I believe that all hon. members of the House have admitted, at one time or another, that the elderly are not getting enough pension, that \$75 a month is just not enough for them to live on in decency in this day and age.

I commend the mayor of Hamilton for again submitting the private bill to make it permissive for the city of Hamilton to give such abatements. I feel that there should not be a parochial approach to the problem.

Although we are not in favour of adding to the categorical ways of handing little bits of money to the elderly, we think it should have been done in a regularized manner by an increase in their old age pension, whichever category they fall into.

The bill introduced by the hon. member for Hamilton East makes it permissive for any municipality to take such action where it finds failure at the senior levels of government to do so, and justifies looking after the elderly in their own community.

I was surprised that we have so much support from Hamilton for the private bill. I often wondered why the mayor of Hamilton—and I feel he intends to try to take over the leadership of the Liberal Party—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: This is one of the little picayune political moves the mayor of Hamilton is making to try to garner public support, but it was quite obvious when the federal Throne speech came down that I did not hear the mayor of Hamilton trying to gather his Liberal supporters across Canada to put some pressure on the federal government to include in their Throne speech an increase of the old age pension to \$100.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Gisborn: This is the approach that should have been taken by the mayor of Hamilton, who is an aspirant for higher political office.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Oh, come on!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: You will notice, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment that our party made to the Speech from the Throne concluded by asking that this government increase the old age pension to \$100.

I would hope that if there is some sincerity in the Liberal group in regard to the needs of elderly people, let us hear from them and from Liberals across the country. Put some pressure on the federal government to get out of this categorized method of giving people a little handout here and there, and raise the pensions to a point where we will not have to take this kind of action. I think

it is a little bit shameful that we in this House have to again deal in a piecemeal manner in regard to the needs of the elderly in this province.

I will now answer the question—

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. member why this bill does not give the same relief to the categorical pensioners as it does to the old age pensioners.

Mr. Gisborn: That is a question that was omitted—

Mr. Nixon: I will say that it is a very serious omission.

Mr. Gisborn: The hon. member mentioned that to the people who drafted it and, before he introduced it, he noticed the omission. I do not think it is one that would say that we are not in favour of giving it to those in disabled groups, or widow or deserted mothers groups; we feel that all of those people need more money.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Mr. Speaker, in rising to participate in this debate, I also wish to commend the hon. member for Hamilton East, not only from the point of view that he has introduced this bill, but from the fact that he is a very valuable member of the select committee on aging; a member who has dedicated himself to the relief of the problems facing our elder citizens and who has made a great contribution to the work of our committee.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Keep it up—keep going—do not stop!

Mr. Carruthers: I will just stop and say this, that I value the services of the hon. member for Hamilton East very highly.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Carruthers: I am very sincere when I say that.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!!

Mr. Carruthers: I think we all realize, Mr. Speaker, that the 508,000 senior citizens in this province are facing a particular problem. The hon. member for Brant has pointed out some of the reasons for this and I would like very briefly to review these.

In the first place, there was the depression of the thirties. In those dark days, many of our senior citizens of today lost their homes; lost their resources and, during the difficult years that followed, did not have an oppor-

tunity to accumulate the necessities of life which would have carried them through this day. There was also World War II which followed immediately on the heels of the depression and, during that war, many of our senior citizens of today lost their sons and daughters—and in many cases lost their friends—upon whom they could today lean upon for a certain amount of support.

Following World War II came automation and many of our senior citizens were forced, because of economic conditions and because of lack of skills, into lower-paying employment. With this came the rising cost of living, which placed them in a position in which they could not meet their needs of today and meet the standard of living which we consider necessary in this day and age.

Many of them are living on fixed incomes—incomes which are totally inadequate to meet the needs of the day. Property taxes are increasing disproportionately to the income of these people; therefore this has created a real problem for them.

Certainly, I think we all agree that the increased costs of medical care and the increased cost of drugs, particularly, have placed a very great burden upon the economic resources of these people.

It is also a factor, Mr. Speaker, that people are living longer. The result is that we have a very serious problem in the fact that employment is not available for these people over that longer span of life. The pension plans that were provided in the days immediate to the present period are not sufficient to meet the requirements of these senior citizens.

Now those are some of the factors that have affected the economic and social life of our senior citizens of today. I firmly believe that the aim of this bill is good but I cannot agree with the method. There is some question as to the means of carrying it out. Throughout our tours of the province, Mr. Speaker, this matter was brought to our attention on many, many occasions, and as the hon. member for Hamilton East has pointed out, the bill points up the great need facing this group of senior citizens. I think in the days ahead that increased allowances may play a major part in relieving the problems of the aged.

May I say that this government has done a great deal already to assist our senior citizens, and I wish to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. members of his government, Mr. Speaker, on the action that has been taken. We have seen a bill introduced to prevent age discrimination for

the elderly in employment. We have seen an office of aging established. We are aware of the rest home programme for senior citizens, and the new nursing home regulations. All of these, Mr. Speaker, will play an important part in relieving this very serious problem.

Our most important problem, I think, the most important issue here is how best to enable our older people to make a contribution to society with dignity and without undue hardship. Now without in any way playing down the real hardships that the increasing taxes particularly make upon our older citizens, I do wish to remind the House at this time that the hon. member for Prince Edward-Lennox (Mr. Whitney) during our tours, and on many occasions when this problem arose, gave some very wise counselling.

He said on those occasions that contributing to the educational services through taxation is a privilege whether we have children in school or not. The point is, we all benefit from the services of well-educated persons. The senior citizens as well as other segments of society.

Our doctors, our lawyers, our engineers, our clergymen and so on, all of these contribute greatly to our complete society. Perhaps the more important issue therefore, as I said before, is to enable our senior citizens to live in dignity and without undue hardships.

I should like at this time to review just briefly some of the existing programmes. Indeed, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) I believe gave a good statement on some of these schemes in the House on February 10 last year.

In Canada, the three western provinces have adopted a system whereby they provide general grants to homeowners to relieve the tax burden. This has been one method. That is, in British Columbia, in Manitoba; I believe a similar system in Saskatchewan is being adopted.

Mr. Bryden: I hope you do not approve of that system.

Mr. Carruthers: No, frankly I do not.

Mr. Bryden: It is a method of bribing the people with their own money.

Mr. Carruthers: Now, the hon. member for Woodbine says that we should just pass this bill. I do not think we should pass anything in this House without giving it very sound and very serious consideration.

As of January 1966, in a letter from Mr. Sidney Spector, with whom our select committee met in Washington in 1965, the new United States Department of Housing and Urban Development has outlined the several states' positions. In Mr. Spector's newsletter, he states:

The public Act 386 approved on June 25, 1965 provides that persons 65 years of age and over may elect to pay his taxes in the year an election is made and in subsequent years the amount of taxes levied on such property for the year preceding such election. But persons who so elect must agree that the amount of reduced taxes becomes a lien on the land to be foreclosed on the death of the owner.

That is in Connecticut. Now they have plans in Delaware, Hawaii, Indiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, which the hon. member for Hamilton East mentioned, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and so on. Now all of these programmes have a tendency to support the hon. member's proposal, but it is equally obvious that these various proposals, or the various methods used in the States are a patchwork in their composition and are not necessarily effective.

I might refer just briefly, and I will only take another minute, Mr. Speaker, to the excellent brief which the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and his staff presented to our select committee at the end of 1965. I am hopeful that this province, under the broad terms of the Canada assistance plan, if they are able to get it into legislation, will ensure that older persons receive income sufficient to enable all to meet their tax bills, as well as other expenses.

We know from the hon. Minister of Public Welfare's statement that this is his intention, with a budgetary means test providing reasonable levels of income for the aged and with the possibility of changes. Changes which the Progressive-Conservative Party, may I say, and the New Democratic Party have advocated, as has been mentioned here before this afternoon many times, that is increasing the old age security pension payments and the forthcoming benefits under the Canada pension plan.

I am convinced personally that these tax burdens where they exist can be more equitably relieved in other ways. Equitably in the sense that with adequate income, older persons may pay their own way without having to declare their age, tax worries and so on. Equitably in the sense that our system of taxation may be kept uniform and free from too great multiplicity of exemptions.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak in support of this bill, I would like to inform the hon. members that on February 10 I made quite extensive comments on this and it was most reassuring for me to be there at the time the mayor of Hamilton was present at one of the committee meetings and attempted to show to the committee the merits of the Hamilton bill.

At that time, the committee did not see eye to eye, but I, as one member, supported him because I thought he was a forward-looking man, a man—

An hon. member: A means test—

Mr. Newman: Maybe at the time it happened to be a means test, but at least he had something that he attempted to put across, assistance to senior citizens by way of tax relief. And this assistance has so caught fire in other areas, that many of the municipalities have passed resolutions requesting the provincial government to amend The Assessment Act to enable them to give municipal tax relief.

I can recall back 15 years or so ago, one of the gentlemen in my community who happened to be elderly at the time, attempted to sell the idea of assisting the senior citizens in some fashion, especially with education tax. The education tax was a real burden to the individual. This was quite a few years ago, so you can imagine the type of burden it must be today. Now that person took many years before he was able to convince members of the Windsor city council as to the merits of his recommendation.

Finally, in March of last year, the city passed a resolution and the most unusual thing concerning the resolution is that it was introduced into the council by the fine lady who ran against me in the last election. And she had her ear to everything that was going on in Queen's Park, so I would assume that she was speaking for the government at the time.

Now, not only did my own community pass that resolution, but neighbouring areas saw the merits of it and passed the resolution.

The senior citizens meeting in Guelph on August 31 and September 1 were so concerned over this problem that they passed the following resolution:

That a request go to the municipal board and the provincial government to amend the school tax structure, to elimi-

nate the education costs levied against homeowners by removing the education tax from the municipal level.

This is referring to pensioners. So they certainly saw the merit of the resolution and attempted to convince others that this government should act on it.

The various provinces throughout Canada have at some time or other passed legislation that gave tax relief to, not necessarily senior citizens, but to homeowners. Saskatchewan has done it this year. British Columbia did this back in 1957. We call ourselves the province of opportunity. Nine years ago British Columbia did this. Manitoba does this today. And this is not just to senior citizens, this is to homeowners. Now, this bill is not to senior citizens, it is to old age security or old age assistance—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Hitler used to do it—

Mr. Newman: If the hon. member wants to idolize Hitler, he can go ahead and do so.

The state of Michigan was so interested in it, Mr. Speaker, that both the Republicans and Democrats in the state fought with one another to introduce legislation concerning this type of assistance.

Allow me to read just portions of the bill. This is the state of Michigan, 73rd Legislature, regular session of 1965. It is called the enrolled House Bill No. 2001:

The people of the state of Michigan enact: Section 7 (c) The homesteads of persons of the age of 65 years or over, who have been residents of this state for at least seven consecutive years immediately preceding and whose gross income as hereinafter defined combined with the income if any for the immediately preceding calendar year of a spouse and co-occupant and concurrent owners of the homestead shall not be more than \$5,000 and whose real property taxable under The General Property Tax Act does not exceed \$10,000 of state equalized value, shall be exempt from taxation to the amount of \$2,500 of state equalized valuation.

For the purposes of this Act the word "resident" means a person who resides in the state of Michigan for at least six months in each twelve-month period.

For the purposes of this Act the "persons" means concurrent owners where one of such owners is 65 years of age or over. Persons eligible to claim the exemption must file with the local assessing officer a claim for exemption which shall be in

affidavit form as provided by the state Department of Administration. The claim for exemption shall be filed during the period beginning with the tax day of each year and ending at the time of final adjournment of the local board of review.

As used in this section, "homestead" means any dwelling or unit in a multiple unit dwelling owned and occupied as a home by the owner thereof including all contiguous unoccupied real property owned by the person. For further purpose of this section, the word "owner" includes any person eligible for the taxation exemption specified herein who is purchasing a homestead as defined herein under mortgage or land contract.

The total amount of taxes lost by any taxing unit as a result of the homestead taxation exemption allowed by this Act is shown on a statement. No homestead shall be allowed more than one exemption under the provisions of this Act. In all circumstances the exemption allowing the greater relief may be claimed or granted.

Now, Mr. Speaker, The Relief Act is of such advantage to the senior citizens in the state of Michigan that some of them only have to pay very nominal taxes in the course of the year. This bill exempts that portion exceeding \$150 or the portion of the real property taxes imposed for school purposes, whichever is the lesser, so with this bill anything up to \$150 would be permitted. I think if states

adjoining our province can look with such favourable light upon tax relief to senior citizens, I certainly think that this province of Ontario should do similar. They should copy some of the good suggestions made by jurisdictions adjacent to us.

We should not think we are the only ones that can come up with good ideas when it comes to assistance. Other places have done this and, because they have come up with these ideas which are worthy of consideration, I think we should give them our full consideration. So many of the jurisdictions to the south have done this. I can mention New Jersey, giving those past 65 a deduction of \$80 from property tax. Georgia, a state that is nowhere as affluent as is this province of opportunity. Yet no action from the government here for a similar type of legislation. Rhode Island does it; I understand Maine does it; in fact I understand, Mr. Speaker, that approximately 30 states in the Union give relief to senior citizens from education tax or some other type of tax.

The political science club of the University of Windsor was so interested in this problem that it went into quite a detailed study of it and submitted a letter containing a recommendation to this government. The *London Free Press* was so impressed by it that it even editorialized in its favour and asked that this government consider this recommendation.

The House took recess at 6.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 3, 1966

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1131
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	1160

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Mr. Chairman: State your point of order, please.

Mr. Singer: I am advised that this afternoon—unfortunately I was not here—a ruling was made by you, sir, to rule out of order any discussion of salaries by reason of the fact that an arbitration is being conducted by His Honour Judge Anderson. Although there was a vote on that, sir, I do, with your indulgence, want to comment just very briefly—

Mr. Chairman: Just a minute, sir. I would rule at this time that any decision made by this House this afternoon cannot be reopened.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I say that this is a matter really of the utmost importance because this budget involves some one-quarter of the total expenditures of the government. If we are balked at discussing the whole question of salaries then I think we are being cut off from a very important facet of discussion.

Mr. Chairman: I would rule that this is out of order at this particular time. As far as a discussion of salaries is concerned it will not be curbed. Salaries and wages will come under the civil service estimates and they can be discussed in their fullest at that time if members want to do so.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I think that since they form such an integral part of the expenditure of \$265,379,000, this point could and should be further explored here at this time. I wanted to draw to your particular attention—

Mr. Chairman: I must suggest to the member for Downsview that any discussion in

connection with the ruling that was made earlier today is out of order at this time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, even though the ruling was made and even though I hear your ruling and respect it, sir, I am respectfully asking that you do reconsider at least to the extent of allowing me to expand a bit on the point of order. If your ruling has the effect that we in the Opposition are unable to discuss this very important one-quarter of the budget on salary, then I suggest to you, sir, that we are going to be very substantially muzzled insofar as a proper discussion of these estimates is concerned.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I have assured the member that there will be no attempt at muzzling. As far as discussion is concerned on the wages and salaries that are a quarter of this budget, there will be ample opportunity to discuss them.

Mr. Singer: No, but Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, I am ruling all discussion in this connection out of order at this time.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, with the greatest respect, sir—and I hesitate to argue with you out of my respect not only for you personally but for your authority—I think that we do deserve a fuller discussion than perhaps took place this afternoon.

Mr. Chairman: I would tell the member that we did discuss it thoroughly this afternoon. There was an appeal to the ruling of the Chairman, the ruling was sustained, and I would ask now that we carry on with the estimates of The Department of Highways.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate that we are going to be muzzled in this discussion. It is nothing more than closure.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may have your concurrence and the concurrence of the House if necessary to comment on the observations—

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me, sir. I would have to make sure that we have the concurrence of the House. A pattern has been established that we have the Minister speak, a lead-off speaker from the Liberals, a lead-off speaker from the NDP and then any remarks by the members. If it is agreeable to the lead-off speaker for the NDP and the House, it is certainly agreeable to your Chairman.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I have no objections, if the hon. Minister were to answer some of the comments of the hon. member.

Mr. Chairman: Is that the wish of the House?

An hon. member: No, that is the last thing he wants to talk about.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I can assure you I made no notes on that topic because we pursued it in the debate earlier this afternoon. But I would like to state to you and to the House that frankly, since the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman)—in what approximated an hour and a half of observation and comment on the subject of the estimates of The Department of Highways—appeared to me to propose expenditures which upon calculation, I think, we might find would lead to the bankruptcy of the province, certainly I find myself at somewhat of a loss to know just how to comment.

I will try to proceed in order, sir, on some of the matters that he proposed. I think, as I recall it, he made some reference firstly to the cost of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, which for all practical purposes, with the exception of one section in eastern Ontario and some facilities to provide for separations of grades and crossovers, is close to completion.

He made repeated references to the cost being something on the order of 20 times what the original estimates were when the project was originally conceived. He used, at one time, a figure of \$3 billion and then on a number of occasions this afternoon made reference to a figure, I think, of \$2.7 billion. It will be a matter of interest to the hon. member and to the House to learn—and these figures involved the cost of property and the construction costs from the date of its inception—that the actual cost to March 31, 1965, almost a year ago, was \$319,324,157.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. Minister, I

have the previous Minister of Highways' figures on this, made in 1960, showing a total cost of \$2.7 billion. These are his figures, not my figures, from The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, my figures are the ones I am placing on the record now. These are my figures.

Mr. Newman: Did you not agree with the previous Minister then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not a matter of agreement with the previous Minister. I can only conclude that the hon. member is very, very confused here, because these are the facts, as recorded by The Department of Highways, since the inception of the construction of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, formerly known as Highway 401.

As I said, up to the end of March last year, \$319,324,157. The estimated additional cost accruing to this year, which will end on March 31, is \$34.6 million, and we estimate that in the 1966-67 year, a further expenditure of \$39,734,000 will accrue. At that time, for all practical purposes, the highway will be finished and the total estimated cost then will be \$393,657,157.

If the hon. member had asked me for these figures, I would have given them to him and they are available in the records of the department. As a matter of fact, this is about one-eighth of the figure that was banded about rather freely here on an earlier occasion.

Mr. Chairman, I make reference to the recommendations and the proposals advanced by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, the Liberal Party critic for this department. In brief, as I recall it, he wants more roads. He wants more roads of every type in every area of the province and he wants them now, so that what he is in effect proposing, I think I would like to say, involves taxation increases of such tremendous proportions that I can only conclude that this must be the policy that the Liberal Party would pursue. I am quite frankly glad to have the observations on record—they will become very useful.

I might pursue, if I could, the references to the northern part of the province, and I think this is a matter of interest. This information was published in the Sault Ste. Marie *Daily Star* on Friday, January 7, 1966. It is a full page, showing 20 years of progress, dating from 1945—back almost to that day when the quiet revolution started in this province, which has been referred to in the House, you know. Not only the revolution, but the evo-

lution which has produced for the province of Ontario the—

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): What revolution?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said the quiet revolution.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) said that he would lead an "evolution," not a "revolution."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but he said "if there was a revolution"—

Mr. Thompson: Oh, no. He never said that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes, he did, but he did not have to. The quiet revolution started in this province in 1943 and it quickly became the process of evolution. I simply want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, and the House—

Mr. Thompson: Does the hon. Minister believe in Darwin's theory?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Darwin's theory? Oh, I believe in Darwin's theory very much, but do not ask me to pursue that one any more.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now back to the estimates, Mr. Chairman.

This very great and respected daily journal, published in one of our major and rapidly growing communities in the northwestern part of the province, headlined this as showing 20 years of progress, dating from 1945. I think it is very interesting and well-documented. It simply points out that in 1945 King's highways in the entire area of the northern part of the province involved a mileage of 1,896 miles, and secondary roads, 1,540 miles, for a total of 3,436 miles. But my word, Mr. Chairman, when you look at the map and the figures for 1965, they are really astounding.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): You should accomplish something in 20 years.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You are going to agree that we have accomplished a very great deal.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: So King's highways in 1965 had grown from 1,896 miles to 3,345.7 miles, and secondary highways from 1,540 miles to 2,325 miles. In addition, as of the date of publication of this paper, high-

ways committed and under construction were 438.9 miles, for a total of 6,109.6 miles versus the figure I referred to previously, 3,436 miles. In other words, the mileage of roads has almost doubled.

These are indisputable facts; they are all available; they are all on record. I am probably prejudiced enough to say that the people of the north are very much aware of it. Very much aware of it indeed.

Now then, I might deal with the matter of service centre locations. The hon. member made reference to locating these service centres and suggested that they should always be located before a community.

Mr. Newman: Beyond a community.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Beyond a community, was this it? I say to the hon. member that the policy has been to locate these as closely as possible every 50 miles. In some instances it is 48, sometimes it is 51, but basically every 50 miles of the entire route of the facility, the highway. For the life of me I must say to you, Mr. Chairman, I find it very difficult to know how you can have a location either before a community or after. They are always either before a community or after, they cannot be anything else.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it is elementary, is it not, really?

Mr. Gisborn: I would just draw to Mr. Chairman's attention, do not forget as we go along that I conceded the floor to the hon. Minister and not the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I will try not to forget that.

Mr. Newman: May I reply to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am replying to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville right now. I think that is fair.

Mr. Newman: I will give the hon. Minister an answer.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, I wish the hon. member would enlighten me.

Mr. Newman: Does the hon. Minister mean to tell me he has a town point at point A and he cannot put the service centre just beyond the town at point A instead of on this side of the town, so that the individual driving—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: These are four-lane roads, these are all four-lane roads, these are limited-access highways, these are not two-lane highways.

Mr. Chairman: Do you want the Minister to answer?

Mr. Newman: This is all on limited-access freeways.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister of Highways, please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, suppose we did that. You see, there are matters of interchanges, there are matters of flyovers, you are familiar with what I mean, we have to find sources of water, we have to find sources of all those things that make it possible to operate these particular service centres in the interest of the travelling public, and that is why they are there.

They are to serve the demands of the travelling public and these demands are very heavy in this automated day and age. But I still suggest to you that if we build one after community A, it is obviously before community B, and I do not know how we can change that.

Mr. Newman: Just outside of Barrie, does the hon. Minister mean to tell me he could not have put it within the same distance beyond Barrie as it is before Barrie going up on Highway 400? Very, very easily. The individual driving could go into Barrie for service or not taking advantage of that would have the service centre on the limited-access 400.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, now, I guess the hon. member did not hear the comments of the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) this afternoon, but there was a great enough storm developed because of the location of the Barrie service centre. I can tell the hon. member if we had moved it farther north the storm would have been much greater. They are concerned, really, that we are going to move into an area. The people who were concerned were not at Barrie, they were some 25 to 30 to 35 miles north. In any case, I think that is enough on that.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): I take it the hon. Minister is against the proposal?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I am slightly against the proposal. You can understand it.

Now, on the matter of toll policy, "I will not have too much to say about that." The toll policy of the government is well known, it has been discussed on a number of occasions. We certainly have a policy of toll-free roads in the province—and I spoke about it a year ago. And you made reference to them this afternoon—we touched on the only exceptions to that and I think I made reference to the fact that a select committee on toll roads was operative in the province a number of years ago. They made some recommendations and these recommendations are the basis for the policy that we have today. We have carried it out, we have lived with it.

The report was tabled in the Legislature and I think accepted.

I think perhaps I would say this with respect to the hon. member's reference to studies in the state of New Jersey about sign policy. He laid great stress on studies in New Jersey that developed a certain sign policy. I suggest to you that the policy we have in effect here is basically a study of what we think fits Ontario. We have examined sign policies in other jurisdictions of the continent and I am prepared to say to the hon. member that we may appear to be restrictive in certain areas, certain situations, but by and large the people of the province of Ontario support the fact that we do not clutter our roads with signs of all descriptions.

I think I can safely say, Mr. Chairman, that if we needed any endorsement of something that the public accepts generally, it was of interest to me to learn not too long ago that President Johnson has appropriated millions and millions of dollars and ordered that the highways of the United States be restored to something like the character of the roads in this province of Ontario.

In connection with rest areas, I can say to the hon. member that we have been studying the matter of rest areas, certainly on controlled-access freeways, and I hope that the information that is made available to me shortly involves the location of rest areas based halfway between our service centres on Highway 401 or the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. Sites are being looked at now. I would hope that by the commencement of another capital construction season that we can start the building of some of these.

These are certainly sensible proposals. I do not think it is possible to do what the hon. member proposes all over the province because, frankly, again that just adds to the expenditures that the hon. member proposed

and interspersed remarks about all through his address.

So again I have to suggest to him that within the ability of the people of the province to pay for these things, we will move along with everything that appears to be sensible and sound and good for the travelling public.

There was some reference made to a proposal by certain municipalities, resolutions from certain urban municipalities with relationship to increased subsidies. The proposal, as I recall it—and I asked about this—was 100 per cent, I believe, for connecting links, 70 per cent for arterial roads, 50 per cent on all other roads and streets.

Now let me suggest to the hon. member that it is only a matter of some three years or less that amendments to The Highway Improvement Act were introduced into this House and subsequently passed, which raised the rate of subsidy on connecting links in small urban municipalities with a population of 2,500 or less from 75 to 100 per cent. Municipalities with a population greater than 2,500 were raised from 75 to 90 per cent. Urban municipalities with connecting link subsidies of 50 per cent were raised to 75 per cent.

I think really we have anticipated the hon. member to a considerable extent as recently as three years ago.

It is not too great a departure really from what he proposed. We recognize the great problem of urban municipalities in terms of financing sensible revisions of their street patterns and their transportation problems.

Regarding the matter of the city of Sault Ste. Marie, this has been proposed to the department quite some time ago. There was a circular, I believe, circulated among all the municipalities with respect to subsidies on subdivision roads. And of course there is a period during which cities undergoing amalgamation over a period of time, have an adjustment factor introduced there to ease the burden on them from the annexation of neighbouring municipalities with a higher rate of subsidy.

They are averaged out as the hon. member, I believe, knows. The subsidy rate of the adjoining municipalities, that are taken in in terms of annexation, are averaged with the existing subsidies on their streets prior to annexation. There is a period of adjustment prescribed for this adjusted subsidy, which enables them to move along. I would say to the hon. member we are not completely satisfied with this, but that exists today and we are pursuing this matter.

In general, with respect to subsidies, I would like to remind the hon. member that at the time the Metro report, shall we say, was presented by the hon. Prime Minister, he announced—with respect to the disparity in the rates of subsidy presently existing in Metro, wherein the city of Toronto, for example, has a subsidy rate of 33½ per cent and North York 50 per cent—he did announce that this matter was being studied and that there would be an attempt made to establish a basis of uniform subsidies prior to implementation date, which is to be January 1, 1967. I can suggest to the hon. member that this was done, because not only the situation in Metro was involved, but the situation in every urban municipality from one end of the province to the other is equally involved. So I can assure you that the study proposed by the hon. Prime Minister is under way.

It is being undertaken by the municipal roads branch of The Department of Highways and we hope to come up with a basis of uniform subsidy, an equitable rate of subsidy that not only applies in Metro, but will apply in every urban municipality of the province. This was announced, as I say, by the hon. Prime Minister, at the time the Metro report was given.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have already told you that he suggested it would be ready for implementation of the date of the Metropolitan Toronto report, which is January 1, 1967.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): How do we know it will in fact be ready? You fellows make announcements all the time that never mature.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I say, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. member, that there have not been too many commitments made around here, in my experience, that have not been kept.

Let me say one more word on this matter of subsidies. The hon. member proposed that certain things should be done at the level of cities and separated towns and I agree with him. But I would point out to him that, while cities and separated towns enjoy a somewhat lower rate of subsidy than rural municipalities, they separate from the county for purposes which they believe to be their advantage—and, as such, they pay no rates to the county. So that, if I may put it this way, they certainly feel that they gain more on the oranges than they lose on the bananas. May I put it that way to you?

Mr. Nixon: Lemons.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, you are familiar with lemons. I do not know what you are talking about. There have been enough lemons produced here this afternoon, as far as I am concerned.

Now, I am almost through, because the hon. member for Wentworth East was kind enough to concede the floor and I am very grateful to him.

Reference has been made here to the matter of U.S. border municipalities. Probably Windsor is as good an example of a border municipality that I can think of for the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: The best.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The best, well all right, I will not quarrel with that at all.

Now the matter of urban expressways I think was referred to as one of those things we should do in border municipalities where there is this heavy surge of traffic across the international boundary.

I think this was made reference to, and I think the hon. member is very much aware that we are in the process now of working with the city of Windsor. Mayor Wheelton and members of his council and advisory staff were down to see me very recently, at which time we agreed to provide the urban expressway rates of subsidy to what I think is known as E. C. Rowe avenue.

I can suggest to you that they went away quite pleased. This subsidy, as I have mentioned before, constitutes instead of the normal rate of street subsidy, 75 per cent across the board.

Mr. Newman: That is the same as every other municipality, no difference at all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What do you mean?

Mr. Newman: Why, when we turned around and asked about municipal subsidies, 50 per cent the same as Metro gets for cities, you immediately turn around and say in link roads we get 75 per cent. Well, you give 75 per cent to everybody, but to Metro you give 50 per cent—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, now, let me tell the hon. member something in this respect for his edification. Metropolitan Toronto has no connecting links. Metropolitan Toronto has no urban expressways. Metropolitan Toronto gets a straight 50 per

cent across the board for Metro roads. The hon. member for Downsview knows this very well. There are no 75 per cent subsidies for connecting links, urban expressways, or anything else in Metropolitan Toronto. I am sure the hon. member wants to be put straight on that.

Mr. Bryden: You think that is right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not think it is particularly good, I think we have got to get some uniformity in this across the province, as I mentioned earlier.

Mr. Bryden: Well, you have been the Minister for some time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, there has not been a change in the Metro form of government for quite a while.

Mr. Bryden: You people have been the government during the entire period.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister about the Queensway in Ottawa?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well now, Mr. Chairman, I think when I sit down, I think in all honesty, the floor was conceded to me.

I think really, Mr. Chairman, I have commented on everything that I wanted to for now, with one exception, and I think during the course of the estimates presentation, the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden) will want to make some comments on it. The floor is, of course, for the hon. member for Wentworth East when I sit down. But I make reference now to the bridge between Fort Frances and International Falls, and let me bring the hon. member up to date.

There have been proposals of course, from the state of Minnesota for a crossing of the river and there have been proposals from the government of Ontario. Officials of The Department of Highways of Ontario have met on a number of occasions with officials of the state highways department in Minnesota. Both departments have presented proposals for a crossing at Fort Frances and it was finally agreed that they would be referred to a local committee.

There have been a variety of proposals and a variety of locations proposed where this river crossing should take place. One of the crossings, in particular, would involve tremendous property damage to the town of Fort Frances. There are a great variety of

things to be decided and this has been turned over to a local committee to examine the recommendations from the state of Minnesota, together with the recommendations from the province of Ontario and, in due course, try to advise us and to advise the Minnesota people what would constitute a proper location for the river crossing facilities.

We think this is a sensible way to pursue it; we do not think it is up to us to impose our ideas on Fort Frances and we do not think it sensible for Minnesota to impose their ideas on Fort Frances.

We think it is better to put our ideas before them and let them have something to say about what goes on in their own respective communities. That is precisely what we have done and that is where the matter stands now.

I hope that the hon. member thinks that that is a sensible way to pursue things. We do, and frankly, so does the town of Fort Frances.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, when I conceded the floor to the hon. Minister of Highways to answer the criticism of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, I did it willingly. But in the half hour, if what the hon. Minister has said is indicative of the criticism of the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, neither amounted to very much.

I also would add that neither one would have the right to say the same about myself when I finish my effort.

Mr. A. Carruthers (Durham): Let us not carry it too far!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Gisborn: Seeing the happy faces on the front benches of the Liberal Party, I have to prepare myself for almost anything.

Mr. Chairman, earlier in this session when I was assigned the responsibility by the New Democratic Party to act as critic of The Department of Highways, I at once began to wonder what might be said or done to improve the building of the kind of highways that we need in this province to take care of the ever-increasing use by automobiles and the trucking of materials. I have gathered together some collective thoughts and, of course, want to present them to the House.

I realize that, because of the complex ramifications of the operations of the gov-

ernment of Ontario, a large and diversified province and an ever-growing province, that I have not had the time nor applied myself to this particular department, as perhaps one should. I assure the House that from now on, I shall be more diligent in this particular field and maybe next session I shall be able to make a better effort and lay heavier impact upon the government.

Prior to my coming into the House in 1955—and I learned this when I came in—The Department of Highways was considered the "pork barrel" department of Ontario. This was where the slush funds came from that paid for some of the campaign expenses of the Conservative Party. Now I think that those allegations were well-founded by evidence prior to my coming into the House; I have no evidence that that is the case today and I assume that it is not.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that my criticisms can be constructive and that my ideas will be given consideration by the government and by the House, so that we can co-operatively develop the kind of highways system in Ontario that will be conducive to the people of the province and not in just getting from one place to another.

Mr. Chairman, there has been relatively little controversy connected with The Department of Highways. It is such a neat department, so factual—it builds highways all over this province, it cuts up the land into odd-shaped parcels bordered by those magnificent concrete-and-asphalt monuments to the automobile.

Yet, despite its blandness, the department spends the second-highest amount of money, exceeded only by The Department of Education. This year's estimates call for a budget of \$107,886,000 of ordinary expenditures, and of \$265,379,000 for capital expenditures—together a total of \$373,241,000.

Now, it seems to me that in order to spend such a vast amount of money from the public Treasury the hon. Minister of Highways would need a pretty solid philosophy of spending. Undoubtedly he is putting a lot of thought into where those millions of dollars go. Which new highways are to be built, which old highways are to be expanded, and so on.

But, Mr. Chairman, does the Minister have the right idea how to spend this money? Here, I submit to him we are already in trouble. His department's spending is largely piecemeal, without a sophisticated highways plan that takes into account the concept of a network of highways geared to human beings and their well-being rather than to

the cold figures of how fast a car can travel from A to B.

This, I submit, is the greatest failing of this department. It does not relate the automobile and the highways to our cities, towns and villages, it does not relate the automobile and the highways to the people who live in these urban and rural areas.

This failure to comprehend the functions of a highway started many years ago, and now the department must pay for its mistakes in the past. The department had to cut a wide swath through the heart of Metropolitan Toronto, slicing it in two parts, when it built the No. 401 highway, or as it is known now, the Macdonald-Cartier freeway.

This is a really shameful way of infringing upon the lives and the comfort of the people whose homes lay in the path of the 401. They were expropriated and had to move. Homes near the new 16-lane highway were inconvenienced, living near the 401 has become a nuisance, and the only person who benefits from this highway is the speedy traveller who was able to cut down his travelling time.

Let me make this point as clear as I can: traffic and roads are not ends in themselves, they are services to people only. When we have reached the stage where these traffic needs, and the roads built to alleviate these needs, disrupt the lives of hundreds of citizens, we have reneged on that simple principle.

Why do we feel we must cater to these fleet-wheeled steel beetles to the extent that highways become more important than a homogenous urban development that is now dominated, rather than serviced, by bands upon bands of concrete and asphalt?

But the hon. Minister of Highways' philosophy, from what I can judge, goes along with the 1958 engineering study entitled "Ontario's roads and streets," undertaken by the municipalities of Ontario and the hon. Minister's department.

This was the time when the hon. member for Grenville-Dundas (Mr. Cass) was Minister of Highways. I quote from the report:

Highways are needed to serve and encourage our economy. Materials, manpower and markets must be available readily and efficiently for a prosperous and progressive way of life.

There is not a word in this report about the infringement on the people of Ontario by the highways. All we read about is, for example: "Are Ontario highways, roads and streets adequate for today's traffic? What are the needs of today?" and so on. The trouble

with such reports is that they are prepared only by highways and traffic experts.

I will make my point even more clear. The report says: "Everyone is conscious of the growing number of motor vehicles and of the increasing dependence on them." The statement ends there. But in Britain, several years ago, the Buchanan report had a chapter that dealt with "The war between the car and the city." Colin Buchanan is, besides being a traffic engineer, also a philosopher, when he states: "The car is a menace that can spoil our civilization." How true. But do we find similar thoughts in The Department of Highways, from the hon. Minister on down? Not a word.

Well, the Buchanan report is so important that I want to read its key sentences into the record from time to time, and then compare its conclusions with what has happened in this province. Buchanan states:

In all consideration of urban form, the question of facility of movement of both persons and goods is of crucial importance. No single system of transport can provide for all the movements involved; co-ordination between systems is required. The United States demonstrates what happens when the motor vehicle is given free licence to lead development where it will.

When Buchanan writes about the U.S., we can safely assume that the situation on our roads is very similar to that in the United States.

The basic fault of all this highway planning lies in the fact that we build roads in anticipation of increased traffic volume because more and more people will drive more and more cars. Highway construction, if we follow this thought to its logical conclusion, is often a retroactive programme to meet existing needs, and sometimes is an anticipatory programme to meet future traffic needs. So far, so good.

But any government, and in particular the hon. Minister of Highways in this province, must come to grips not only with the technical problem of building more and better and longer and faster highways, but it must, before anything else, start thinking whether or not the highways we build should be there in the first place.

Buchanan has analyzed the four basic ways in which motor vehicles are used:

Transport of raw material, merchandise and food; conveyance of passengers in bulk; conveyance of persons individually or in small numbers; mobile services such as fire departments, etc.

There is no question that this Department of Highways is catering first of all to the "conveyance of persons individually or in small numbers"—that is the private cars with driver alone, or one passenger; the tourists with trailers; the salesmen; the hundreds of thousands of people who will readily jump into their car to get from A to B without even considering mass transportation.

Why? Because there is no adequate system of mass transportation we have no choice but to drive our own car over hundreds of miles, arriving tired, endangering our lives and the lives of others on the road.

Why are we in this situation where traffic needs can only be guessed at roughly? Again, Buchanan has the answer: "Essential traffic is calculable, optional traffic depends on many uncertain factors."

What is essential traffic? Certainly our system of transportation of material goods must have priority. Police, fire departments, doctors and similar persons must be able to get from A to B in a hurry. But this sort of traffic is predictable.

Optional traffic is all the rest. And we build highways to cater to optional traffic: to the tourist because he chooses to come by car, because he brings dollars to Ontario; to the vacation travellers within Canada who use these highways; to the many people living in this province who would rather drive than use commercial transportation. This optional traffic is indeed an uncertain factor. Weather plays a great role.

But we never know how many people in cars will want to use certain stretches of highways at a certain time. Therefore we have built for them highways that can accommodate the greatest number of cars at any given time. During periods when traffic is minimal—during the night, during bad weather, and in the winter, and so on—these highways are little used. They are there, but they don't accomplish their purpose for much of the time. This, I contend, is uneconomical thinking, because highways must be constantly patrolled, serviced and repaired.

Despite all the planning and highway building in the past, many of our highways are still jammed bumper-to-bumper during peak traffic periods, and tempers flare easily on a 100-degree humid summer day when drivers and passengers breathe exhaust fumes instead of Ontario's clean, fresh country air. But I suggest that there are alternatives to our outmoded highway system.

To quote Mr. Buchanan: "The problem is to rationalize the arrangement of buildings

and accessways. The basic principle is circulation." What Mr. Buchanan means is this:

There must be areas of good environment—urban rooms—where people can live, work, shop, look about and move around, in reasonable freedom of motor traffic. What is needed is a complementary network of roads—so-called urban corridors—for effecting the primary distribution of traffic to the environmental areas. The design would ensure that traffic is related in character and volume to the environmental conditions being sought.

The result is a town with a cellular structure consisting of environmental areas set within an interlacing network of distributory highways. This concept requires to be explored and developed into a set of working rules for practical application. The function of the network—of highways—would be to serve the environmental areas and not vice-versa.

All this sounds pretty highfalutin, so let me put it in focus. If the central areas of towns and cities are not capable of accommodating heavy traffic, it is obviously unwise to feed into the centres wide roads and highways which would stimulate traffic from the suburban areas. And yet this is exactly what is happening all over the province.

In other words, if a four-lane highway feeds traffic into a two-lane street in a city or town with inadequate parking facilities, you obviously get a hopeless traffic jam in and out of the city.

In the report of the steering group on Colin Buchanan's working group report—known for short as the Buchanan report—the authors state:

There is an enormous waste of manpower. No longer in our cities can life be divided between work, sleep and leisure; there is a fourth division of time spent sitting in vehicles that, if they are moving at all, are moving far too slowly. There is a waste of capital. Too many vehicles have to be provided to do the necessary work of transport, and the time required to produce almost anything is unduly prolonged. There is a waste of fuel—almost all of it imported.

All of this, while compiled in and pertaining to Britain, is equally true of our traffic scene in Canada and Ontario. I do not think there is one expert in traffic or highway designs who would dare to disagree with such fundamental truths. The problems is that despite such investigations the remedies applied are old-fashioned and outmoded.

In the same report of the steering committee the authors state:

Some of the roads are magnificent engineering achievements driven through the hearts of the cities with great ingenuity—but also, all too often, with a brutal disregard for the appearance and the amenity of the cities they serve.

This criticism, please note, is not made about British cities, it pertains to American and Canadian cities which were studied by British traffic experts in the course of their investigation. The last quote describes adamantly the shortfalls of Highway 401, now known as Macdonald-Cartier freeway. And yet this freeway was hailed as a great accomplishment when it was designed and built.

Let me reiterate that solutions that appear, on the surface, to be inescapable, do not always constitute the right approach. When our cities were built, the needs for increased motor traffic could not have been anticipated. So we must correct the mistakes of omission made in the past. But what matters is the attitude, the overall philosophy, of how to relate highways to cities, and traffic to man.

A man called S. Chermayeff in his book, "The New Nomads," has realized this need, and he has put it into three admirable sentences:

We don't get together any longer necessarily because we are neighbours; we get together because we have something in common or a task to perform. I am convinced that we are going to regroup, largely because of the compulsions of the rise in population, the rise in technology, and the infinite complexity of our systems. And I don't wish to accommodate any transportation system at the expense of other values.

This writer is warning us not to fall prey to worshipping the automobile as an end in itself. However, the automobile is here to stay, and rightly so. So we must tackle the problem of how to steer it away from our immediate environment where the automobile causes confusion, danger, inconvenience, foul air and, specifically, ugliness in our landscape.

This concept, if it is realized, requires planners of outstanding calibre. How good these highway and city planners must be is described in a paragraph of a magnificent book entitled "Planning for Man and Motor," written and compiled by Paul Ritter, who is director of the international traffic separa-

tion planning research office in Nottingham, England.

It takes the whole man, the feeling philosopher, not only the objective scientist in each one of us, to take properly into consideration functional and ethical implications, imagination, aspirations. The planner must be a man who can imagine, visualize and subscribe to the vision of another, and then work for its realization.

Is the hon. Minister of Highways such a man, such a planner? Is he both philosopher and objective scientist? The hon. Minister is neither, in the context of highway planning. He is a politician who must begin to realize some of the obvious problems entailed in planning highways. He, as a politician, must be expected to be intelligent and sensitive enough to appoint such people, such philosophers and objective scientists. Only if he does that can we expect his department to come up with the kind of answers this province needs. But of course it does not end with The Department of Highways.

The department must, if it is to function along these lines, become a part of an overall effort by the government of this province to grasp the challenge of our decade. What is this challenge? Among other matters, it is mobility—or transportation, or movement on roads, whichever way we describe it.

Here is what Ritter has to say about this challenge:

This is the century of the common man. The luxury of planning is to be for all. The motor vehicle is to serve every family. All this is a challenge of immense proportions. It is not a matter of mere accommodation, not a matter simply of good looks or smooth traffic flow. The task is to provide an environment conducive to better satisfaction of primary needs. The positive attributes of a wonderful mobility given efficient vehicular service, and the planning of communities taking into account the advantages of co-operation, by those who wish to co-operate, give an increase in the choices available to each individual, extending his capacity and his opportunities.

These are great words, they are good words. But do we have, in Ontario, wonderful mobility?

To some of us this mobility may appear wonderful at times. At other times we wish we wouldn't have to drive because our frustrations mount, our health deteriorates, our blood pressure rises, and our well-being is undermined. Let me quote Alec Issigonis,

the brilliant chief engineer of the British Motor Corporation who was quoted in the *New Statesman* of August 6, 1965, in an article entitled "The Steel Beetles," written by William Connor, better known as Cassandra:

I have given up driving for pleasure. The car is going to contribute very largely to wrecking our civilization.

In the words of Paul Ritter, it is time everyone of us co-operate, and that includes The Department of Highways, it includes the hon. Minister in particular, and the government in general.

Let me return to the Macdonald-Cartier freeway as an example. When it was built, it contained two lanes in both directions. Soon the traffic planners found it became congested, particularly during morning and evening rush hours, and during peak periods in the summer holiday travel.

Now, when a road or a highway or a freeway becomes congested, there are 12 obvious remedies. They are: (1) It may be widened; (2) A highway or a freeway can be built; (3) Obstructions such as pedestrians, or traffic lights, or parking can be taken out of the road; (4) Traffic may be diverted; (5) Paths or public transport may be made more attractive; (6) The goals toward which the traffic streams may have their position changed; (7) The working hours which create the congestion could be staggered; (8) Parking costs at the destination could be raised, discouraging travel; (9) The use of the road could be charged for with a similar effect; (10) Smaller vehicles could be used; (11) More people could travel per car; (12) Any combination of the above could be tried.

These 12 points are a veritable profusion of alternatives. But what did The Department of Highways decide to do in the case of the old Highway No. 401? It decided to widen it to up to 12 and more lanes. And now comes the main point of these 12 alternatives, according to Paul Ritter's book:

The obvious first solution, to widen the road, is, ironically, likely to be the least effective.

In other words, The Department of Highways has chosen, very likely, the least effective method to remedy the congestion on the old 401. This proves, beyond any doubt, that the planners in The Department of Highways are not sufficiently adept in adopting new methods, in incorporating new philosophies of travel and highway construction. But it is, and I want to make this point very strongly, not necessarily their fault. It is up to the

hon. Minister to provide his experts with the kind of help and guidance they need.

What kind of traffic must our roads, our highways, our freeways, accommodate? The function of private vehicles, besides all the other types of vehicle traffic, I have outlined earlier, is six-fold:

(1) Travel to work; (2) School and university traffic—children being taken to school and students driving to their alma mater; (3) Shopping; (4) Visiting—which includes visits to lawyers, doctors and social visits; (5) Sports and cultural events; (6) Weekend and holiday travel.

In the report of the steering group on the Buchanan report, the authors draw analogies between Britain on one hand and Canada and the United States on the other.

If the coming great flood of vehicles means freer and easier transport of goods and persons, it cannot help but be beneficial. If, however, it leads to a clogging of the arteries, it may lead to a general thrombosis.

I submit that all over Ontario, our highway system is already suffering from thrombosis. Another aspect of car ownership is even more relevant in the report:

Before very long, a majority of the electors in the country will be car owners. What is more, it is reasonable to suppose that they will be very conscious of their interests as car owners and will give them a high priority, it does not need any 'gift of prophecy' to foresee that the governments of the future will be increasingly preoccupied with the wishes of the car owners.

I presume the hon. Minister of Highways will agree with me that what is described in this paragraph is already true in Ontario. This government has indeed acceded to the wishes of the car owners, often at the expense of other commodities or necessities. It is acceded to the driving electorate to the point where highways have become political tools, have become vote-getting tools. Mr. Chairman, this is done according to the motto: "Keep the driver happy and you keep 90 per cent of the population happy." I would not even attempt to make an issue out of this fact were it not that our highways do not fulfil the functions they have been assigned. We have already heard why.

The report goes on:

These matters are not purely speculative. We can draw on a mass of evidence available from the United States and Canada, which are, broadly speaking, a generation further into the motor age than Britain.

The hon. Minister could argue: "So what's wrong with giving the driving public more and more highways?" Again the report of the steering group on the Buchanan report gives the irrefutable answer:

The American [and so, the Canadian] policy of providing motorways [the English word for our highways] for commuters can succeed, even in American conditions, only if there is a disregard for all considerations other than the free flow of traffic which seems sometimes to be almost ruthless.

And the report criticizes further:

Even with all the advantages that their circumstances provide for the success of a motorway policy, many Americans [and so, Canadians] are coming to doubt whether it provides a final solution. Each new motorway, built to cope with existing traffic, seems to call into existence new traffic sufficient to create a new congestion.

The obvious answer to this congestion of our highways is to build a new system of interurban railways. And I must agree, Mr. Chairman, that the first major step in this direction has been made recently with the planning of the rapid transit system between Dunbarton and Burlington.

But many more rapid transit systems or interurban railway systems must be built soon to ease the traffic congestion. I can imagine that the planners are afraid their spanking new rapid transit systems would not be used by enough commuters. The British report seems to support this fear: "The car commuter cannot be forced back on the public transport—not, that is to say, in a car-owning democracy."

However, several traffic experts have recently estimated that car commuters will indeed resort to public transport if they find that highways are clogged and slow and expensive to travel, while a rapid transit system is cheaper, clean and fast. Just consider these benefits of rapid transit, as presented by L. M. Schneider in his article in *Traffic Quarterly* of January, 1961. It is entitled: "Impact of rapid transit extensions on suburban bus companies."

Mr. J. F. Edwards (Perth): Mr. Chairman, may I make a point here? A lot of the heavy stuff which is not going by rail—steel, logs and some explosives—should be back on the rails where they belong.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, if some hon. member will decipher the question and let

me know what he means later on, I will try to answer it.

Mr. Edwards: Sure, I will tell you. I will tell you right now. The Department of Highways has spent a lot of money building highways to carry a lot of the heavy loads of steel—

Mr. Bryden: You tell the hon. Minister of Highways that.

Mr. Edwards: I want to do it here, if you do not mind. As far as I am concerned, we have railroads in this country which are doing a fair chore; they want to cut lines off, they want to do this, they want to do that—

Mr. Chairman: Let us get back on the rails again.

Mr. Edwards: I am just asking a question. I am not talking on the estimates. Are you in favour of that, are you in favour of trucking steel from the Sault instead of sending it by rail?

Mr. Gisborn: No, I think the transportation of heavy material should be done by rail, moved by locomotive.

Mr. Edwards: I have a few more points, too.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to quote from an article by L. M. Schneider in *Traffic Quarterly* of January 1, 1961. It is entitled: "Impact of rapid transit extensions on suburban bus companies."

He says these are the benefits as against car commuting: (1) reduced automobile congestion; (2) improved property values; (3) reduced travel times; (4) access to new jobs; (5) smog reduction; (6) lower commuter costs; (7) greater residential availability; (8) greater cultural accessibility; (9) new leisure opportunities; (10) expanded sales markets; (11) lower (car) insurance rates; (12) auto accident reduction; (13) expanded labour markets; (14) preservation of scenic beauty; (15) new civil defence facilities; (16) lower freight costs; (17) better city planning; (18) wider access to schools.

Some of these 18 points in favour of rapid transit systems should tickle the capitalist palate of government members.

What are some of the types of possible rapid transit systems? Buses are still the cheapest form of mass commuting; but they have the disadvantage of being as slow as any private car during rush hours. In effect, slower still because of frequent stops.

Then we know of the duo-rail system of streetcars and suburban trains. Streetcars are outmoded and have been scrapped in many countries, except in Ontario. They are even slower than buses.

Suburban commuter trains are different; they would work, except that we have but a very few lines. In order to be fast and effective they need uncongested areas without intersections and other obstacles.

The monorail system has been built experimentally in Seattle, in Tokyo and in Turin, Italy. In Germany, in the city of Wuppertal, a suspended monorail has been working for the past 40 or 50 years, but it has not been copied anywhere else except in experimental form.

Subways are good for sleeping, as the title of a play goes. They are also good for fast and clean commuting. But they only solve the commuting needs of a large metropolitan city such as Toronto and Montreal.

A possible alternative is self-guided bus trains, where the buses arrive at a predetermined place, are coupled together, and make the journey into the heart of the city or the town together. This system is also experimental and is described in detail in Paul Ritter's book on page 99. I will leave that to the hon. members who are interested to look it up and get some education in regard to public transportation.

Reviewing my remarks, I find it unfortunate that The Department of Highways is concerned almost exclusively with the planning and building of new highways. We cannot afford to divorce our Department of Highways from The Department of Transport, because the role the automobile plays today in the life of man is staggering. Everything connected with driving, therefore, be it roads or safety, warrants the scrutiny and the constant attention of both departments, in fact, of The Department of Municipal Affairs as well as The Department of Economics and Development.

Again we see little evidence of a cohesive, co-ordinated approach. This government prefers piecemeal solutions.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, unless this government comes to understand the complicated and intricate area of man and motor, getting from A to B will be more and more unpleasant. There is no longer any excuse for catering to the motorist with more highways without considering the fact that the same motorist is also a human being who likes breathing, likes living in a beautiful landscape, and likes going to work as fast

and as safely as his wife and family would want him to.

Mr. Chairman, if I might mention—and I will not try to impose something that you may think out of order—but tonight we took a vote on a challenge of a ruling by the chair. I think it was both on a technical, and perhaps a precedented reason, or something that has happened just lately, such as a board of arbitration being established to make certain investigations. I am not, at this point, going to argue the pro and con of the vote or the reasoning, but I do think that it is time that, during estimates, the Ministers should at least have some responsibility and some interest in the wages paid to the men who are in their departments and under their jurisdictions. Not that they should establish them, but I think they should have the fortitude to make comments on them. I think it would give some direction to the people who are responsible for arriving at a basis, and it would help out greatly in this problem of salaries in the departments.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, as on the previous occasion, I hardly know where to start with any comment. I suppose it is possible to agree generally with the theory and the philosophy that was expounded here by the hon. member. I did not detect more than a line or two of anything original; I gathered that he was reading someone else's views rather exclusively into the record.

Mr. Bryden: Not quite.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, very generally, they were someone else's views.

Mr. Bryden: They were views worth listening to, except that the hon. Minister has not absorbed them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I would like to say, on that score to the hon. member, that reference was made here to the question of whether the Minister of Highways was a planner, philosopher, scientist—I do not know whether—

An hon. member: And a politician.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. Well, we are going to come to that later.

A politician? Yes, I admit to that. A philosopher? I am not too sure. I have certain philosophies, of course, that we in The Department of Highways work together on. A scientist? No, I make no profession to being

a scientist, but I can tell you this: The Minister of Highways does not have to be a scientist, he does not have to be a planner, and he does not have to be a philosopher to any considerable extent, because this Minister does not have to be. He is surrounded in The Department of Highways, with the best planners on the continent, and with the best engineers, and I can assure you that the advice and direction I get from these people is highly valuable to me.

Mr. Thompson: How about philosophy?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Philosophy? I will admit to a little bit of philosophy—and it is not all political.

Again, let us see if we can pick any precise detail out of this scattergun generalization of somebody else's thinking that the hon. member presented to the House.

Mr. Bryden: What is the hon. Minister's basis for saying that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Because he read it off!

Mr. Bryden: That does not make it a scattergun summary of other people's thinking, but it has apparently made the hon. Minister confused and very scattered.

Interjections from hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor, please.

Mr. Gisborn: I would say this, Mr. Chairman: If the hon. Minister can prove without a doubt that the conditions the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville and I have put forward do not exist, then I will say that there is no reason to accept some ideas and reasoning to better the conditions.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right! Let us start off with what the hon. member refers to as "piecemeal" spending. I can assure the House and the hon. member that it is not piecemeal spending. The spending of The Department of Highways is part of a well-planned programme. Every dollar that is expended by The Department of Highways is either part of a new plan, or a stage of a new plan.

Mr. Gisborn: If they are all like the Queen Elizabeth plan—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: When the Queen Elizabeth was built 30 years ago it was re-

garded on this continent, as the hon. member knows, something well in advance of its day. I think it has the record of being the first limited access facility ever built through open country.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can tell the hon. member and the hon. members of the House that the results of the Niagara transportation study, which were presented a year ago January, proved very conclusively to everybody who was there, that the planners of that day could not have chosen a better route or a better way to get from the Niagara peninsula to Toronto. It stands today just as well as it did on the day that it was planned, 30 years ago.

An hon. member: Who built that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It does not really matter. It was built in the days of the Liberal administration; and for this, more credit to them. That does not detract one bit from it.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If the hon. member is interested in this—he wanted some answers and I am trying to give them to him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has the floor, please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Reference was made to the Queen Elizabeth Way, built 30 years ago, not being properly conceived nor properly planned—possibly because we have to widen it today. Is this the reason the hon. member advances? Probably because we have to put control of access on it?

Mr. Gisborn: But you have been doing it every year since it started!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly. We are doing it in stages and we are doing it in those areas where priority demands it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if his consultant, his planner, Dr. Pleva agrees with him that this was such a well-planned highway? Is he in agreement on this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can tell the hon. member that Dr. Pleva attended the presentation of the London area transportation study and, I think, vouchsafes the planning

of The Department of Highways over the period of the last number of years as being quite satisfactory.

Mr. Thompson: I am thinking of the Queen Elizabeth highway. Is Dr. Pleva in agreement that the Queen Elizabeth highway is the most resourceful and the best approach for a highway to be built to Niagara Falls?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Could the hon. Minister vouchsafe that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I can.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister says that he is—I just want to get his answer. He says that he is in close consultation with him?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I see Dr. Pleva from time to time. He is not one of our consultants.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister was explaining that when he was asked about having scientists and planners; he mentioned his name and I want an answer from the hon. Minister as to whether Dr. Pleva agrees that the Queen Elizabeth highway is the best constructed and put in the most resourceful position.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I made no mention of Dr. Pleva's name at any stage of my remarks.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister mentioned that he does work with his department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no, I did not; the hon. leader of the Opposition raised the name and I said that he was at a transportation study in London. I never raised the name, the hon. leader of the Opposition did.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister knows the man.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very well.

Mr. Thompson: Since you know him well, could the hon. Minister tell me if he is in agreement that the Queen Elizabeth highway is—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He has not taken me into his confidence on that. I say that we know. I regard our planning people as being just as good as Dr. Pleva, quite frankly, just as good. That is not to say that Dr. Pleva is not a very careful man in terms of planning, land use and everything else, I know that he is a foremost authority on it

and regarded as such, but when it comes to planning roads, knowing where they should go and why, I do not think the people of the province of Ontario have to take a back seat to the planners we have in our department at all—not at all!

Mr. Thompson: May I say that the hon. Minister has not answered my question. I asked him if either Dr. Pleva or—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I said that I did not know.

Mr. Thompson: What about Dr. Krueger? He helped the hon. Minister's department. Does he agree that the Queen Elizabeth highway—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have never consulted Dr. Krueger.

Mr. Thompson: The hon. Minister has never consulted him?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am just going to try to close off this matter, Mr. Chairman, by paying tribute to the people who planned the Queen Elizabeth Way 30 years ago. They did a splendid job, because it is serving the driving public in that corridor just as efficiently and well today as it did then.

All the projections that we can make through to 1985—

Mr. S. Lewis: Are there many projections?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, there are enough to convince us that it is still going to serve the travelling public in that corridor as far as highway facilities are concerned; so this is once when I have to pay tribute to the planners who worked for the Liberal government of the day.

Mr. S. Lewis: It happens rarely.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Now then, Mr. Chairman, I was going to make mention of the fact that the hon. member was reading material—I believe he was quoting from Buchanan there at one time, was he not? He did qualify it later on by saying he was dealing with England, and with respect to England he is quite right.

Mr. Gisborn: But they investigated the American system.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but he was largely back to the traffic density problems in and around London and parts of England, I think, in terms of that treatise that he wrote.

Mr. Gisborn: He based the mish-mash of uncontrolled—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well then, he had better go back to Britain, because they are going to be involved in tremendous expenditures to catch up on the backlog of lack of planning and vehicle density.

Mr. Gisborn: That has nothing to do with the problem.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I tried to pay strict attention to the hon. member when he was reading mostly somebody else's remarks. I wonder if he paid as strict attention to the remarks I made when I addressed the House.

Mr. Bryden: When the hon. Minister was reading somebody else's remarks, he means.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no.

Mr. Bryden: He is floundering when he is trying to go it on his own.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We attribute these remarks to nobody. But I think, Mr. Chairman, the whole theme of what was said to the House there indicates the extent to which I concur that some of the statements, made by others that the hon. member read, have some validity.

He made reference to the matter of knowing how and why roads should go in a certain direction, why they are located where they are. Of course, I explained to the House a year ago that this was the very purpose of our area transportation studies, the reason we have divided the province into 19 areas.

The hon. member made reference to studies commencing in 1957. We have implemented the general recommendations of those reports and now we are into the more specific character of highway planning. I have already told the House that we have completed three of these studies. There will be more completed in 1966, and they will continue. Already some of the recommendations from these reports are in varying stages of implementation.

There was reference made to the county needs study which was completed. This was done, as I pointed out to the House, to develop a desirable system of county roads; because if they are not integrated with our

King's highways, then the highway system of the province does not fulfill the complete service that it could.

These county needs studies are completed and already the counties are moving towards the implementation of the recommendations of that study. It is a basis upon which we determine their eligibility for direct assistance, shall I say. We determine where the need exists for expenditure of direct assistance funds. These studies were largely completed towards the end of 1965 and I can say to the hon. member we are in the course of implementing the recommendations now.

I can say to him that in the counties of Lambton, Lanark, Frontenac, Hastings, and in many others, this implementation process is under way and the studies were completed only in December, 1965.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the hon. Minister, what does he mean by implementation? Actual construction or just figures on paper?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I mean the approval and allocation of funds in terms of direct assistance, better known as development roads, pre-engineering designations which will lead to construction designations as soon as the design and engineering is completed. In all these counties, and there are more, they simply know now that they will get the money to build these road requirements above and beyond their normal subsidy or bylaw programme. This is what we call direct aid.

I am sure you know what a development road is. And this was the purpose of it—to determine not only the extent to which county roads have to be integrated with our King's highway system, but also the study of what is taking place in these 19 transportation areas. We are now in the process of putting them together. The plan is there to work against now, for the future. But implementation is already under way.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the hon. Minister another question on that: From the point where you originally start a study in a community, up until the time you get your first vehicle on the road, how long does it take?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say, in some cases, two years and in some cases five. We project the needs over a 20-year period and we usually divide it into three stages. The first stage is for early implementation,

because they are priorities; second priorities are in the second stage; and the third stage has lower priorities. But we move into it in this area. Not only do we accomplish it in this way; it simply means that everything that is done in that area becomes a part of the implementation of the plan. It is a staged programme. I am sure the hon. member would agree with the sensibility of that.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question? In regard to this needs study, some of these roads are going to be handed back to the municipalities. Is that right? To the townships?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Spence: That is a step backwards, is it not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I was attempting to deal with this general matter of planning. This should really come up under another vote.

Mr. Spence: I will withdraw my question and ask it later.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I have not much more to say. I can agree with some of the general observations that were made. I think I am going to get on with this matter of direct questions and perhaps we can answer the hon. members as we go.

One more word with respect to Highway 401 with reference to the widening of the Toronto bypass, as the hon. member calls it. He calls this poor planning, but of course when the original bypass road went through there, there was very little of Toronto up there. There was a little bit of dislocation in Weston, probably a little bit in the area of Avenue road, but this area of the city had not developed at that time. Since then, that transportation facility I think has made a greater contribution to the development of that portion of Metro than probably any other single facility. It is rather obvious, with the extent that Toronto has grown north almost up to Steeles avenue, if you wish.

But I would make one more reference to the planning and pay tribute to the people who planned for it. They were foresighted enough to acquire most, if not all, of the property requirements at the time, so that this entire widening process has been possible with the acquisition of very little more land. As a matter of fact, it will be of interest to the House, I think, to know

that the cost of additional land to undertake this entire widening process, I think, was something in the order of \$8 million—a very small amount when you consider what is being done up there.

I think this is foresight; I think it is good planning; because it was done quite some years ago as we are reminded from time to time. I call this foresight. And I think 401, in its entirety, has lent to the development of the southern portion of the province. We are told it has. Ask the people in Kitchener what they think about 401. It puts people on Bay street and King street from Kitchener in an hour.

Mr. Gisborn: At 60 miles an hour?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, an hour and a quarter—who is going to quibble over that? You can get from Guelph down here very handily, I am sure.

Mr. Gisborn: Mr. Chairman, so there is no misunderstanding, 401 was started originally some years ago; we are now in 1966. Some of the ideas that I put forward are some that I think will deserve consideration for 20 or 25 years from now. I would have hoped that the hon. Minister would have made some comment on the need for rapid transit, such as the experiment they are trying—whether they intend to expand this sort of system. If the experimental case from Burlington to Dunbarton is successful—this is what we want to know, and is this the programme—

Mr. Chairman: I suggest to the member that any questions as far as expansion of the rail service can be brought under the actual vote.

Mr. Bryden: Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister did not comment on that at all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to comment on that in general terms and we can come back to the detail on the vote, if it is all right with you, sir.

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will answer this question of the hon. member. I think it is rather implicit. It has been said many times that this experimental service we hope to have underway in about a year from now—from the earliest announcement and in many subsequent announcements, it has been said, it has been printed and recorded—will be expanded. I have pointed out to the House

that there are a number of rail lines converging on Toronto. As a matter of fact, I put it this way to the hon. member and I will come back to that: You only have to get out of Toronto to realize the extent of the tremendous opportunity to develop one of the greatest urban transportation systems in the world. You only have to go to cities like Los Angeles which has virtually been ruined with concrete expressways. You only have to go to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, any of the cities you want to mention, and see their transportation problem to realize the great, great opportunity this capital city of Ontario has to become the finest transportation urban municipality in the world. You do not have to go to London, England, to do it.

Now then—

Mr. Bryden: You would not even subsidize the subway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well—

Mr. Bryden: Even now you subsidize it on a two-bit basis. You do not give it a proper subsidization in relation to highways.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me come to that. We subsidize at the same rate as we would subsidize it if it were a surface facility, the rate that is permitted—

Mr. Bryden: You did not—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes, we do.

Mr. Bryden: You did not—on the expressways in Metro Toronto, you pay 50 per cent of the cost, on the subway you paid a third, I think it is, and only a third of the right-of-way.

You have to have cars on subways or did you hear about that? You are not even approaching the problem. You are discriminating in favour of expressways and it is a very shortsighted policy.

Mr. Chairman: I think I will have to ask the members to refrain from participation now except under the specific vote. I would ask the Minister to continue with his explanatory statement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If I may conclude, I would say it must be implicit, there is no doubt about the importance we place on mass transportation, there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Gisborn: All I can say, Mr. Chairman, after the last comments of the hon. Minister,

is if we cannot put enough emphasis on the need for rapid transit, then my whole effort—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am suggesting that we wait for the vote which comes under 806 or 811 in connection with it.

Mr. Chairman: Now 801 is before us.

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister made a few comments concerning my remarks in there and I think that he misunderstood—

Mr. Chairman: Is this under No. 801?

Mr. Newman: Yes, it is under all of these.

Mr. Chairman: No, no, if it is under 801 we are ready to proceed with it.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, how do you get under a general vote when one of the questions we have asked is whether the hon. Minister was ready to consider the amalgamation of the two departments, The Department of Highways and The Department of Transport?

Mr. Chairman: No.

Mr. Newman: Well, where do you put it then, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Thompson: It is obviously under administration. Administration of two departments coming into one?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): It is a matter of government policy, it does not come under this vote. If they want to advance that as their proposition, then bring it up in the Throne debate or the Budget debate, or the hon. leader of the Opposition can bring it up when he winds up the Throne debate.

There are lots of opportunities. It is not the Minister's responsibility during the estimates to talk about the amalgamation in detail of his department with another.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the House leader, I suggest that under general administration, which is the item we are discussing, that surely a member of the Opposition can suggest the broad outline of administration which we think a particular department should embrace and this is what we are suggesting. Most logically and lucidly the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville is suggesting that you should include a larger area of responsibility.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to point out to the leader of the Opposition and the

members that this year's estimates have been broken down into, I think, about 11 estimates in comparison with last year when we had three only. There are several opportunities to discuss all phases of this as we go along and I suggest we follow what you requested, some form of order.

No. 801, please. The first item, travelling expenses, maintenance, collection of bridge tolls—everything under 801, please.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under collection of bridge tolls, is the department considering eliminating the tolls on the Burlington skyway in the near future?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The answer is "no."

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Burlington skyway and the Garden city skyway I have heard rumours to the effect that the cost of collecting the tolls on these exceeded the tolls gained. Could the hon. Minister verify this question, please?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am sorry.

Mr. Chairman: The member was asking whether the amount collected was less than the amount of cost.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is correct. I have this information in some detail here. I can provide it for the hon. member.

Now, on the matter of traffic and toll revenue, on the Burlington Bay skyway the total in 1965 is \$966,570, which, as a matter of interest, is an increase of \$121,788 over the previous year. Again a matter of interest, since the tolls were rather sharply reduced what it does do is reflect a very substantial increase in vehicular use.

The tolls pay for maintenance, they take care of maintenance, they take care of staff, they take care of part of the interest on the debt—not quite all of it—but they do not provide yet for any debt retirement, I can assure the hon. member.

I have similar figures for the Garden City skyway if he is interested. On the Garden City skyway, the total revenue is \$635,139, which is an increase of \$54,000 over the previous year again. Since the tolls were reduced there are more trucks; particularly in the truck classes there is a greater vehicular use.

Mr. Paterson: The tolls on these bridges, I believe are what, 15 cents, but a person

utilizing these quite frequently can buy, what is it, 17 for a dollar—?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Twenty for a dollar.

Mr. Newman: Under what vote could I ask the hon. Minister questions on property rentals, gas pump revenue, workmen's compensation, price index?

Mr. Chairman: When we get down to item 8, we will have workmen's compensation.

Mr. Newman: Well, I have a series in here that may be scattered anywhere, you just tell me when I can ask and I will be glad to abide.

Mr. Chairman: Fine. Anything further on item number 8? On workmen's compensation. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, page 35 of the hon. Minister's annual report, I notice that the workmen's compensation from the years 1964 to 1965 have dropped substantially. Is that because of the decrease of number of personnel? In 1964 it was \$280,000. In 1965, it is down to \$229,000. Is that as a result of less work being done by the department, farming out the work, fewer employees? What is it, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is a better accident experience. The rate of contribution is adjusted from time to time and as the claims experience goes down, then so is the rate adjusted.

Mr. Newman: It has nothing to do with the fact that more work may be done by private contractors than by the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right. That is quite right.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have a second question. Would it come in this vote somewhere?

Mr. Chairman: What do you mean by price index?

Mr. Newman: The tender price index, page 34 of the hon. Minister's report.

Mr. Chairman: That would be in the capital section, 807, I think.

Mr. Newman: Now I have several questions under property rentals. I might as well ask them now and get them over with, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I must say Mr. Chairman, in answer to that, that these are expenditure estimates. I think it is fair to say in a general way no revenue accrued to any department. It accrues to the consolidated revenue fund. Now these are expenditure estimates only.

Mr. Newman: I know they are expenditures. I simply want to know why for example, property rentals in 1964 rose from \$267,000 to \$716,000 in 1965. There is a real substantial increase, \$500,000 almost.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would that be for rental?

Mr. Newman: I have no idea what it is. It is on page 38 of your annual report, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like to ask the hon. member whether he is making reference to rent we pay for properties we lease, or rent we receive?

Mr. Newman: Statement of receipts, page 38.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I doubt very much if I have a record of that. It shows in the annual report?

Mr. Newman: Yes, Mr. Minister, on page 38. You can supply it to me later, that is quite all right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right. It is not in the expenditure items that I have here.

Mr. Newman: All right. While you are doing that, also Mr. Minister could you give me the answer to why the gas pump revenue has dropped from \$28,725 to \$2,325, a drop of maybe 1400 per cent over the year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You volunteered to receive that information at the same time?

Mr. Newman: Yes, sir, that is quite all right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no, I think I can give that information now. It is a field we have abandoned. We have cut out of this. We frankly found it was costing us more to collect these rentals than we were taking in.

Mr. Newman: And as a result what is happening?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We discontinued it entirely.

Mr. Newman: There are no more pump rentals then? No revenues from pump rentals?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As I understand it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Under item 5, roads publicity, could I ask a question concerning the department's highways maps? Is this roads publicity?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think that properly would come under that vote. Yes, maps are included in that.

Mr. Paterson: I happened to take a tour of the Tourism department this past week and a comment was made about a show in Philadelphia and the great mass of circulars and maps that were being distributed down there were from the Highways department. The inference seemed to be that these were given out *holus bolus* and that they could obtain them from you in any number of quantity, rather than using their own printed matter. I just wondered if the hon. Minister could comment on this for me.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I can. Other than a few routine distributions, we send some out to our district offices, but the bulk of our maps are distributed by The Department of Tourism and Information, that is the form this distribution functions for. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will have to ask the hon. member to ask the question of the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld).

Mr. Chairman: The member for Wellington South.

Mr. H. Worton (Wellington South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask one question. The hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville was discussing, a few minutes ago, the revenue from the service stations on 401. During the course of the past few years there have been a number of these stations gone into bankruptcy. Has The Department of Highways become involved in this, or have they lost any money to any extent in this bankruptcy operation?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: None of the service centres, as such, have gone into bankruptcy. This would be impossible really, because they are all operated by the oil companies. Now there have been some restaurants get into difficulty in these service centres.

Mr. Worton: Well, that is what I mean.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We do not get involved in that. That is a problem that is entirely that of the oil companies because all these arrangements are with them and then they make the arrangements with the catering people.

Mr. Worton: This is what I am getting at, Mr. Minister, your revenue is guaranteed by the oil companies?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, our contract is with the oil companies entirely.

Mr. Worton: And they have gone into bankruptcy but your stake in it is guaranteed by the oil companies, and there has been no loss whatever?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No loss accrued to the department.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I have a question, I am not sure whether it comes under item 5 or comes under 804. It is concerning the overhead signs on the highways. Would this come under item 5 or—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: 807.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question on the revenues from all the service centres on 401? How much revenue was there this past year derived from those service centres? The total.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The estimated total revenue for all the centres presently operating for the fiscal year ending March 31 of this year, will be \$999,234. Rounded off, \$1 million if you like.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Minister, may I ask if all the service centres are built around 401, or are there more to be built?

Mr. Chairman: I think as far as that question is concerned, we can wait until we get into the actual building and construction which is not before us at the present time.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister whether he exercises price control over articles sold in the service centres?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would not say it is a complete control. We inspect these

people and expect them to be as reasonable as they can, consistent with the character of the service they are providing.

Mr. E. Sargent (Grey North): Tell the truth.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: What did the hon. member say? The hon. member for Owen Sound, I want to know what he said.

Mr. Newman: He did not say anything, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, that is just right, he did not say anything. If he said what I thought he said, I would make him apologize.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Minister, may I suggest to you then that your department have a little closer scrutiny at the prices, because charging 25 cents for a ten-ounce glass of coke, half ice, is just a little too much for a family that may be travelling the road with three or four children.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I agree with the hon. member. If he would care to give me the name of the service centre, we will certainly take a look into the situation.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Minister, I have just paid for it less than six weeks ago.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Which one?

Mr. Newman: I will give it to you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Will you, please? It is an exorbitant charge, I agree with you.

Mr. Newman: I think so too.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have a question. I understand that the halfway point in the trans-Canada highway is located in the northern part of our province. There was a dispute in that area whether it should be located in a small community to give some economic benefit to this community at the time that the historical branch of our Ontario government erected their plaque. It was erected in the middle of nowhere. I just wondered if the department have any plans of making this area more attractive to give full cognizance to the fact that this is the midway point in the trans-Canada highway?

Mr. Chairman: I am not sure what this comes under. Is there anything under this particular vote, 801?

Mr. Paterson: I am not sure either.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, under 801, this might be the appropriate place for me to ask the hon. Minister a few questions concerning the roads on Indian reserves.

I understand that in the improvement of these roads the provincial share is paid for with a grant that goes to the Indian council.

Mr. Chairman: Is this for the construction of these roads? I think anything for the construction of the roads would properly come under—

Mr. Nixon: Yes, I will ask the question where you say, sir, but of course this is on Indian reserves where it means dealing with the government of Canada and I do not believe that the estimates elsewhere deal with a matter like that.

Mr. Chairman: I think that practically everything under ordinary expenditures and maintenance comes right up to 806 and then we start into discussion of the construction of the roads at 807.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think the hon. member will find it comes up under the municipal roads branch. I think it is 804.

Mr. Nixon: I will ask it then.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Will you, please? Because it has to do with municipal road subsidies and so on.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, where could we discuss the regulations in reference to roads and bridge contracts?

Mr. Chairman: Under 807, I would say.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under this vote, roads publicity. We notice, on Highway 401, our provincial Rondeau park; there is no sign stating that Rondeau provincial park is on road 15. Is it the policy of the government not to advertise provincial parks on 401?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would think the access road to the park should be marked and I am surprised to hear that it is not.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: I wonder if this is the vote on which we could ask questions regarding St. Clair parkway?

Mr. Chairman: Under the planning branch,

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the hon. Minister that he look into signs for Jack Miner bird sanctuary, too, on 401?

An hon. member: You are just wasting time now.

Mr. Newman: Well, are you fellows not interested in selling a tourist attraction in that area?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I just want to suggest to the hon. member for Essex South, under vote 808.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Riverdale.

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): Mr. Chairman, under item 5 of vote 801, in regard to road publicity, I am quite sure that the hon. Minister is well aware that the hon. Prime Minister has stated that the ground rules for interprovincial conferences are not laid down by him, but I would ask the hon. Minister whether the ground rules insofar as conferences with other highway Ministers are concerned are not laid down by him and whether publicity and the media through which the public are informed are not of public importance?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I do not know whether that is quite appropriately categorized here. But I will say, because it is a good question that has to come up sometime, that the province of Ontario and the Minister of Highways did play host to the other nine Ministers of Highways across the country.

But he did not make the rules. The conference made the rules, which I think is quite appropriate and it was decided to meet *in camera* for a variety of reasons, principally that no Minister was able to commit his government completely to the recommendations of the conference. It was felt, sensibly, that he should take it back to his government.

This was an exploratory thing, which was a very useful meeting. Much information was put together. The views of the ten provinces were discussed thoroughly, consolidated in a report, the reports were sent back, they were prepared here, sent to the Ministers of the various provinces who attended, to be submitted to their governments for approval, modification or otherwise.

When that has been done—and I might say all the provinces have not as yet indicated to me what the action of their respective governments was—when that is done, we will act as

a clearing house and see what steps should be taken for the next round. Whether it is another conference, or the manner in which we present the views and deal with the federal authorities, I do not know. But this is the reason why the Ministers in attendance, or just the conference, if you like, set the ground rules.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I certainly heard what the hon. Minister had to say about the problem, but it seems to me that there can be very little in the area of the highways Ministers of the various provinces throughout Canada that would require that kind of elaborate cloak of secrecy, which the hon. Minister imposed on the conference to which he was a party.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: On a point of order. The Minister did not impose this cloak of secrecy. The conference decided it would be done this way.

Mr. Bryden: What was your position then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We were hosts.

Mr. Bryden: Who called the conference?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The conference rules were set before the meeting took place.

Mr. Bryden: Who called the conference?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Who called the conference? It was not called, it was done by agreement with the Canadian good roads association when all the Ministers met out there in Saskatoon. It was suggested that this would be a good thing and we took the liberty of inviting them to Ontario. We like to bring people to Ontario. We like them to see Ontario. We like to do this, we like to be good hosts, you see.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the hon. Minister has explained somewhat of the background of this conference, but I would like to have the precise details as to how the conference took place, whether it was in fact in the area of the interests of the provincial—

Mr. Chairman: I am going to suggest to the member for Riverdale that we get to the estimates.

Mr. Renwick: Well, it is publicity.

Mr. Chairman: No, I cannot accept at the present time what you said, that it comes under publicity of the roads.

Mr. Renwick: Where would it come?

Mr. Chairman: Now this is a different question entirely.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, surely if this province was host for a conference, the public Treasury, at the advice of the hon. Minister of Highways acting as host, must have paid for it. And it comes under the first vote, I would think.

May I say, sir, that on this basis, assuming that that is correct, and I notice the hon. Minister is nodding, I listened very attentively to what he was saying about the reason for secrecy. First of all that the conference has decided this secrecy, but the basis on which the province decided concerns me.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I am not quite certain that the hon. leader of the Opposition is quite in order on this.

Mr. Chairman: I would agree with the member for Riverdale. Now regarding the point that was made, I have no desire whatsoever to restrict discussion. If you want to discuss it under this particular vote at this time, I would ask the leader of the Opposition to yield the floor to the member for Riverdale.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the matter which concerns me and which I think the hon. Minister should explain to this House is whether or not this conference fell within the area that the hon. Prime Minister was speaking about. The hon. Prime Minister stated that despite his views about the secrecy of conferences, he in fact did not lay down the ground rules. Did in substance this province and the hon. Minister of Highways invite the other Ministers of Highways from across the country to come here for a conference, thinking that it would be a very good idea and were the ground rules not in fact set prior to the arrival of the Ministers here, because very elaborate arrangements were made for publicity on those conferences? It would certainly appear that it was the intention of this hon. Minister at the time the conference was convened in these buildings—or at the Royal York hotel—that the very fullest publicity would have taken place about that conference. There must have been a decision made at the conference held here which precluded him from carrying out his evident intention of providing the fullest disclosure.

Now, if the hon. Minister was the host and did invite the Ministers of Highways for the other provinces to attend this conference, then I think the ground rules were within the

purview of this government and that the fullest publicity should have been given to the activities of that conference.

My reaction simply is why did they post three Ontario provincial policemen at the doors of that conference in order to preclude the dissemination of information? And why did they hold various news conferences at which they had nothing to communicate to the public?

I think that the hon. Minister should answer these questions and he should answer them now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I will answer them briefly. I have already pointed out that the conference set the rules; it was their wish that these meetings be held *in camera*. Each province came here to present certain views and to hear certain views and, I suppose, the views of their respective departments. But none of them came prepared to say what developed at the conference and what was written into the conference report could be accepted as part of the policy of their governments until they returned and disclosed it to their governments.

Now in the light of that the rules were set and they were observed. It is one thing to be host—but I do not think it is up to a host to impose rules on guests assembled for that purpose. We simply offered the facilities of Ontario and the Ontario government for this purpose. We did make provision for publicity because we had no reason to know, until the rules were set, that there would not be any, so we made provision for it.

We had quarters for the reporting staff of the various media—they were there. Now there is no point in asking me whether I think it should have been done differently or not; that does not matter. The conference decided otherwise and the conference was conducted that way. I certainly am not going to comment on the wisdom, or otherwise, of the decision that was made; I do not think that is proper, but that was why it was done.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister disclose to us what position he took as host of this conference when the question of publicity came up?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Shall I simply say that I concurred with the majority opinion of the conference as a member thereof. That is all I did.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister indicate whether or not he was part of that majority or whether he was opposed to the decision of the conference?

Mr. Chairman: I think he indicated that he concurred with the majority.

Mr. Renwick: May I ask the hon. Minister one further question, Mr. Chairman, before we leave this difficult subject—about which he is very reluctant to answer any questions related to it—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have answered every question.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Renwick: Would the hon. Minister of Highways disclose, since he has no objection to disclosing the position of this government and since he made all the arrangements for the publicity to take place, what was the position of this government in the matters which were discussed at that conference?

Before the hon. Minister answers my question, could I perhaps have the opportunity of conveying to him what I am trying to ask him about?

Mr. Chairman: If it has anything to do with publicity under this vote?

Mr. Renwick: Yes. Certainly it has a lot to do with publicity because we are talking about the cloak of secrecy with which the hon. Minister surrounded this conference.

The hon. Minister says that it may well be that the other Ministers at the conference were not prepared to disclose to the public what they had discussed, because it might be taken as committing their particular government to viewpoints about it.

If this hon. Minister made preliminary arrangements for the kind of publicity which we think the conference deserved, and which would have taken place had he not been overruled at the conference, will he now tell us what the position was of this government about the questions which were raised at that conference?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not going to give an elaborate answer to this; I undertook to obey the conference rules and, as a member of the conference, the answer is simply "no."

I am not prepared to disclose this information until all the governments represented by their Ministers of Highways have had a

chance to either approve the report, submit a modification of some sort to it, or to disapprove it.

When all that information is together, the position of the Ontario government will be incorporated in it and the conference will probably reconvene and a determination be made at that time. So I am not prepared to disclose it now, sir, and I think, with respect, that we have allowed much latitude on this.

This expenditure here in terms of roads publicity is really not associated with this at all, but it appeared to me to be as good a place as any to discuss it.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, the number of dollars involved is not at issue in this question; the important point is the question of the principle which is involved.

Does the hon. Minister expect that we here in this Legislature and the people in the province of Ontario are going to await the full agreement of the ten provinces of Canada before we find out what took place at that conference? If so, none of us will, in fact, be here when that decision is arrived at. I think and my party thinks—

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): You win!

Mr. Renwick: That may very well be true—and true of others, as well.

But I was thinking of those of us who might well be here the longest period of time—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That will be us, of course. We will still be here to deal with the report.

Mr. Renwick: I am certain that you will outlive me.

I would think that the hon. Minister must not, against his own personal convictions, cloak what took place at that conference, under the suggestion that we must await until all ten provinces represented by their individual Ministers of Highways have come to full agreement with all the governments across the country before we in the province of Ontario would have any idea of what was discussed at that conference.

Now let us not think for one moment that this is a terribly controversial problem. This must have to do with highways—it must have to do with roads. It does not really have to do with whether or not Confederation is going to continue or dissolve—it is not one of that kind of problem. Surely the hon. Minister has put himself in a ridiculous position

when he agreed to that kind of a decision, that the Ministers of Highways are entitled to have all their conferences clothed in a cloak of secrecy and that we should not know anything about them whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that the hon. Minister does not agree with it; why does he not come across and tell us what, in fact, took place at that conference and simply say that it is a lot of nonsense?

Mr. Chairman: I think that the Minister has indicated to the member that his decision has been bound by the conference.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If this is a question—I regard it as a speech. I have already indicated that commitments were made—nothing to do with the validity of them, or anything—but I happen to be one that believes in keeping commitments when I make them, and so do the other members.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister has a commitment to this Legislature, as well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Renwick: I am one of the members that has a high regard for the hon. Minister, and his energy and devotion to the department in which he is concerned. But I think that even he will recognize that the decision which he made does not stand up; it does not recognize, in any way, the fact that questions relating to highways in the province of Ontario and the connection between the highways in this province and in other provinces, the general area of discussion of Ministers of Highways, are not matters, really, which should be cloaked from the public interest of this province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is the hon. member's opinion and he is entitled to it. I am not quarrelling with it.

Mr. Renwick: The hon. Minister is not quarrelling with it, but is he, in fact, agreeing with it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister: Does he not think that it is a ridiculous situation that the Minister of Highways has placed himself in?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member can ask me, but I certainly am not going to answer.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I am very interested that on the front row benches are

three discordant voices to the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, the leader of their party, because he said very clearly that he thought it was ridiculous to have this secrecy and he hoped that there would be changes, but apparently there are three Ministers and let me just mention them for *Hansard*, the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), the hon. Minister of Labour and the hon. Minister of Highways, who obviously are in disagreement with the hon. leader of their party.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: May I say this as well, that I would hope—there is a very fundamental principle attached to this. Now I appreciate that the hon. Minister of Highways is saying that he made a commitment because he was the host. Mr. Chairman, I realize some of them are sensitive and some of them have great yearnings to take over in the front bench, but I think their yearnings will last for many, many years. The contribution is simply one of cackling over there.

The hon. Minister has said that when he was host he felt he had to comply with the guests at the conference. At a conference at which he is not the host, could we have from him a commitment that he would stand with his integrity in connection with secrecy of conferences?

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, I am not going to permit this.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Thompson: Your hon. Prime Minister is saying he is against it.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to ask the leader of the Opposition to stay with vote 801.

Mr. Thompson: I am very much on it. I am wondering in view of the cost of this conference, how much publicity we got from it and that is what we are trying to seek. It seems to be the principle that they do not want to give any publicity in connection with what went on. The hon. Minister is then saying that in Dominion or provincial conferences across this country—if he goes as a guest even—he will still adhere to the principle that they would be secret.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would adhere to the conference rules if a majority of those who are conferees decided to do it that way. I might not particularly agree with the rule, but if the majority at the conference decreed that those were the rules of conduct

of the conference, I would, of course, go along with it.

Mr. Thompson: I am asking the hon. Minister this: When he goes to the conference, before he goes—there are other ways of trading secrecy, I guess, than by drowning out the voice of an Opposition leader.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not trying to drown him out.

Mr. Thompson: May I say this now—no, I appreciate the hon. Minister was not. May I ask: Before he knew what the majority rule was, where would he stand?

Mr. Chairman: No. I am going to suggest to the leader of the Opposition that this is a hypothetical question. Let us deal with 801.

Mr. Thompson: It is not a hypothetical question, Mr. Chairman. The leader of this party the hon. Prime Minister of this province, has stated that, as a matter of government policy, he is against secrecy at these conferences. And from the hon. Minister of Highways we cannot elicit that he would follow his hon. leader with respect to this principle.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is a pretty specious thing; I hope we can dispose of this, Mr. Chairman. This was the first meeting of what will be a series of conferences. I simply suggest then that it is an incomplete conference. This is an initial report involving the views of ten provinces, written into the report.

Certainly, after the views of the respective governments have been obtained, this conference is going to have to reconvene, no question about that—in due course I think it is going to have to reconvene because there may be modifications of the views, there may be disapprovals, there may be approvals. I think it would be prejudicial to the continuing conferences that might have to take place if these interim things were disclosed. I simply ask the hon. member and the hon. leader of the Opposition to take my word for this—if they will—because to say what position I might have taken really does not matter. This is hypothetical, really. I think at this time it is. There will be a time for full disclosure of these things when finalization is obtained.

Mr. Thompson: Ah, well, that is just my point. One of the other real concerns I have is just exactly what the hon. Minister is saying: There will be disclosure when finalization takes place and that very statement

makes a rubber stamp of this whole Legislature. The problem that we are having today—and I do not appreciate this sort of “quacky” shouting out which is all some illiterate members do with respect to the rules of Parliament; they are a disgrace as representatives when they stand up here shouting in that way.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, may I say that the observations the hon. leader of the Opposition is making do him no credit, nor to this House.

Mr. Thompson: Who has the floor?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I rose on a point of order—

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition has the floor but I assumed that the deputy leader stood up on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I rose on a point of order.

Mr. Thompson: I am sorry, I did not hear it.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: And I think the comments and observations of the hon. leader of the Opposition, directed at—

Mr. Thompson: What is the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The point of order is simply that the conduct of the hon. leader of the Opposition is unparliamentary—and I think apparently it lies in his mouth.

Mr. Chairman: I would rule that disparaging remarks about other members are definitely out of order.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I am sorry, sir. I am just reporting with respect to the shouts and yells which we have been receiving from other hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the members of the House to give attention, please, to the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: May I say on this, sir, that my other concern and my other principle is this: Is your concern that when the province of Ontario meets with other provinces you will not disclose to the public or to the Legislature—this Legislature which will be making the decisions—what the decisions are which you have been discussing, until they are finalized? And I say that that is making a rubber stamp of this Legislature.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I disagree.

Mr. Thompson: I turn again, sir, if I could, to come back to this point: Does the hon. Minister disagree with the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, with his remarks that these conferences should be open? Does the hon. Minister disagree with that remark of the hon. Prime Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not say that at all.

Mr. Thompson: I ask: Does the hon. Minister disagree with the remarks of the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, that these conferences should be open?

Mr. Chairman: I suggest to the leader of the Opposition that that is not relevant to this discussion. I am sorry, I—

Mr. Thompson: With deepest respect to you, we have talked about the money spent—

Mr. Chairman: And now you are asking about the Prime Minister's decision and I am saying it is not relevant to this vote.

Mr. Thompson:—which is a policy in connection with publicity about conferences and we are talking about—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Chairman, surely the hon. leader of the Opposition will recall that the observations made by the hon. Prime Minister of this province, were made with respect to federal-provincial conferences.

Mr. Thompson: I would say, if they are made with respect to federal-provincial conferences, they are conferences from across this province, from all across Canada. And they are going to have the same influence in my opinion, and be a new approach taken, to shaping our Confederation. I congratulate the hon. Minister of Highways on having initiated and being the host of drawing all the provinces together and then making presentations to the federal government. This is a very worthwhile project and it is going to have as much influence, in my opinion, as federal-provincial conferences. And the same principle—as the hon. Prime Minister of this province has said—applies to all provincial conferences, as to federal-provincial conferences. That is, that they should be open.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 801 carried?

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask a question of my hon. friend in relation to what we have been

talking about. It relates to the apparent agreement that was reached, or the discussion that took place, in regard to the trans-Canada highway—the addition of four lanes to that highway and the subsequent suggestion that the federal government should pay half the cost of that highway.

Mr. Chairman: Well, I should judge that this question properly comes under the construction vote.

Mr. Gaunt: Well, it is in connection with publicity and the conference and so on.

Mr. Chairman: That would likely come under construction, which would be under our capital disbursements, 807.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, I am just mentioning this as a follow-up to what was—

Mr. Chairman: No, it has nothing to do with the follow-up of this at all.

Mr. Gaunt: I am talking about the conference and we have been talking about that all night, or half the night.

Mr. Chairman: You are specifically asking—as I follow your remark, you are asking about the construction as far as the federal highway is concerned.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we know there was one thing publicized, and that was that the reason for all these provinces coming together was questions about a trans-Canada highway. This was one of the deliberations.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If you know that then, there is no—

Mr. Thompson:—and this is why the hon. member for Huron-Bruce wants to bring that up; which, I suggest to you, sir, is perfectly correct.

Mr. Chairman: I am suggesting to the leader of the Opposition that we have several votes in which, if he wants to deal with the construction—

Mr. Thompson: No, it is not construction.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Chairman, for the sake of continuity, I brought it up at this time. However, I am willing to abide by your ruling. It does not matter when I bring it up really.

Mr. Chairman: Anything further under 801?

Mr. Bryden: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would direct the hon. Minister's attention to item number 6, which is described as relating to contingencies and sundry awards. I would like to ask him to explain what contingencies and sundry awards are.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have it here. This is an item that we simply put in the estimates to cover unforeseen expenditures, such as special investigations, legal fees under unusual circumstances, and miscellaneous. The department also has under consideration the establishment of a staff suggestion programme to reward employees for worthwhile suggestions relative to improving the efficiency of operations, and in reducing operating costs, and we have made provision for some funds here.

Mr. Bryden: If you have in mind a programme of staff suggestions, why do you not put it in that form? I suggest to the hon. Minister that this is really what he started out to say; it is an item that covers nothing. The department has just put some money in there in case something arises that it has not thought of now, but which it might think of later.

I would suggest to the hon. Minister that even though the amount involved is only \$10,000, this is a heritage of the remote past that should be abandoned. There is ample procedure through special warrants and Treasury board orders to deal with legitimate contingencies that arise later, which were not foreseen. There is no need for this disguised type of unforeseen and unprovided for vote. While I am on my feet—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, you know, it is very difficult to disguise anything from an alert Opposition, because we will answer all your questions. You asked about this.

Mr. Bryden: You have not answered this one adequately.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we have.

Mr. Bryden: You have something in your mind that you might do something about, so you put an item in that you call contingencies and sundry awards, which will cover any of the things that you might think of later but which you have not really thought of now or on which you have not matured your thinking.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh yes, we have.

Mr. Bryden: You have? Well, why did you not put it in—precisely what you mean?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We said awards.

Mr. Bryden: Awards. Well, sundry awards, I would suggest to the hon. Minister, covers a great many different possibilities. I suggest to the hon. Minister that, if he has something specific in mind, he should describe it and put in the precise amount that he intends to spend on it. If he has nothing specific in mind, then he should not put the item in at all. If later something matures, some policy matures that is legitimate, he can deal with it by the regular procedure. I suggest to him this is really just a relic of the old "unforeseen and unprovided for" item that we have gradually been knocking out of the estimates of other departments.

I want to add one thing, however, Mr. Chairman, in case I may have sounded mildly critical of the hon. Minister on this item. I would like to congratulate the department on the new look of their estimates. Some of us, including hon. members on the other side of the House as well as on this side, used to be quite critical of the department for the fact that they gave us I think only three votes in which to deal with \$200 million or \$300 million. I am pleased to note that the department has altered its approach in that respect and, I think, to the benefit of the House. However, I would suggest that they should not come in with an item so vague as "contingencies and sundry awards."

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on this point, could I ask the hon. Minister: When he presented this item to the Treasury board, had it gone further than this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Which item?

Mr. Thompson: Contingencies and sundry awards. When it was presented to the Treasury board, was it broken down more fully than this, or not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not think so, Mr. Chairman. I do not think that \$10,000 was broken up very much.

Mr. Bryden: This is chicken-feed to the highways department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, probably the hon. member is right; but I do not think there is much subterfuge associated with a \$10,000 item. I really do not think so.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister, in just taking item 801, in fact all of his estimates: When they were presented to the Treasury board were they presented in more detail than they are in this book?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They are presented in the manner prescribed by Treasury board, but they are set up differently.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, it sure is set up differently—much more detail for the Treasury board than when you present them to the Legislature. Would you deny that, Mr. Minister? Would you deny that there was more detail given to the Treasury board than to this Legislature?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No more basic detail, no.

Mr. Thompson: But there was more detail.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it is set up in a different manner.

Mr. Thompson: In what way was it different, Mr. Minister? I suggest you read Professor Schindler's book in connection with presentations to the Treasury board, and its analysis, and you will find that the difference was detail and far more scrutiny.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister to provide us in the House with a breakdown of salaries paid to employees, the same as was provided by the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) the other day?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In all categories and classifications?

Mr. Newman: That is right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In all categories and classifications?

Mr. Newman: I am merely interested in the lower categories—below what is recorded in the book here.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Below what is recorded in the book? Yes, we can do that; it will take a little time, we have a lot of employees.

Mr. Chairman: Anything more on 801? Carried?

Vote 801 agreed to.

On vote 802:

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the House leader how long we are going to continue tonight?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I was trying to get some indication of the temper of the House.

Mr. Bryden: Well, at least part of the House is unfavourable to continuing past 10.30.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The point I was directing my remarks to was whether or not it was the wish of the Opposition to get the next two votes through and then adjourn. I take it that you would like to debate item 802. In those circumstances, I move that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report a certain resolution and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I think we should be prepared for third readings, House in committee.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, we were informed by the Whip late this afternoon that we would be on Throne debate tomorrow, and we have made arrangements to have our speaker here tomorrow. Is there any difference, any change?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Well, we will put Throne debate first, ahead of the other items, if that is the arrangement.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.35 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, March 4, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow
Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Friday, March 4, 1966

Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962, bill to amend, Mr. MacDonald, first reading	1163
Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, bill to amend, Mr. Freeman, first reading	1163
Tabling answers to questions on the order paper, Mr. Robarts	1164
Tributes to Mr. Oliver, 40th anniversary	1164
Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Braithwaite, Mr. L. M. Hodgson, Mr. Davison, Mr. Bukator	1167
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Bukator, agreed to	1187
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1187

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome as guests, students from the following schools: in the east gallery, Holy Angels separate school, Toronto, and in the west gallery, Queen Elizabeth public school, Port Credit and school No. 4, Markham township, Markham.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE ONTARIO HUMAN RIGHTS CODE,
1961-1962

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Ontario Human Rights Code, 1961-1962.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): **Mr. Speaker,** in brief explanation of this bill: at present the prohibition against discrimination in respect of accommodation applies to apartments in buildings containing more than six self-contained dwelling units. The purpose of the bill is to extend the prohibition to apartments in a building with two or more self-contained dwelling units.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS
WITH PAY ACT

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations With Pay Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Mr. MacDonald: **Mr. Speaker,** I have two questions: my first one is to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) and I would ask

him what progress is being made in getting together the parties concerned in the Tilco Plastics Company strike?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): **Mr. Speaker,** I presume that the question really means more than just getting the parties together; the hon. member is really talking about what progress is being made, but he does not say that. However, I will answer on that basis—according to the spirit of the question.

We have been successful in having meetings with both sides to the dispute—separately—and we have also been successful in having brought the parties together and further steps have been arranged to advance the matter toward what I hope will be a mutually satisfactory solution.

Mr. MacDonald: Thank you, **Mr. Speaker.**

I might explain to the hon. Minister of Labour that I was talking about getting them together mentally, as well as physically.

My other question, **Mr. Speaker,** is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart).

Are the members of the Legislature entitled to attend the meeting called by the government for 10.30 next Monday morning to explain to other farm commodity groups its action on the bean growers board take-over?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): **Mr. Speaker,** my hon. friend must be psychic. I have a copy of the letter here that was sent out to the commodity board directors and their secretaries and there is no mention made whatever of anything to do with beans. The meeting called is not intended as a public meeting; it is simply a meeting confined to the commodity board directors and their secretaries to discuss marketing legislation and responsibilities under The Marketing Act with those boards and the farm products marketing board.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister has not really answered my question; has he any objection to members of the Legislature benefitting from the government's further explanation of the responsibilities of the marketing board?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I feel that the meetings should be confined to those people who are most interested, the members of the commodity boards and their secretaries. If we were to throw it open to one segment of society, I would feel that it should be open to all segments of society. It seems to me it would be confined to those who have been invited specifically.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I would like to appeal through you to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts). When we have had Goldenberg reports, when we have had other reports, the members of the Legislature have had opportunity to obtain—

Mr. Speaker: Order! I am afraid the member cannot make a statement during the question period.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day. Recently the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher) addressed to certain hon. Ministers a number of questions and I would like to table the answers to these. In addition, I would like to table the answer to question No. 2 on the order paper.

The hon. Prime Minister tabled an answer to a question as follows:

2. **Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine):** Inquiry of the Ministry: (1) Has the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario acquired title to the lands described as "the remaining lands" in the agreement between Dimensional Investments Limited and the commission dated March 11, 1959? (2) If so, what amount or amounts were paid for the said lands, when and to whom? (3) If not, what steps are being taken or have been taken to acquire title to these lands?

Answer by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario:

1. Yes, on December 17, 1964, without cost to the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario in excess of the original purchase price.

2. The amount of \$22,000 was paid on August 14, 1964, to Her Majesty in the right of Canada on behalf of the Indians of the Sarnia reserve.

3. Not applicable.

Mr. Speaker: At this time, in order that we may have a little more freedom in the House, I am going to adjourn the House during pleasure in order that the members of the

press gallery and the photographers may take a few pictures of a very important ceremony that is about to take place.

The House is adjourned during pleasure.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, this is an unusual procedure, but I might say that it is in addition a very unusual occasion. On this Friday morning, March 4, we are making a change in the order of the House so as to pay honour to one of our members, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). This is the closest sitting day we could get to his actual birthday. He was born on March 6, 1904, at Priceville and has lived there ever since.

The other great significance of this day is, of course, that the hon. member was first elected to the Legislature in 1926 as a candidate of the United Farmers of Ontario party, and has been re-elected at every general election since that time. That makes a total of nine elections, and any way you look at it that is a very long, very honourable, very noble and indeed remarkably successful record, and on this we congratulate the hon. member.

He has served his province and his people very well in the governments he has supported and of which he has been a member. He was Minister of Public Works and Welfare in the Hepburn Cabinet of 1941. In 1942 he resigned his portfolio, but in 1943 he resumed the same portfolio under the leadership of Mr. Nixon, the father of the hon. member for Brant. In July, 1945, he became leader of the Opposition when the government changed. Then in 1954 he once again became leader of the Opposition.

The hon. member has been renowned from the days of his youth as an orator, a speaker of great renown, as a prominent public debater, and I might say that in my years in this House, particularly when he was leading the Opposition, on many occasions we heard that very resonant and very magnificent voice delivering great blasts at this government in fine style.

Perhaps some of us are a little disappointed we do not hear it as frequently as we used to, although sometimes he was able to make one squirm just a little bit under the impact of his words and his delivery.

In any event, it is a very great pleasure for me to have this opportunity of making these few remarks. The hon. member and myself on a personal basis have been close friends and associates in various forms of activity over my years in the Legislature.

While we strive mightily, perhaps I should say we eat and drink as friends.

And so, sir, in view of the fact that the House now stands adjourned, I might feel free to present to the hon. member this scroll, which reads:

To Farquhar Robert Oliver, MPP, on behalf of the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, I extend to you our sincere congratulations as you celebrate your 62nd birthday and your 40th year as a member of this House. During that time you have served the people of Ontario not only as a private member for Grey South, but as a member of the executive council in two governments and as Leader of the Opposition for ten years. It is the hope of all of us that you will be able to continue this service to our province for many years to come.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I propose to leave my seat and cross the floor to present this to the hon. member. I do not want any conclusions to be drawn from my actions. The fact that we are adjourned at pleasure makes it possible for me to do this, without in any way endangering my political reputation.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. Prime Minister in his generous remarks to the dean of this House. For me, and for my party, this is a very happy and proud moment.

It is a very important and remarkable and memorable occasion when we have the dean representing his 40 years in public service.

Indeed, sir, I think that not only the occasion transcends party lines, as it has been shown by the hon. Prime Minister, but also I think the man himself transcends party lines, in the affection and respect in which he is held by all the members of the House.

He is a man whose roots sink deep into the soil of Grey South, and indeed into the province of Ontario. I think that is probably why with the strains and the buffetings of political life; the storms and the hurricanes which would blow over lesser trees, that this solid gnarled oak stands firm and immovable, no matter the political climate.

If I could change my metaphors or similes, it seems to me the life span of the political gladiator is not too long. When I look across at the lions on the other side, at times they appear ferocious, and I am sure that over the years they have taken many a bite and a cut and thrust at the man who sits on my left. But he ventures into the arena, faces

any lion with a zest and a vigour and he seems to come out completely unscathed.

I say, sir, that he is known as having a reputation as an orator, and I assure the hon. Prime Minister that there will be other occasions when that firm, resonant voice will be heard in this Legislature, and, I hope, making the hon. Prime Minister and his colleagues squirm just a little.

I call the hon. member for Grey South my friend, and I feel deeply honoured in doing this. I call him my adviser, and I feel enriched by doing this. I also feel enriched, sir, when I think of his humility and when I feel the warmth and the kindness of this man. On many occasions I have, after talking with him, felt able to stand up straighter and to go out feeling taller. I think, sir, I am not alone in this. I think not only the people of his riding, but the hon. members of the Legislature and also the people of Ontario, feel the same way in having known for so many years the hon. member for Grey South, the dean of the House.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, there is very little more that I can add, but I would like to echo the sentiments of the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition in their remarks with regard to the hon. member for Grey South.

I am certain that every hon. member of this House, no matter where he sits, feels that Farquhar Oliver is the kind of person he can approach with a political problem, a public issue, or a personal problem and feel that he is talking to a friend.

I caught a delightful nuance in the hon. Prime Minister's remarks, and I must say that I cannot quite agree that I have shared in all of the activities of the hon. member for Grey South. But that simply means that conceivably I can have a closer friendship with him than others, because some of those activities may mean there is a pecuniary barrier introduced, and I am told that that barrier sometimes results in friendships becoming a bit strained.

I know this is all very oblique, Mr. Speaker, and you have no idea what I am talking about, but I would like to join with every other hon. member in wishing the hon. member well. I do not know whether I can go as far as the hon. Prime Minister who virtually said that he was not going to run a Conservative candidate in Grey South in the next election. I will have to give that matter careful consideration, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the New Democratic Party.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to be associated with the words of congratulations and good wishes that have been extended to my friend, the hon. member for Grey South. I tell you quite frankly, sir, that my hon. friend and colleague was one of two men who were responsible for my entrance into the political field. I do not know whether to thank him for that or not, but that is beside the point.

In any case, the name Farquhar Oliver is synonymous across the province with long dedicated service in the field of politics. The stature of the man stands tall in the minds of those of all political persuasions.

As the hon. Prime Minister said this morning, my friend was elected in 1926 for the first time, and he has continued to be re-elected in each succeeding election since that time.

This represents 40 years in political life, a real accomplishment when you consider the number of casualties that have taken place over that time. He has had the honour of representing a rural riding steeped in rural tradition. It is somewhat similar to my riding in that regard, perhaps not to the same extent that some of the eastern Ontario ridings are, but nonetheless it does have a real rural traditional history.

On reflection, my hon. friend was elected to the House ten years before I was even born.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grey South has contributed a great deal to the field of politics during the past 40 years. I am certain that he will contribute even more in the next 40 years. As the youngest member in our party, I want to say that I have been attempting to emulate in part some of my hon. friend's political sagacities. I would be quick to add, however, that I have not picked up his cigar-smoking traits, I tell you that my constitution just would not stand it.

On the occasion of his 40 years in this House as well as the occasion of his birthday, I want to join with all hon. members in the presentation of this tractor, which you see here in front of him as a symbol of his first love. As you know, he was a farmer, and I think this represents the farming industry and is a symbol of such. I join with the entire House in wishing him continued political success and health and happiness in the future. It is an unusual occasion for an unusual man, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. A. W. Downer (Dufferin-Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege this morning

for me to join in this tribute to the Dean of the House—the hon. member for Grey South. The Dean has made a tremendous contribution to this House; a tremendous contribution to the province of Ontario; and I would like to say, too, that I am very proud and honoured to call him not only a neighbour but a friend.

If I could wish him something this morning, I would say may he live as long as he wants and never want as long as he lives. I would also say that he has those qualities of heart and mind that all of us admire. He has a philosophy of life that is expressed perhaps best of all in the words of Edgar Guest:

I would like to think when life is o'er
That I had filled a needed post.
That here or there I paid my fare
With more than idle tale or boast;
That I had taken gifts divine;
Breath of life and manhood fine;
And tried to use them now and then
In service of my fellow men.

That is the hon. member for Grey South. To-day we pay tribute to a great man and an outstanding parliamentarian.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I would not have missed this for anything, but I almost did. There was talk last night, I understand, about the secrecy of some meetings that the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) was connected with. They could not have been more closely guarded than this little secret because I almost went home this morning. I am certainly glad that I did not go.

On an occasion like this, of course, one's mind runs in two directions at the same time. In the first place, you are happy, of course, at the achievement of 40 years of service in this House and to the people of your riding. But in the same train of thought you realize that a great many years have been spent in achieving this occasion.

But looking back on 40 years of political life in this province, I have very few regrets. I have many fond memories; I have made many good friends; I have made some contribution, I think, to the public life of Ontario and I believe that it is the right and the opportunity, and almost the obligation, of young men and young women to be interested in politics to a greater degree than the young people are today.

I am upset and disturbed when one recognizes the lack of understanding of politics and the failure to appreciate what politics means in this province and in this country.

And I have always felt, Mr. Speaker, that in the lives of many it is said that: "Politics is not a good business. It is for somebody else, it is not for me."

Well, after 40 years in politics, I can say that politics is not a dirty business. Politics is the business of the man and the woman on the street and everyone. If politics are bad in the eyes of some, it becomes bad only because they have failed to make their full contribution towards government in this province and in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not usually lost for words, but apparently occasions like this seem to hurt me more in my ability to project myself than those occasions when Mr. Drew and Mr. Frost used to be after me in all their fury in the old days.

There is something about a time like this that affects one, and I just say that the feeling that you get is all right, and it is easy to contain. I thank all those who have said kind words—the hon. Prime Minister, and my own leader, my good friend who is making a great contribution and who will make an even greater one in the public life of this province.

Thank you all for remembering me on this occasion.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order, resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to participate in the Throne debate and to offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox) and to the hon. member for Armourdale (Mr. Carton) who moved and seconded the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. The fresh way in which they carried out their task was appreciated, as we have seen, by all hon. members of the House. I am certain that their admirable performance will bring honour to themselves and to their constituents.

I would also like, Mr. Speaker, at this time to offer my felicitations to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) on his birthday

and on his anniversary in this House, I would like to tell him that I hope the time will be a short one when he is once again able to take a seat as Minister of Her Majesty's government on the other side of this House.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, as one of those who admired your tact and skill in presiding over the deliberations of this legislative chamber, I would like to join with all hon. members in offering you my congratulations and best wishes.

I would also like to congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) on his appointment to the post of Deputy Speaker and I wish him every success in assisting you, Mr. Speaker, in your onerous duties.

On September 15 of last year, two by-elections were held. In Nipissing, in spite of the Tory steamroller, the lavish use of money and advertising and the many visits from the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and members of his Cabinet, the people of Ontario made it quite clear they did not want a glamour boy; they wanted a hard-working man who would remember them when he got to Queen's Park.

They wanted a Liberal and above all, they wanted a winner. They got one in the person of Richard Smith.

On the same day in the riding of Bracondale, the people picked another outstanding man in the person of George Ben, to represent them. We welcome both these men into the ranks of the Liberal caucus and have no doubt they will make outstanding contributions to the workings of this House.

Mr. Speaker, our winning of these two by-elections has been, and is regarded by many, as a manifestation of a vague, general uneasiness, to be found in the cities and also in the rural areas; an uneasiness which arises because the public of Ontario is gradually becoming aware of the fact that this Tory government is not all that it claims to be.

For years the voters have been fed with the pabulum of good government, but the time has come when the baby has grown. Now the people of Ontario no longer wish to be fed baby food. They have become discontented with the old ways in which this supposedly progressive government conducts the affairs of this province. As a result, it is the opinion of my colleagues and I that these two by-elections in Nipissing and Bracondale and the results thereof are but an indication of what is to come.

I have no doubt my colleagues across the House are at this moment smiling to themselves smug with self-satisfaction. They are probably thinking they have been in power so long that they have nothing to fear. Like ostriches, they are putting their heads in the sand. They see nothing, hear nothing and feel nothing. They are content that all is well.

I think they are wrong. My colleagues on this side of the House think they are wrong, a growing number of people in Ontario think that they are wrong. Time will prove us to be right.

This Tory government has become so smug that it believes it can do what it likes, to whom it likes, at any time, no matter how dangerous and sinister this may be. I have only to refer to the infamous and ill-fated police bill to show what a complacent Conservative government is capable of committing.

It might be said that this unfortunate bill was but a slip and could not happen again. This may be true, but I would remind the hon. members of this House that a scant few days ago we found Mr. Vockavitch, and other innocent homeowners in the township of York, thrown out of their homes. And what was his crime? He dared to oppose the taking of his home. He dared to challenge the paltry sum offered to him on the expropriation.

Mr. Speaker, unjust expropriations not only in the township of York, but in other municipalities throughout Ontario, have occurred. What has the government done to humanize and bring up to date the whole matter of expropriations? Precious little.

As things stand now, an owner who feels he has been unjustly victimized must be prepared to submit himself to the jackboot and the whip in the middle of the night if he dares to protest an expropriation and if he dares to try to protect his land.

It has been submitted many times and in many forms, that although the right to expropriate for the public good should continue to be available as needed, this government should have long ago posed legislation where all expropriations in Ontario be dealt with in a uniform manner, in each and every case.

I submit that the following should be available as a minimum for the protection of the individual:

1. In appropriate cases, the owner should be guaranteed the right of a hearing before the expropriation.

2. The owner should be guaranteed fair and equitable compensation for his property. In arriving at the purchase price, consideration should be given to the fact that an owner's land might become sterilized and decrease in value, solely because of the threat of expropriation.

3. Immediately on the taking of the said land, the owner should receive a cash advance equivalent to a substantial portion of the purchase price, so that he might be able to secure alternative accommodation, or make other business arrangements, as the case may be.

4. The owners of lands adversely affected by the threat or actual expropriation of land adjacent to or in the neighbourhood of their own, should have the right to tender their lands to the expropriating authorities without waiting for an expropriation which might never come.

In any event, the individual rights of an owner should be protected and guaranteed. The taking or expropriation of his lands should never be allowed, unless it is quite clear that the lands are necessary for the public purpose. If expropriation is necessary, it should occur only after the owner has had a chance to make representations on his behalf. Then he should be guaranteed a just price for his lands.

In no event should the conservation or other authorities be able to announce a plan for the redevelopment of a certain area which might not commence for some years—or not at all. Later, at the time when compensation is payable, the authorities should not be able to argue that the land has become devalued and that the market value has dropped and therefore the compensation paid should not be based on a much lower than fair price—in fact, on a give-away price.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, this government stands indicted more for what it has not done, than for what it has done. It is to be castigated for its sins of omission, more than for its sins of commission. One need only to point to the pockets of poverty to be found all over rural Ontario—to the farmers who have difficulty in making a living, no matter how hard he might try—to realize the shortcomings of this government, which has been in power so long that it has become cosy and, to use the words of my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson), it has become fat, arrogant and complacent.

I would like to make a few observations in connection with the field of hospital accommodation. During the Throne debate last

year, I brought to the attention of this House the fact that we in Etobicoke had set up a board of governors, and under the guidance of the Ontario hospital commission we were planning a 400- to 500-bed hospital, on a twelve-and-a-half acre site located in Rexdale, in the township of Etobicoke.

At that time, I drew to the attention of the House the fact that a group of interested citizens with courage and determination could do something to alleviate the hospital shortage, and that the citizens of Etobicoke were prepared and eager to try.

Mr. Speaker, I felt that this might be an appropriate time to tell the House of the progress of the Etobicoke General Hospital Corporation.

To date, an architect has been hired and sketches commissioned. An administrator is actively being sought. All elected members of this House and of the Parliament at Ottawa, who represent any part of the township of Etobicoke, have been brought into the picture. The project has truly become a township-wide drive for the erection of a hospital to serve all the citizens of Etobicoke.

Residential and industrial commercial campaigns are in the works. We are all quite certain it will not be long before the Etobicoke general hospital, with an initial 425 active treatment beds, plus 75 psychiatric beds, becomes a reality. As a matter of fact, at a recent meeting with the Ontario hospital services commission, approval was given for a building which would ultimately include 600 active treatment beds, 75 psychiatric beds and 75 chronic care beds.

We are trying to erect in time a hospital that will be a fully accredited hospital, with teaching facilities, training for internes and so forth, in conjunction with one of our major universities. I would ask the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) to seriously consider assisting the board of governors in that regard.

I would also ask the hon. Minister of Health to give serious thought to approving the erection of a regional nurses training school under the government's new plan. This school could be erected on our site, which is more than six miles from any other nearby hospital where potentially a nursing school might be located.

Mr. Speaker, we in Etobicoke are proud of the progress which has been achieved in connection with our new hospital. However, we are running into many of the problems referred to by the hon. member for Scarborough North (Mr. Wells), during his recent

speech in this debate. We have found that circumstances exist which are quite similar to those which led to the forming of the United Appeal. Corporations and other organizations who might be likely contributors are approached not once, but many times by many different groups throughout Metropolitan Toronto, all of whom are planning to build another hospital. It would seem that the setting up of some central agency to deal with financing of hospitals is a most urgent requirement.

During his speech, the hon. member for Scarborough North suggested that construction grants should be raised by a Metro-wide tax revenue and that fund-raising drives should be conducted by the new Metropolitan Toronto hospital co-ordinating council.

Mr. Speaker, I concur with the hon. member when he states that large downtown hospitals have made the raising of funds by suburban hospital boards a most difficult matter. However, I would take his suggestions one step further. I would say that inasmuch as the government is going to make pension plan contributions available for school construction, it should consider the urgency of the need for hospitals in Metropolitan Toronto. Recognizing the fact that there is such an urgency, the government should then make available loans from the pension moneys.

I suggest that the government could pay the appropriate interest rate on these loans, thus freeing the hospitals to pay back the principal alone over an extended period of time. Of course these loans would be complementary to the existing scheme for low-cost loans to the building of hospitals. Also, in deserving cases, the government could forgive the principal and interest, and pay back the pension fund money to the federal government out of the general revenues of the province.

In case, Mr. Speaker, one might feel that there is no urgency in the need for hospitals not only in Etobicoke, but throughout the whole area of Metropolitan Toronto, a supposition which might be arrived at by a reading of the Throne speech, where no indication was given of an intention to expedite the building of hospitals—then I would refer, Mr. Speaker, to the recent submission of the Ontario hospital association to this government, which charged that the government grants were so small that hospital construction was seriously threatened.

Mr. Speaker, a hospital costs about \$21,000 a bed. The total contribution available from all levels of government amounts only to

\$10,000 a bed. This leaves approximately \$11,000 to be raised by the hospital corporation.

The present government loan programme lends up to \$5,000 a bed. However, the only source of revenue the average hospital has, is one-half of what it gets from private and semi-private beds. This is committed to pay off loans.

All might appear to be well until a few years after the hospital is opened; it finds that it must make another addition, and so it does not take long before it becomes obvious to the board of governors and to those who use the hospital, that loans are not the final answer to the problem.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that much larger government grants are required if anything is to be done with the problem. Dr. Harvey Agnew, once a key man in hospital staff work in Toronto, and now a leading professional consultant on hospital matters, has stated and I quote:

When the survey of hospital needs in Metropolitan Toronto was made using 1961 statistical figures 43 per cent of the population of Metropolitan Toronto lived in the seven or outer fringe communities, yet only 17 per cent of the hospital beds were located in these municipalities. By 1980 it is anticipated that 58 per cent of the population will be in these fringe areas. It is absolutely vital that a much higher percentage of the hospital beds be there and it is the responsibility of these communities.

The highly respected Ontario hospital services commission says Ontario needs 5.6 beds per 1,000 of population.

Let us take a look at the township of Etobicoke. Township officials report that Etobicoke has a present population of some 250,000 persons, with a projection that the new borough of Etobicoke will have over 300,000 population in the next few years. I personally believe that the figure will be even higher, somewhere closer to the 350,000 figure.

These people will be wanting hospital services in Etobicoke by 1969. This means a minimum provision of approximately 1,900 beds at that time.

Presently, we have two excellent local hospitals, one the Queensway hospital located in the south part of the township, open since August of 1955, with 132 beds. Now, due to an extension of facilities and services, the Queensway hospital has a total number of 347 beds.

Secondly, we have available Humber memorial hospital, which is located in the town of Weston, immediately east of the township of Etobicoke. This hospital opened in 1951, with 54 beds, and now has in the neighbourhood of 323 beds. Between the both existing hospitals, total bed capacity is therefore approximately 670 beds.

There is no doubt that both the Queensway General Hospital and the Humber memorial hospital could be added to in stages, as time goes by.

However, by 1969 Etobicoke, to serve its local needs, plus the needs of thousands who come from farther east, west and north, will not be able to survive without a total capacity, I believe, of some 1,900 beds. Even as I speak, Mr. Speaker, we have an admitted shortage of 750 to 1,150 beds, depending on how far one feels we should have gone, how much we could have provided for special services, such as pediatric care, chronic care, psychiatric care, and so on.

It is impossible to provide 750 to 1,150 or 1,500 or 1,900 beds in a hurry. We all know that building a hospital with all its intricacies, all its fire-proofing, all its special wiring services, heating, ventilating, feeding, all its labs, laundries, operating rooms, emergency wings, clinical spaces, staff housing and other amenities, is not the same as building a factory or a warehouse or an office building.

With the coming in of the government's medical care plan, such as it is, which will be in operation long before the Etobicoke general hospital is completed, it becomes very apparent that services such as we are planning to provide will be in critical short supply in Etobicoke for many years to come.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that there is a hospital need in Etobicoke. All of the hon. members who represent suburban constituencies know full well that Etobicoke is not alone in its need for new hospital beds, and that the need is urgent.

Before I leave the subject of hospitals, I would state, Mr. Speaker, that I refer to the sins of omission of this do-little cosy Tory government. Well, Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1966, a member of the Queensway hospital board of governors attended before the township of Etobicoke board of control, and made a plea for funds to increase the size of that hospital to 700 beds.

He pointed out that Ontario hospital services commission had recommended a total of 1,200 hospital beds for Etobicoke. To date, the township has only 347 beds. He estimated that an additional 360 beds would

cost his board about \$9 million, of which approximately \$6 million would be provided through federal, provincial and Metro grants.

His appeal to the board of control was for assistance in raising the approximate difference of \$3 million required for the addition. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that it made it quite clear that the appeal was being made to the board of control of the township of Etobicoke, because no fund-raising appeal to the public by any organization in the last year or so had reached its objective. This bears out, Mr. Speaker, my previous comments in connection with the difficulty which not only the Etobicoke general hospital, but all suburban hospitals are having in raising funds.

At the same meeting, another member of the board of governors of the Queensway general hospital went so far as to call for hospital lotteries to solve the bed shortage in Etobicoke. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to dwell here on the pros and cons of hospital lotteries, but I am going to state that it is indeed ludicrous and a sorry commentary on the performance of this Tory government where, on the one hand we have a desperate need for hospitals, and the other we have a government which looks at the problem, sees so little and moves so slowly that desperate measures such as lotteries must be considered.

To those who are still not convinced that the situation is desperate, perhaps I could remind them of the case of five-year-old Rosino Minardo of Grace street, Toronto, who died on February 21, 1966, while waiting for a hospital bed so that her tonsils could be removed. I could further remind them of the death of 27-year-old Maurice Fraser, the father of five children, who knew he was going to die, and tried three times to be admitted to hospitals before he was pronounced dead on arrival at Queensway general hospital on January 23, 1966.

And if that is not enough, Mr. Speaker, I would refer the hon. members of this House to the case of Irwin Kerr, of Guestville avenue, Toronto. Here we have the case of a man who died nine hours after being refused admittance to Humber memorial hospital and Northwestern general hospital because no bed was available. At the inquest, the jury urged the Ontario hospital services commission and the provincial health department to take steps to end Metro's bed shortage. The administrator for the Humber memorial hospital, Robert Ferguson, among others, warned that the situation is critical and that the same could happen again. In

fact, the coroner at the inquest, Dr. F. B. Cruickshank, told the jury that the bed shortage was desperate.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the word is "desperate." His feeling was that the shortage of beds is a matter for deep concern and immediate action.

The sad conclusion that can be reached from all these cases is that if a bed had been available, the chances are that these lives could have been saved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Health—I should say here that I feel he is conscientious and extremely able and that he has done all he can—has stated that his 1965 goal of 625 more hospital beds for Metro has been bettered by 140 beds. He has stated that he expects the 1966 goal of 393 more hospital beds to be exceeded by 400 beds.

However, the fact remains that projections and fancy figures are of no use to those who die today or may die tomorrow because there is no bed available. Flights of fancy are of no use to the next of kin of those who die. One wonders whether the recommendations of the jury at the inquest of Irwin Kerr are going to be buried along with the recommendations of many other juries sent out to investigate other areas of provincial concern, such as grand juries who examine jails, or juries who hear of construction accidents which need never have happened if supervision had been correct as required by law.

One wonders just what is needed to spur this government to take a hard cold calculating look at the hospital situation, so that massive immediate money and help is made available to cure the hospital bed shortage.

I have said, and I will say again, that this government stands indicted for its acts of omission. Nothing bears out this statement more than the present hospital bed shortage in Metropolitan Toronto and throughout all of Ontario.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I know much of what I have this morning has been said previously about the hospital bed shortage, and no doubt will be said again to an unhearing and unfeeling Tory government. Let us all hope that at long last it bestirs itself to correct the situation at once before it deteriorates even further. The hospital bed shortage is a crisis as grave as that which exists in the field of education.

Mr. Speaker, I would like here to quote from an editorial which appeared in the Toronto *Daily Star* on February 23, 1966. In part the editorial says:

If we are ever going to match the pace

of hospital construction with the obvious need, hospitals will have to be financed out of taxes, not left to private charity to bridge the chasm left by provincial and federal grants and loans.

There should be no financial gulf and the OHA is right to press its case on Queen's Park. Federal and provincial grants amount to \$8,000 a bed. Building costs are soaring. The first 300-bed stage of York general is now estimated to cost \$24,000 a bed and government loans added to the \$8,000 in grants won't entirely fill the bill. They would involve massive repayments the hospital boards couldn't meet under present arrangements.

The OHA's request for an immediate increase in construction grants to \$14,000 a bed is reasonable. The association says that the federal government is woefully short of holding up its end. The Ottawa grant is only \$2,700 a bed.

If Premier Roberts can squeeze more from Ottawa, let him go to it, but the primary responsibility to produce the necessary money is his, whether he gets more out of Ottawa or takes it out of his own government's kitty. The provincial government collects insurance premiums for hospital care. It has the responsibility to ensure that the care is available.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the views in this editorial clearly set forth the wishes and desires of the people of Ontario. It is my sincere belief that the government should seriously consider the use—with the appropriate safeguards—of massive sums from the millions which will become available from Canada pension plan contributions in the very near future. These moneys could be used to give hospital construction the immediate assistance it requires.

Mr. L. M. Hodgson (Scarborough East): Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure this morning to rise and participate in the Throne Debate.

I followed with interest the previous hon. speaker's (Mr. Braithwaite's) remarks in terms of hospital construction in this metropolitan area. I would point out that we in Scarborough are building the Centenary hospital and we are developing an extension to the Scarborough general hospital.

Shortly we are beginning a campaign of public subscription for funds for these two hospitals, and the people of Scarborough have taken a great deal of interest in this. They are determined that we are going to

progress and develop hospital beds for people who require them.

I would like to ask at this time, if this House would give us moral support in our campaign to raise funds for the construction of these hospitals. We are very grateful and very much appreciate the help that has been provided by The Department of Health and the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) and the great interest that has been taken in the programme of construction.

Since I spoke last in this House on this debate, two new hon. members have come in and I would like to say in congratulating them on their election and on taking their seats in this House, that I hope they enjoy their stay as much as I have enjoyed mine. I do hope also, that I shall continue to be senior to them.

This morning I wish to address the House on the ever-increasing social problem that involves many of our citizens and possibly each and every one of us at some time throughout our lives. That is the problem of moving motor vehicle traffic safely throughout this province. In the last couple of years, I believe, there has been more discussion of the traffic accident problem than ever before. Just over the previous weekend, a Toronto newspaper, the *Telegram*, carried a very excellent three-part series discussing the result and the problem of traffic accidents in this country.

As we have heard from other hon. members of this House, a new book "Unsafe At Any Speed" by Ralph Nader, has created a great deal of alarm and a great deal of interest in the governments of the United States and here as well.

In 1965, for instance, statistics taken in the first nine months of that year, indicate that the number of motor vehicle accidents increased by 16 per cent. The insurance industry reminds us of this tremendous increase in accidents, with its ever-increasing costs.

About two weeks ago, the President of the United States pointed out to the American people that the traffic accident toll in the United States was their greatest problem, second only to Vietnam. On March 3, a story was carried in the *Globe and Mail* of Toronto stating that the President of the United States had asked Congress to create a Cabinet-level department of transportation, with command over \$700 million budget and a six-year programme of traffic safety, to try to bring about a realistic solution to this problem.

It is a point of interest that the United States government is forming this department, when this government took similar action in 1957.

In Ontario, in 1964, the drivers of Ontario travelled over 20 billion miles, had 111,000 traffic accidents, injured over 54,000 persons, killed 1,454 and, as I pointed out previously, the accident toll for 1965 appears as though it will be in the order of 16 per cent greater than that of 1964. Although 1964 and 1965 are showing the highest number of accidents ever occurring within this province, there is a certain amount of sunshine—a bright side.

In the 10-year period from 1954 to 1963, the motor vehicle accident rate was reduced from 5.4 accidents per million miles to 5.2 accidents per million miles. Deaths were reduced in that period from 9.1 per 100 million miles to 7 in 1963. Fatal accidents were reduced from 7.8 per 100 million miles to 6 in 1963.

If we go back and look at the traffic picture a few years ago—take the year 1932—we find that deaths per 100 million miles were 18.7 and fatal accidents per 100 million miles, 17.2.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, although the number of accidents are increasing, the rates are reducing. But it would be interesting to speculate what the number of people killed and injured would be if we had not had this tremendous improvement in accident rates per miles driven over the years. These improvements have been brought about by many different factors. First, and I think one of the more important, is the improved road design and maintenance and the programme of maintenance carried on by the municipalities of the province of Ontario. We have improved our vehicles greatly, we have improved the method and the technique of enforcement, and we have increased the awareness of drivers and pedestrians of the traffic problem within the province.

Now, to discuss the motor vehicle for a moment. I would say this and say it quite quickly: Motor vehicles can be made safer. In 1955, studies from the Cornell University on crash research brought about many improvements. Some of these are:

1. Safety catches
2. The implementation of padded dashboards
3. Dish-shaped steering wheels
4. Seat belts, and
5. A generally improved design in the vehicle to absorb shock on impact.

Speaking of those improvements of that time, I would like to quote a friend of mine, Roy Haeusler, a very prominent vehicle safety engineer in the United States

"Seat belts have now been available since 1956." This is ten years later and this vehicle engineer Roy Haeusler, with the Chrysler Corporation, points out that we are not even in the shape where we have half our people using lap belts. Many of those who are wearing them are not wearing them as they should, putting them on snugly and doing them up properly. In other words, after ten years of progress in seat belt use, we still have not reached the point where half the people are using belts.

Speaking of the Cornell studies—this research was done collectively by the automobile companies.

Those companies have proven that vehicles can be designed to prevent injury. In 1965, the General Motors Corporation spent \$1.25 million on vehicle safety research.

This appears to be a very large sum to be spent in one particular area. However, when you consider that against the profit of that organization of \$1.7 billion, I wonder if they are doing enough.

To help encourage the standardization of safety features in vehicles in the United States, the President of the United States, in his request to Congress, has now asked that this new department of transportation set up uniform standards for vehicle safety to be used across the United States. We have also seen where the motor vehicle companies are ever increasing their attempts to bring about a safer vehicle. I think we are now coming to the point where the floodgates are opening and there will be great improvement in this area.

The greatest problem of vehicle safety at the present time is the lack of service. The best designed vehicle is a hazard if it is not maintained in safe running order. To accomplish this, it is important that vehicle inspection on a selective compulsory basis, such as forecast in the Speech from the Throne, be continued and expanded.

Critics say that vehicle inspection should be carried out on an annual or semi-annual basis, not on a selective basis. I do not agree with the principle of regular annual or semi-annual vehicle inspection. This programme leads to vehicles being driven for a long period in an unsafe condition. If a driver knows that his inspection date is, say, four months hence, there is little need for him to

maintain his vehicle until that date appears. A selective, compulsory inspection programme creates the necessity, through preventive enforcement, for vehicles to be in safe operating condition at all times. While speaking on enforcement, I would point out that active enforcement by the police has proved to reduce the number of traffic accidents.

It is recognized that approximately 15 per cent of our drivers need to be brought before the courts and penalized. However, the total accident problem cannot be solved by enforcement alone. People will continue to break the law, either from a lack of knowledge, or a disregard for the law.

I would point out here, as a point of interest, that we used to hang those who stole bread. So I would say the penalty, regardless of how severe it becomes, will not completely solve the traffic accident problem. To argue this point that all traffic accidents cannot be prevented solely by enforcement, I would point out that of the 189,000 drivers involved in accidents in 1964 in Ontario, 3,584 were impaired and 11,000 had been drinking.

This is a total of 8.1 per cent of all the drivers involved in accidents; 89.7 per cent of all drivers involved in accidents were apparently normal. Therefore, total enforcement and prevention of drinking and driving would have reduced the accident toll by eight per cent only, if drinking had been the sole cause of the accident in each case.

It is suggested, and I would suggest, that constant research should be continued to develop new methods of enforcement. In past years, breathalyzer tests, radar and aircraft have been used for traffic enforcement. The modern age and advancing technology will develop many new aids for enforcement officers, and we of the Legislature should be quick to accept these.

The one method of enforcement on our highways not used is the plainclothesman in an unmarked car. If we feel it is an advantage to observe offenders in a clandestine manner from the air, why can we not do the same at the highway level? Since the beginning of The Department of Transport in 1957, great emphasis has been placed on the testing of new drivers and selective re-testing of others. It is important to know that our drivers have the fundamental knowledge of the road and the ability to drive a motor vehicle in a responsible manner. Personally, I would like to see the programme of re-testing extended, and more and more people called to our driver examination centres to

prove their ability to drive and their knowledge of the rules of the road.

The greatest opportunity to reduce the accident toll lies with driver education, and I speak here primarily of education in the secondary schools. Graduates of a course in secondary school driver education have far less accidents than non-graduates. It has been estimated that graduates have up to 30 per cent less accidents than non-graduates. Driver education gives the opportunity to break the chain of the father—the one responsible for the traffic accidents today—teaching the son; the friend—the one that is responsible for the traffic accidents today—teaching the friend. Driver education increases that great group of people who have taken the time to learn to drive safely and defensively.

The present course, as it is offered in Ontario, is now in 150 schools. This is from a total of approximately 500 secondary schools in the province. In the school year 1960-61, 36 schools in Ontario offered driver education.

I might point out as a matter of interest here, at that particular time, I was with The Department of Transport and meeting with the various school boards in the province, trying to implement and promote the programme of driver education. Many of the principals I talked to at that time felt that it was not part of a programme that should be offered in the secondary schools.

But now, five years later, in talking to many of those principals, some are the strongest advocates of driver education and one happens to be my brother.

In the present year, 1965-66, over 140 schools offer this course, graduating approximately 7,000 students. As well as this programme of secondary school driver education, we have in Metropolitan Toronto, the pro-drivers club and last year they graduated approximately 1,800 students. Private driving schools throughout the province are adding to this number of people who have taken the time to learn to drive in a safe and defensive manner.

A secondary school driver education is supported by The Department of Transport in Ontario, and The Department of Education. The Department of Education gives grants for the in-class portion and the instruction, and The Department of Transport provides books, dual brake systems, report papers and other assistance in operating this course. It is recognized, as pointed out earlier, that driver education in the secondary schools can reduce the number of accidents

appreciably. The amount of reduction is not known exactly. I would think that the government should introduce a cost-benefit study of this programme.

In Ontario, we have been graduating people in driver education since 1949. The first course started in Kitchener and these people, the graduates of those courses, over the years, would be the people who could prove the results of secondary school driver education. The results of this study, I am sure, would be favourable and this could be used as a basis for giving increased grant assistance to the secondary schools, and possibly total grants for the carrying out of the driver education programme.

An average student in the school system of Ontario spends ten to 12 years preparing himself for life. It seems a small sacrifice to spend 50 hours of that time learning to drive a vehicle in a safe manner. Expansion of driver education courses can lead to accommodating all students coming through our secondary school system. I would suggest that a certificate of graduation from a recognized driver education course, could become necessary to the issuance of a driver's licence.

A point of interest here is that we are continually asking people to drive safely. We have our countryside littered with signs saying: drive carefully; drive cautiously; do this and so on. But I wonder if our people have really taken the time to know how to drive safely and how to drive defensively? This course of driver education becomes more important when we consider that one in seven persons employed in the province of Ontario today, works in the automobile industry. They are either driving, servicing, repairing, or making automobiles.

Now, finally, sir, I would like to talk for a moment about community safety councils throughout the province. At the present time, there are approximately 50 community safety councils functioning. These councils are made up of publicly spirited citizens, giving of their time to improve living conditions within their own community. These are the community volunteers. These are the traffic safety coordinators within any one community. These are the instigators of community safety programmes. Traffic safety in all its ramifications has to be carried out at a local level. You have to approach traffic safety from your own street and your own street corner. The accident problem cannot be solved by directives from central government.

Over the years in Ontario, active community safety councils have been responsible for the implementation of many programmes,

driver education, safety lectures in the schools by policemen, community safety drives, pedestrian safety programmes, bicycle safety rodeos, driver rodeos, and many other functions, to bring the attention of the people of any one community, to the need to live and work and drive safely.

It is important that the community safety programme be expanded throughout the province, and in order to do this, I would suggest that the province consider a grant for safety councils, based on a per capita of five cents, with a limit of \$500 per council. This grant would not be used for the implementation or conduct of safety programmes, but rather for the administration and maintenance of the safety council itself. We have some councils, Mr. Speaker, operating in the province, and I know that their total budget comes from the pockets of the people that are giving of their time. I think that the government can give some assistance to these people.

There is ample precedent for the government giving grants to volunteer safety organizations. A few years ago, The Department of Agriculture when setting up the farm safety councils, provided a grant. At the same time, the government has provided grants for the Ontario safety league, the Canadian highway safety council, and others. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that from my experience of working with the interested persons of this province, that a grant of this amount would go a long way towards implementing active community safety programmes.

In conclusion, I would say that traffic accident prevention must be looked at in a very broad sense. We should not narrow our view and think we can solve this problem by improved vehicle design, greater enforcements, or driver education, any one thing. These things will have to develop and progress parallel. Action must be taken to educate our drivers and pedestrians to prevent the actual occurrence of an accident.

There is a rather interesting editorial in the *Toronto Daily Star* of Thursday, February 24, in support of the safety vehicle, and it points out:

When it comes to attacking slaughter on the highway, Ontario belongs to the "loose nut" school.

This is a body of horse-and-buggy thinkers, whose approach to highway safety is concentrated on the driver, or—as members of the school call him—"the loose nut behind the wheel."

Transport Minister Irwin Haskett earns his membership by stating that "nine out

of 10 accidents are due to carelessness of the driver," while missing an opportunity to take meaningful action against the real killer—the car itself.

Well, I would say that we in this province have always had a policy of approaching the traffic problem in many ways, and not solely concentrating on one particular area.

At the conclusion of this editorial the hon. Minister of Transport was quoted as saying that Ontario would study any results that might come out of the New York project after it is completed. This is the project of which the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) spoke.

He—Mr. Haskett—cited careless drivers as a major cause of highway deaths and added that Ontario will not select one facet—presumably building a safer car—and exploit it out of all proportion.

Well, I believe, sir, the most successful way to attack the traffic problem is to build safer vehicles; but also to create within the driver the ability to prevent an accident from occurring. Do not let us try to solve the whole problem after the point of agony.

These few suggestions I have made will, I feel, do much to help this Legislature improve the safety drive that has been conducted in this province of Ontario for some time.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of the House that we have with us this morning, students from Vincent Massey collegiate from Windsor-Sandwich in the east gallery.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Speaker, I have for many years been concerned that the aged be able to retire with an income sufficiently large to provide them with the necessities of life and a few of the comforts as well.

Now while I do not feel the Senate has by any means justified its existence, the Senate committee on aging has embodied in its report a proposal that has a great deal of merit. I refer to its proposal to provide a guaranteed annual income of \$1,260 or \$105 per month to all people 65 and over who are single and \$185 per month for married couples.

The federal government would pay the difference between actual income and the guaranteed level. Presumably this assistance would be determined from income tax returns and would do away with the objectionable means test required by the Canada assistance plan.

Now this method, Mr. Speaker, would be a way of helping Canadians over 65 who will not get increased old age benefits from the Canada pension plan.

Of course, I do not think the amount is high enough when a special committee of the Canadian conference on aging states that a single elderly person living alone needs a monthly income of \$138.96 and a retired married couple \$223.82, but it is a great improvement over the present \$75 monthly pension.

With Prime Minister Pearson refusing to raise the pension to \$100 a month, some action must be taken and taken quickly to assist these elderly people to a decent standard of living.

Some federal government members are opposing the committee's proposal because, they say, it would excite squabbles with the provinces over federal responsibility in the field of social welfare.

Let this Ontario Legislature be the first province to set aside this petty type of jurisdictional pride and give the federal government some indication of support and assurance of co-operation towards any means of raising the living standards of Canada's pensioners or let this province initiate a similar type of assistance on its own.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak of a matter of grave concern to the citizens of Hamilton. I find it difficult to understand why Hamilton received such minimal consideration as the terminal point of a rapid railway commuter service by the committee established to make a study of Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation.

Surely it is only common sense to undertake an experiment of this nature by providing commuter service between the two largest potential users, that is, Toronto and Hamilton. I claim that the success of this experiment is jeopardized if Hamilton is not designated as the western terminal point.

I understand that early in their studies the committee consulted railway officials and concluded that heavy freight traffic to Hamilton would prevent bringing the rapid commuter system to Hamilton. On this point I would like to read a portion of the brief presented by the corporation of the city of Hamilton on November 25, 1965:

When the announcement was made that the commuter service would terminate at Burlington, it was pointed out that the passenger service on CNR facilities could not be continued into Hamilton on a frequent schedule because of the very heavy freight traffic on this stretch of track.

We propose a solution to that problem by making the T. H. & B. station in downtown Hamilton the commuter terminal here. There are complete facilities there for such a terminal point, an excellent station, more than adequate trackage, together with facilities for the servicing of trains, the turning around of trains and the overnight storage of trains. Burlington does not have these facilities at the present time and the ending of the commuter service at Burlington would appear to require a substantial capital expenditure which would not be required in Hamilton.

The problem of the usage of track facilities between Burlington and Hamilton does not appear to be as serious as indicated. We realize that there is very heavy freight traffic on this stretch of track, but if the T. H. & B. station were used as the terminal, the pressure on the use of the track would be reduced from that part between Burlington and Hamilton to that part between Burlington and Bayview, from which point trains would proceed over the T. H. & B. track to their station. It is estimated that a train proceeding at high speed would take no more than five minutes to cover the distance between Bayview and Burlington.

Surely it would be possible to schedule commuter trains, at least on an hourly basis, into and out of Hamilton so that they would not interfere with the freight traffic of both the CNR and the CPR, which use the track between Burlington and Bayview. While there should be no need to reroute freight via the CPR line through Guelph junction, consideration might be given to the greater use of the CNR beach strip line, which might ease the pressure between Burlington and Bayview. We have discussed this arrangement with railroad people informally and understand from them that this plan is quite practical and workable as a means of bringing the commuter service into Hamilton.

It is going to involve some study and co-operation by the railway companies, working with your committee. We respectfully suggest that you call together, at an early date, officers of the CNR who will be operating the commuter service, and the T. H. & B., and the CPR, both of whom are involved in the use of the facilities between Bayview and the T. H. & B. station.

I suggest that the railway companies could assist your committee by co-operating

towards this solution. The railways have responsibilities to the city of Hamilton just as our governments have and they are not meeting those responsibilities if they advise your technical committee, in effect, that they are so busy using their trackage for profitable freight business for Hamilton that they cannot provide our citizens with this passenger service.

Mr. Speaker, this portion of the Hamilton brief clearly indicates that the commuter service should extend to Hamilton because it is practical, since arrangements can be made with the railways for the use of tracks—and it is economical, since we have the station and other necessary facilities already available in Hamilton.

While the hon. Minister of Highways is familiar with the location of the T. H. & B. station, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize for the benefit of the other hon. members that this station is located right in the heart of the city of Hamilton and is most convenient, indeed, to our city transportation system.

It is, as well, within walking distance of three major hotels—the nearest is one-and-a-half blocks away, while the other two are within three-and-a-half and four-and-a-half blocks.

To give an idea of the potential customer gain to be made if the service is extended to Hamilton, I would again like to quote from the brief:

A survey made two or three years ago by the Ontario government indicated that there were at that time approximately 12,000 persons moving between Hamilton and Toronto each day.

The location of the commuter terminal at the T. H. & B. station in downtown Hamilton would put the commuter trains in direct contact, through the Hamilton street railway, with 300,000 persons who would not be available at Burlington. There are approximately 8,000 persons on the mountain who might use the commuter service if it was in downtown Hamilton.

Through the Hamilton chamber of commerce, a survey has been made to get some idea of the potential for the commuter service in Hamilton. Many industrialists, business people, lawyers, government people and others have indicated that they would use the commuter service if it is fast and frequent and available in downtown Hamilton. Our city hall people make about 50 trips a month to

Toronto on city business. They drive now, but would use this railway commuter service here. Local ticket agencies estimate that approximately 1,000 persons are moving weekly from Hamilton to Toronto and back to attend sports events, theatre and other entertainment.

I think we all know human nature well enough to realize that these potential railway passengers are not going to drive to Burlington and then use the railway from there to Toronto, and then go through the same transfer procedure on the way back. The service has to be where the people are.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the brief pointed out that the CNR ran a special train to Toronto for the Grey Cup game—not from Burlington—because they wanted 500, 600 or 1,000 people to use it. All the people mentioned, the brief continues:

—are those who would use commuter service from downtown Hamilton to commute to and from Toronto. It is quite likely that a large number of Burlington people, travelling to work in Hamilton, would use the service if it comes right into downtown Hamilton. About 1,200 men from here work at the Ford plant in Oakville. They could be a big market for potential users of the service, twice a day, if it is available conveniently in downtown Hamilton. These people are not going to drive to Burlington, transfer to the trains to Oakville and do the same thing again coming home. They will continue to drive their cars, because it is more convenient.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, a \$50 million redevelopment programme is planned for Hamilton's downtown area and the commuter terminal should be an integral part of this rejuvenated core of the city of Hamilton.

It is my understanding that a reduction in highway traffic between Hamilton and Toronto is very desirable to reduce the safety hazards caused by the present heavy flow. This cannot be accomplished unless Hamilton becomes the western terminal point of the proposed railway commuter service.

Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed over the lack of enforcement of the safety regulations in the construction industry. To illustrate the reasons for my alarm, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to this House some excerpts from the coroner's inquests reports of Metro Toronto.

In August of last year, Richard Buckle was killed: jury's verdict—preventable death. In September of last year, Ronald

Fowler was killed: jury's verdict—preventable death. In July of last year, Vittorio Cashera was killed: jury's verdict—preventable death.

These reports are not pleasant, and I could go on and on. In fact, I could relate cases of preventable deaths of 17 construction workers in Metro alone in 1965. I could also list the 15 preventable deaths of construction workers in 1964. To round out the picture, I could list the 406 workers killed in all of Ontario in all types of employment in 1965.

However, I will not disturb the comfort of the hon. members with any further examples. But I will ask—just how long are these “preventable deaths” going to continue? How long are we to tolerate a situation where men are being killed unnecessarily? The 65 men killed in the construction industry in 1965 in Ontario are ample evidence that the government is doing little to combat the negligence and indifference that reigns in this area.

We have a new Industrial Safety Act in Ontario. The government was pressured after years of waste and delay to finally draft amendments to the antiquated document of 1926. It has done so. It has produced on paper regulations, which, to some extent, cover the safety procedures in the industry. But what is the use of an elaborate legal statement which is not being enforced? What possible effect can this document have if day after day maiming and fatal accidents occur on construction jobs?

I would like to discuss these problems for a moment in relation to the hon. Minister of Labour's (Mr. Rowntree's) statement in the House on January 27 of this year.

Apparently one is supposed to believe that Utopia has been reached. All is so well in the construction area that nothing remains to be done. Why then, do we still read of so many deaths in which the coroner's verdict holds the construction firms responsible? As a result of the amendments passed last year, the maximum penalty for being at fault is now \$5,000. And yet James McNair, chief of the department's safety branch, stated recently that the biggest fine levied against a contractor in Ontario for ignoring a stop-work order because of safety infractions was \$2,600. The biggest levy in Metro Toronto was \$1,000.

These paltry sums are no deterrent. The contractor can actually save money and time by paying the fines. The government has armed itself with a set of regulations that it

is unwilling to enforce. It has chosen the battleground, but it refuses to charge.

The only way to make this Act effective is to enforce it. Why have more construction firms not being fined the maximum amount when they have been found guilty? The fact is that magistrates often are not tough enough when dealing with safety infractions. A father of three fell to his death in August of last year. The contractor was found guilty and hence convicted by a Toronto court on three charges under The Construction Safety Act. Yet this contractor escaped the possibility of a then maximum fine of \$500 personally or \$2,500 as a company, because the magistrate suspended sentence on conviction. Why is the government refusing to see that its legislation is enforced?

The simple fact remains that maximum fines are not being imposed so as to make construction firms realize that accidents are expensive, not only in terms of human life, but in hard cash. Examination of reports will reveal that in every case of accidental death on a construction job the cause was some simple breach of safety regulations. It is up to the government to make it more expensive for them to neglect safety than to enforce it.

I would like to quote from the hon. Minister's remarks of the same day regarding the matter of inspection. The hon. Minister stated that "nearly 250 [inspectors] are now at work across this province." The hon. Minister neglects to clarify whether these people are construction safety inspectors, factory or boiler inspectors. Are these inspectors engaged full time or part time? Are they adequately trained as inspectors? The hon. Minister purports to have clarified the situation across the province but has only succeeded in confusing the facts and clouding this touchy issue.

It is obvious to anyone that the present system of municipal responsibility in construction inspection is chaotic, inefficient and antiquated. More often it is non-existent. Many municipalities have one inspector whose job requires both office and inspection responsibility. Long Branch, New Toronto, Mimico, Swansea and Leaside have only one construction safety inspector each. In all these areas vast amounts of construction are taking place.

Hamilton has only two construction safety inspectors, one of whom is required to spend most of his time in the office.

In Hamilton, at the present time, we have 20 major construction jobs, going on, 300 medium sized jobs and about 500 small construction jobs under way. It is obviously

impossible for these two men, really only one man, to give all these jobs the proper and frequent type of job inspection needed if we are to eliminate preventable accidents. About all that can be done is to investigate situations where complaints have been laid. Complaints are not always laid because workers have found a tendency on the part of the contractor to tell them to go get another job if they don't like things there. This is particularly true, I am told, on smaller jobs.

The enforcement of safety regulations is simply being outpaced by the construction boom. Since the frequency of inspection often means the difference between life and death, the government must bring some efficiency to the system. In addition to efficiency, standardization is needed so present hazardous methods are eliminated. It is obvious that only through the appointment of provincial inspectors can we hope to improve the gross inadequacies of inspection and enforcement.

When an investigation of the death of a Toronto construction worker was conducted, it was found that no safety inspector had visited the construction site for over a month.

Inspectors, when questioned, cannot even state how often an inspection should be carried out. In Metropolitan Toronto, the hon. Minister informs us, there are 14 full-time construction safety inspectors. I repeat, 14 inspectors for an area covering 240 square miles which has one of the highest construction rates in North America. It is inconceivable that so few men can carry out the requirements of the Act with any degree of reliability.

All inspectors should be appointed by the provincial government. They must be trained by The Department of Labour so that the same safety regulations can be enforced across the province. There must be a substantial increase in the number of these inspectors so that one man is not overburdened to the point where his work becomes futile.

Construction safety inspectors appear to be doing the best possible job under the circumstances. But they are fighting a losing battle. The chief of the labour department's construction safety branch is apparently so harassed by the present system that, when asked how often construction sites should be inspected, he refused to answer.

Later, when pressed, he stated "when necessary." Surely these remarks are proof enough that the system is simply not working. Inspections must be carried out on a regular basis, not on a "when necessary"

basis. The whole process of safety inspection must be overhauled, and made a direct responsibility of the provincial government.

Under the present system of municipal inspection, we are often forced to rely upon company-hired safety men. What the government has helped to create, due to its own inadequacies, is a greater system of inadequacies. In reference to this matter, Dr. Elie Cass, one of Toronto's coroners, stated: "It is utterly impossible for any construction safety engineer, who is employed by a company that is the contractor, to do an adequate, unprejudiced, enforcement of The Construction Safety Act."

There should be no reason for relying on anyone other than a provincially trained inspector whose job is solely that of inspection.

I would also like to bring to the attention of this House another matter of injustice which often occurs in the construction industry. There are countless examples of workers who protest the safety of conditions on the job and yet are forced to continue to work on the site. They are threatened with the loss of their job and see no alternative but to follow the orders of the company. These men have little recourse, especially when a construction safety inspector has not been on the site for days. It is the responsibility of the government to actually provide protection for construction workers, not just a set of paper rules.

Unless the government increases the number and frequency of inspection, workers themselves will begin to enforce stop-work orders. This type of action is already taking place. Some of the largest construction projects in the area have been closed down by protesting workmen. I am referring to the action taken by Norman Pike, safety director of the labourers' union, local 183. His attitude and that of his union is logical and reasonable. Why wait for someone to be killed to prove that the job is unsafe?

The government must begin to realize that the Act itself is no solution to increasing problems of the construction worker. The killing and maiming of workers cannot be stopped by legal documents. Only by intensified enforcement of the Act can we hope to prevent the wholesale slaughter of people who are building this province. The government must immediately take as its responsibility the task of developing a system of provincial, rather than municipal, inspection.

It must appoint more inspectors, men who are better trained in the full-time job of inspection.

The government must enforce the fining procedures it has established, so that the price of a man's death is no longer cheaper than the cost of preventing it.

Mr. Speaker: The member for York North (Mr. Mackenzie) insists that I recognize, in the west gallery, a group of ladies from the Markham township Progressive-Conservative ladies association. We welcome them to the Legislature.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in the Throne debate at this late hour. I had something prepared that would keep the House going for four or five hours. Now I find myself with only 35 minutes. So I am just warning you in advance that if some of you want to leave, I might do a better job.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore): It would not be near as much fun.

Mr. Bukator: I am going to touch on a subject this morning that should have been discussed long before this. I want first to confess that I have come short of the mark, as far as a member is concerned, and maybe when I was a member of the Niagara parks commission.

We have had a problem in that area for quite some time, and I believe it bears discussing very thoroughly. I would like to make reference to The Niagara Parks Commission Act, how it came about and when it did come about. I have before me the Revised Statutes of Ontario, 1960, The Niagara Parks Commission Act, and it says:

The commission means The Niagara Parks Commission, a corporation constituted under Queen Victoria Niagara Parks Act 1887, and taking its present name under The Niagara Parks Commission Act 1927.

The Act moves on to define what these men have to do and how they are constituted. Back in 1950, the parks commission had an eight-man board that was appointed by the present government. That is one of the commissions that holds with the government. To the winner goes the spoils. When you have a change of government, you change the commission. And this might be the answer to the problem there, I do not know. If you change the government, you may change that, and this might be the answer to the problem there. I do not know.

If you change the government you may change that commission, and if you do they might be updated to present-day thinking.

However, in 1951 they decided they should have additions to the eight-man board. They decided they would have three added representatives on the board, a member from the county of Lincoln, a member from the county of Welland and a member from the city of Niagara Falls.

I was fortunate enough to be the warden of the county that year and I was appointed to the commission. I felt I would make quite a contribution to that particular group because they were all Conservatives, naturally, and here they had a Liberal member to tell them the other side of the story.

So for six consecutive years I sat on that commission. I discussed their problems with them and I have said in this House before, and I say it to you again to keep the record straight, I thought the chairman, Todd Daley, who was the Minister of Labour at that time, did an excellent job as the chairman of that particular group. I have not changed my mind. He chaired those meetings and he chaired them well.

They had lots of money and they made a lot of money with their concessions. They paid for the whole park system from lake to lake, which is about 35 miles—most of you are acquainted with that, Mr. Speaker. They have an excellent area for the people to enjoy the parks. Much of it is free—swimming is free, park areas are free, and I think this is wonderful.

I do believe they came short of the mark when it comes to recognizing their employees. Let us say in my term of office at that time I might have brought this before them, but I do not want to criticize the commission. I think we should put this in sequence, and I think it starts off with a commission operating a board under the present government.

The government, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) himself appoints the commission—I guess it is the Lieutenant-Governor in council who does. I am sorry, because it is under The Crown Act that it operates. However, they are appointed, and they have often discussed wages while I was at the board meetings.

It is customary for the chairman to bring before you a schedule of wages annually and tell you, or lead you to believe, that this is the policy of the government that sat before the commission. The commission on occasion may ask the odd question, but it is accepted because those men who work under the chairman as commissioners are—his wish is their command. Their command comes from the chairman and the chairman naturally imple-

ments the facts and the business and the wishes of the government. So if we are going to blame anybody for the conditions in that park—I want to make this very clear to you—I believe it is the government that is to blame.

I believe it is the government that is to blame because they have the commission working for them—

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Even though the hon. member used to be on the commission?

Mr. Bukator: That is right. I thought I would preface my remarks by saying I was on that commission for six years. When the chairman brought in the schedule—I would like to make this clear to the hon. Minister of Labour, because apparently it did not get through to him—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): It is difficult sometimes.

Mr. Bukator: Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to that hon. gentleman that when I sat on the commission I was an outsider. I watched the operation. They brought the schedule in by the chairman and the manager and they led us to believe that this is the policy of the government, because these men are civil servants, and it was accepted.

And no matter how much I kicked up my heels, I would not have reached first base anyway, and the hon. Minister knows that as well as I do. I wish he would nod his head just once more. He has the wrong kind of nod.

Mr. Eagleson: Did the hon. member kick up his heels?

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bukator: I have said on occasion, Mr. Speaker, when we discuss the problems of the parks commission in this House, which is a big group, doing a big job, spending many millions of dollars, we left the affairs of the parks commission and the problems right at that board meeting. Any group of directors in any business, whether they argue in caucus or in a board of directors' meeting of a business, they leave their problems within the confines of that building and I think this is good business.

What was said by myself or any other member of that commission, I am sure this House would not want to know. The facts are, these men did not get their pay increases

to the point where they could be recognized as employees being paid the proper amount of money for the work that they do.

Let me say more to you about the parks commission employees. I have had the odd man come to me and say, "I think we ought to get more wages. I do believe we should be paid better and should have better working conditions." And I felt they sure should. I have said, "You put this on paper. Give me a letter to that effect. I will read it into the records of the Legislature." I have often said that to them, but each man operates under a certain amount of fear, wondering, if he did convey this to me, whether or not he would have a job next week. So you can understand the conditions under which they work.

While they belong to the civil service branch 74, paying their dues to an organization—as they have done, according to a clipping I have here, for eight consecutive years—they found that the civil service association could not bargain for them, because this was brought very forcibly to them by the chairman himself. And I think maybe we should clear this point:

The chairman said that we do not have to bargain with you because we operate under a Crown Act.

And so if I can get through these many notes that I have before me here, I might be able to put on the record some of the facts as they were presented to me.

This is the civil service association of Ontario press release pertaining to the Niagara parks commission employees who seek certification under The Labour Relations Act. If the hon. Minister of Labour would listen to this, he might bend a little bit and give these people the treatment they ought to get.

Hon. Mr. Rownree: I have read that press release already.

Mr. Bukator: Have you, Mr. Minister?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): The problem is that the hon. Minister was going to answer a question.

Mr. Bukator: As a matter of fact, if it was read here—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bukator: This is the release:

The Niagara parks commission, under the chairmanship of the Hon. Charles Daley,

operates a series of parks in the Niagara peninsula which are entirely separated from the administrative purpose for other Ontario public parks. The Department of Lands and Forests parks employees are civil servants.

Now you see, this is something I did not know until I read this account. I might say again:

The Department of Lands and Forests parks employees are civil servants. The Niagara parks employees are employed of a Crown agency and thus are excluded from the collective bargaining privileges of Ontario civil and public servants. Since they are employees of a Crown agency, it appears that a union may not become certified as their bargaining agent under The Labour Relations Act. This means that the Niagara parks commission employees, who have belonged to the civil service association of Ontario for the past eight years, now find themselves in a no man's land between civil and private employment. At a recent meeting of the civil service association, representatives were informed by Chairman Daley that the commission would not meet with staff representatives of the association or any union to discuss the salaries and working conditions for the park employees, and further that the commission would not allow employee grievances to be placed before an impartial arbitration board.

Now, there is democracy for you.

Mr. Bryden: And a former Minister of Labour.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bukator: To continue:

At a meeting in the union hall on Wednesday, February 9, 1966, parks employees voted unanimously to seek certification under The Labour Relations Act, through the Civil Service Association of Ontario Incorporated, and completed the necessary application for the purpose. Telegrams of support were read by Mr. David Archer, president of the Ontario federation of labour, representing a half-million trade unionists in Ontario and Mr. Harry Simon, Canadian labour congress of Ontario, both of whom expressed their warm support of Niagara parks commission employees in their struggle for collective bargaining and removal of their present status as second-class citizens.

You can see where they are getting a lot of support from outside groups, believing that they have not had an opportunity to speak for themselves. Now, in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, if I was assured by the hon. Minister of Labour that this condition would be cleared up and that they would somehow find ways for these people to speak for themselves and be able to bargain for their rights, which every human being in this country has a right to, then I would sit down immediately.

There seems to be quite a gap. And I may say that there was a time—just in trying to defend myself—there was a time in that park that if you were employed or had a steady job there, you were exceptionally well treated. You had a good job, because jobs were scarce. But as time went on, other wages were increased and these men's positions were static. So they finally came to the conclusion they want a little better treatment than they are getting.

They have explored every possible avenue. They are decent people and are doing a good job. I do not think management is dissatisfied with their work, but they just are not getting the treatment that employees ought to get. And so I read on—

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order there, I might say—

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member can only ask the member speaking a question.

Mr. Morningstar: I just thought we could correct something that he wanted to know.

Mr. Bryden: Everything he said is correct up to now.

Mr. Morningstar: The Niagara parks commission have no objection to the men forming their own association; the same as the Hydro, the provincial police or any other organization. They have no objection.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) brought in a bill a few years ago that deprived employees of Crown agencies of their basic rights, under the guise of getting federal tax exemptions for Crown agencies.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order. The member for Niagara Falls has the floor.

Mr. Bukator: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I do have. It is good to have an interjection

from the hon. gentleman from Welland. He is now the new member to the parks commission and he is one of those genuine members, because he was appointed by his government to fill a vacancy on the proper commission.

I was picked annually, along with two other colleagues, to fill a position for a period of one year. But this man will be there as long as the government—this particular government—is in the House. And by the fact that he is there, and he is a labourer himself, he has always looked out for the labouring class in his riding. It would have been my opinion that by this time he would have expressed his opinion to the people of that area, and tell them that he was going to look out for their interests, because he is the only labour man on that particular commission.

Mr. Morningstar: I did that at the commission.

Mr. Bukator: He did that at a commission meeting. Now Mr. Speaker, if he did that at the commission meeting, apparently it did not faze them too much because they are still sticking by their oars. They are operating under a Crown Act and they say under no circumstances do we have to deal with you, the employees.

Now we are getting to the crux of the matter, it is about time some action was taken.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: Pardon?

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Bukator: You know there is one thing about the member for Niagara Falls; he never worried whether they were there or not.

I have never worried about the press. I look after the people in my riding, Mr. Minister. That is why I was so fortunate to have defeated one of the parks commission members by well over 4,000 votes in the last election. Thank you for the opportunity to interject that. I would think the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman) by this time would take that smirk off his face and be satisfied that he took quite a horse-whipping for a week here. He is recovering?

Mr. Speaker: Will the member continue with his remarks?

Mr. Bukator: It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Prime Minister stepped into

the situation to remove parks employees from the no man's land in which they find themselves. All we are asking is that the Niagara parks commission bring its personnel administration at least into line with that which the Ontario government provides. There is absolutely no reason why employees of all boards and commissions in the province should not be represented on the Ontario joint council for collective bargaining purposes.

Now, if the hon. Prime Minister, Mr. Speaker, does not hear any more than that, and acts on it, he will be doing a job for us.

For further information it tells us to contact other people. I would like to read another release. It says: "Ex-Minister of Labour denies bargaining rights," and this is the only reason why I brought this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to this House. People should not be denied the opportunity to speak on their own behalf without being fearful of being defeated, or even losing their jobs. So when? It says:

Mr. Charles Daley, ex-Minister of Labour for Ontario and presently chairman of the Niagara parks commission, has refused to discuss salaries and working conditions with the representatives of the civil service association of Ontario. The majority of the Niagara parks employees have belonged to the association for the past eight years. Mr. Daley made it clear at a meeting at Niagara Falls on Friday, January 21st, 1966, that he will not meet union representatives, or allow representatives to be present if and when he agrees to speak with individuals or groups of parks employees.

Mr. Daley stated we will not allow our employees grievance arbitration or any other form of arbitration. We will not hand over our authority to anyone at Queen's Park.

What a comment, if it is true:

We will not hand over our authority to anyone at Queen's Park. We, the commission, will decide what is best for our employees.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Prime Minister was going to make a statement on that. When is he going to do that?

Mr. Bukator: The meeting was called at the request of the civil service association, which is seeking bargaining rights at least equivalent to those which the Ontario government provides for other provincial employees.

Now I do not think this is an unfair request. I started out, Mr. Speaker, to say that I was delinquent possibly in my duties when I sat on that commission for six years. I thought then that our employees had good jobs, because their wages were almost in line. But over the period of years wages have increased throughout the whole area and their wages have not come up to standard.

I spoke about this matter in the House a year ago, and I suppose if you looked into the records, I mention the parks commission annually. And I say again to you that I have the greatest of respect for the hon. Todd Daley. He has done an excellent job in this House. He has had the commission with a fence around it. It operates under a Crown Act and he says in no uncertain terms that no one will tell him how to run that show.

An hon. member: How much are they paid?

Mr. Bryden: Just perquisites, but substantial perquisites.

Mr. Bukator: No, there is no payment there. These men do a good job for very little money. No money at all, as a matter of fact. Sometimes, I suppose, I should get an opportunity to speak to you for three or four hours and give you the whole history of that group of people. They have done an excellent job there. I mentioned that these people here in the province loaned them a little money quite some time ago, to buy the park. They maintain it and maintain it well. A lot of people enjoy those facilities.

But these men finally found themselves in a position where they could not maintain themselves and their families well. They needed more money and they had to turn to someone. They finally came to me. I did not interfere in this particular issue until they came to me by resolution of their particular group. They, the president of that particular association, the employees, and the secretary-treasurer, came to me and said, this is our problem and if you can do anything for us, we would like you to do this and give us a hand. And so I have taken it onto myself to relate the facts to hon. members.

I am not being critical of anyone. The commission has operated under an Act, which keeps from their employees the right to bargain. So they have explored every possible avenue, to get someone to listen to their woes and sorrows.

I am hoping that this morning I can get through to the people on the other side of the

House, and they may take a little time off and speak with the chairman and that commission, which as I said before is governed by this government. They are appointed by this government and they are there at the pleasure of the government. They are there until the government is changed.

I do not criticize anyone. If I did, I would take it out on the hon. Prime Minister himself. He ought to know by now that there is an injustice imposed on these employees.

These men are fearful of speaking to anyone, for fear that they may lose their jobs. But it has come to the point where they now say to their member, we would like you to tell them the story, and that is exactly what I am trying to do.

So I say to you that the Niagara parks employees are employees of the Crown and thus are excluded from certification under The Labour Relations Act.

Mr. Bryden: That was by a double cross from the former Attorney General, now the Minister of Lands and Forests.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Very good. I enjoyed that, Mr. Speaker, although I did not get anything out of it.

Certification requires non-government employers to negotiate with unions. The commission maintains the police force of some 15 men which operates outside of the requirements of The Police Act. I think that originally they were appointed as guards and caretakers. I do not believe that that section of the Act was changed. I still think that they do operate as guards and caretakers with the exception that they wear uniforms and are called "Niagara parks police."

If I am wrong on this issue, I would like someone to correct me. I might say, too, that they are the greatest public relations men that the park has ever hired. They are there to direct and help the tourists in that area and in my opinion, do an excellent job. They are, again, treated the same as the employees. I will read on:

It was primarily the question of the status of the officers of this force which prompted the meeting. Although the officers are required to meet the discipline requirements, etcetera, of The Police Act, they are not afforded the right of representation and arbitration provided in the Act.

Mr. Daley's statement effectively placed all the Niagara parks commission employees in the position inferior to that of

any public or civil service in Ontario, and the parks police in a position inferior to that of any other policeman. Since they are excluded from the protection of The Labour Relations Act, the employees now find themselves completely at the mercy of Mr. Daley and his commission.

Now, let me tell you, they are not a bunch of difficult people to deal with. All they require is some instruction and they require the instruction from this body—the provincial government. I am sure that this situation can be very nicely cleared up.

All employees of the provincial government have the right to expect equal treatment from their employer. The apparently autonomous empires which are allowed to exist in the Ontario service militate against this. Four years ago a select committee of the Legislature composed of members of all political parties—this is good—four years ago, a select committee of the Legislature composed of member of all political parties agreed unanimously that these empires should be abolished.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: No, I would not want to take it that far.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. member's leader (Mr. Thompson) does.

Mr. Bukator: I can speak for myself from time to time. I am sure we have that much freedom in this country.

So far no action has been taken on the select committee's report on the Ontario government. The association will continue to insist on the rights of all Crown employees, including the Niagara parks commission, to effective representation.

Now all they are asking for—it says here—is "effective representation."

Let me tell you some of the circumstances under which some of these employees work. They are called on to work overtime; they are called on to work Sundays; they get a limited time for their lunch—if they are busy, they do not get the usual half-hour. For overtime and the extra days that they work, they get no pay. I hope that you heard that—for overtime and the extra days that they work, they get no pay. They have one privilege; they have the right to take off the time when the manager, the administrator or the man in command tells them that they can have time off for the time that they have worked overtime.

They can have no vacation from the month of May until Labour Day, because they are busy at that time. They pile up a lot of hours and if they cannot take these hours off that they are entitled to within the year in which they piled them up, then it is a lost cause. They take it up in the following year.

Within the last six weeks two of them, in my opinion not the best—they are all good policemen—but two exceptionally good officers from the Niagara parks commission have quit their job because they just did not like the conditions under which they worked and could find something better to do with a little more pay.

I am sure that both of them would have stayed with the commission if they had had an opportunity to be treated as policemen should be, and ought to be, in this day and age.

They, too, have to take off their time. If they work overtime, taking care of traffic in the summer months—and Lord knows the traffic is dense there from early morning until late at night—they are obliged to take off the time that they added to the hours that they work at the discretion of the manager of the park. This does not seem to be quite the thing to do in this day and age.

Mr. Speaker, it says that: "The Niagara parks police department is the lowest paid police department in Welland county."

This would be a wonderful thing for the hon. member for Welland to look into—a county representative for many years, a warden of the county, a member of the commission—

Mr. Morningstar: Mr. Speaker, in regard to these working hours. The hon. member for Niagara Falls was a member of the Niagara parks commission for quite some time when this went on at that time. I have inquired about it and was told that the men wanted it that way.

They used to work that way, as the hon. member knows, with the federal government on the canal and on the seaway authority. When they accumulated their overtime, they took days off. It has been changed now, but this went on for quite a while down there and I was told that they wanted it that way so that they would have days off.

With regard to the police, I would be glad to inquire as to what they do get. There are always people who want work with the Niagara parks commission; they know that they are not pushed around too much and it is nice work there during the summer; they

meet a lot of people and there are always many applications for positions there.

Mr. Bukator: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there are always a lot of people asking for jobs in the park. They have to get a letter from a close friend of a very close friend of a very close friend, and the fact—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Did the hon. member have any trouble?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, as a matter of fact I did. I always use a Conservative friend of mine and say: "You go and talk with him and he will get you on." And it works—on occasion it works!

One plays the game according to the rules of the game of that particular day and so I said: "You ask me, a Liberal member, to recommend you, when there are two people applying for the job?" All things being equal, both men being identical in ability and talent, they would naturally pick the Conservative over the Liberal.

Now to reverse the issue; if we were in there we would have done the same thing and no doubt they did!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Morningstar: Mr. Speaker, in reply to that—when they come to me for work I never ask them what religion they are or what their politics are—I never ask them.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, order! I have to inform the members once again that the member for Niagara Falls is making the speech and we hope to hear from him and not other members.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bukator: Nothing would please me better, Mr. Speaker, than to have what the hon. member for Welland said, that these people are happy to be that way.

I was assured of only one thing; that they would call the president and the secretary of that civil servants 74 branch.

They believed they had some rights. Would he assure me, even after the next meeting—and I know when it is, the second Friday of every month—that he had these men in to discuss these very problems? I do not think that they would want unions; I do not think they they would want anything more than fair play from the commission.

They have not had this privilege and I might ask the hon. member for Welland when he feels like answering me—have they ever had any of the employees before that commission? I know that they were not there in my time.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): He is going to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Mr. Bukator: Have they ever had any of the employees before that commission to discuss the problem, to find out if these people do want it that way? I would think that a man working overtime would want his overtime pay—yes, time and a half, at least—and there is no such thing. They take hour for hour; if they work a Sunday, they will take off a day in the fall or in the winter, no matter what the day happens to be.

This is the treatment that they are getting now. I would like to ask a question of the hon. Prime Minister himself, if he would care to answer it: Does he think that is fair? I am quite sure that he does not.

As I said before I was asked by the president of this particular group finally. After all these years they came to me and said: "Would you bring this to the attention of the House?" I have much more than I can say about it and I feel that I would like to adjourn the debate and continue on with my comments on the Throne debate at the pleasure of this House.

Mr. Bukator moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): **Mr. Speaker**, on Monday, I would like to proceed with the estimates of The Department of Highways and we will see how far we go. But after Highways, the next department to be dealt with will be The Department of Tourism and Information; after that The Department of Lands and Forests and after that, The Department of Labour.

On Monday we will see what the procedure will be on Tuesday, depending upon how much we get done on Monday.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Before the hon. Prime Minister moves the adjournment, **Mr. Speaker**, could he tell us the times will be working next week? Will we have a Monday night sitting?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: We will, **Mr. Speaker**, unless there is some other notice. We will sit Monday, Tuesday and Thursday nights from now until that far-distant date when we prorogue this session.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): **Mr. Speaker**, may I ask the hon. Prime Minister another question relative to what the hon. member for Niagara Falls (**Mr. Bukator**) was talking about?

Some substantial time ago the hon. Prime Minister promised that he would inquire into this matter and advise the House. I wonder if he could give us any indication as to when he will be able to make a statement?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: This is completely out of order but I am quite prepared to answer my hon. friend.

At the time there was a question asked and I gave a fairly detailed statement as to the position of these employees with the Niagara parks commission. What I, in fact, said was that I could not say whether this quotation from **Mr. Daley** was so, because I had not been able to speak to **Mr. Daley** in the period of time available if I were to answer the question that was put on the order paper. He was someplace where I certainly could not reach him.

I will be quite happy to get his confirmation or denial of whether, in fact, he made this statement which was really the undertaking that I gave the House.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.00 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, March 7, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966

CONTENTS

Monday, March 7, 1966

Crown Agency Act, bill to amend, Mr. Bryden, first reading	1191
Fatal Accidents Act, bill to amend, Mr. Sopha, first reading	1193
Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1200
Recess, 6 o'clock	1226

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to welcome as visitors to the Legislature today, students from the following schools: In the east gallery, Burkholder drive public school, Hamilton; and in the west gallery, St. Francis of Assisi's separate school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE CROWN AGENCY ACT

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Crown Agency Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation of the bill, The Crown Agency Act was passed in 1959. At the time, it was represented as being designed to secure exemptions for Crown agencies operated by the Ontario government from federal excise taxes. However, it has been used primarily to deny the right to organize and bargain collectively to employees of such agencies, the most recent example being in connection with the Niagara parks commission.

This bill, if adopted, would change the Act to make it clear that it cannot be used for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker: I beg to inform the House that the Clerk has received from the commissioners of estate bills, reports of the following cases:

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MACKAY

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KELLY

OSGOODE HALL, TORONTO 1
MARCH 2, 1966

RODERICK LEWIS ESQ., QC,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO 2, ONTARIO.

DEAR SIR:

Re: Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting the Tilbury school board.

The undersigned as commissioners of estate bills as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act, RSO 1960, chapter 208, section 57, having had the above noted bill referred to us as commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

Your commissioners appointed February 28 at 2 p.m. to consider the said petition and bill and gave notice thereof to the applicant. On the hearing Mr. G. A. Gallagher, QC, appeared for the petitioner, the Tilbury public school board and submitted the following documents:

Copy of the will of William J. Miller;

Copy of bylaw 2397 of the county of Kent;

Copy of the resolution of the town of Tilbury passed January 24, 1966;

Copy of affidavit of Malcolm A. Derbyshire.

Mr. M. Derbyshire, secretary-treasurer of the Tilbury public school board, **Mr. H. Herman**, a member of the said school board, **Mr. K. B. Rodger**, clerk-treasurer of the town of Tilbury, and **Mr. J. Young**, mayor of the town of Tilbury, were also present at the hearing.

The following are the amendments to the bill we suggest:

Sections 2, 3 and 4 as they appear in the draft bill be deleted and that in their place be substituted the following:

2. The trustees of the William J. Miller Trust shall be those members of the public school board of the area of which the town of Tilbury forms a part, who are from time to time elected as members of such board by the public school ratepayers of the town of Tilbury.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of bylaw 2397 of the county of Kent which came into force on January 1, 1966, establishing an enlarged school area which includes the town of Tilbury, the assets of the William J. Miller Trust are hereby vested in the said trustees of the William J. Miller Trust as herein provided for, and the board of trustees of the public school area created by such bylaw 2397 is authorized and directed to transfer, convey and pay over the said assets to the said trustees of the William J. Miller Trust.

4. All moneys both capital and income coming into the hands of the said trustees

from the assets of the William J. Miller Trust situate in the United States of America set out in the schedule hereto shall become and be in the hands of the said trustees, capital of the said trust.

5. The trustees may postpone the realization of any of the assets in the said schedule set out which are not investments authorized by the laws of Ontario for the investment of trust funds; save as aforesaid all funds of the William J. Miller Trust shall be invested and reinvested in investments authorized by the laws of Ontario for the investment of trust funds.

The first three lines of section 5 shall be deleted and the following substituted:

The net income in the hands of the trustees shall be paid and applied as follows:

A new section shall be inserted between sections 6 and 7:

The trustees are authorized to appoint a secretary-treasurer and to engage the services of agents, accountants, investment counsel, solicitors and such other professional assistants as may be reasonably required in the administration of the trust, and may pay proper remuneration for such services out of the income of the trust fund.

Your commissioners have dealt with the bill on its merits and the form relating thereto. We would point out that the petitioner, the Tilbury public school board, by virtue of the creation of an enlarged public school area, pursuant to The Public Schools Act and by-law 2397 of the county of Kent, ceased to exist on January 1, 1966, and that all its assets became vested in the board of the new enlarged public school area. We have not felt called upon to express any opinion as to the effect on the proposed bill of the facts recited in this paragraph.

We are of the opinion that the intent of the bill is a reasonable one and that the terms of it are proper for carrying into effect its purposes and that it is reasonable that the said bill should pass into law.

The bill duly signed by the commissioners and a copy of the petition for the same together with the documents referred to herein, are accordingly returned herewith.

Yours truly,

(signed)

F. G. MacKay, J.A.

A. Kelly, J.A.

Commissioners of estate bills.

THE SUPREME COURT OF ONTARIO

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE MacKay

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE KELLY

OSGOODE HALL, TORONTO 1
MARCH 1, 1966

RODERICK LEWIS ESQ., QC,
CLERK OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY,
PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS,
TORONTO 2, ONTARIO.

DEAR SIR:

Re: Bill No. Pr28, An Act respecting the estate of William A. Dickieson.

The undersigned as commissioners of estate bills as provided by The Legislative Assembly Act, RSO 1960, chapter 208, section 57, having had the above-noted bill referred to us as commissioners, now beg to report thereon.

Your commissioners appointed March 1 at 10 a.m. to consider the said petition and bill and gave notice thereof to the applicant. On the hearing, Mr. Dingwall, QC, appeared for the petitioners and submitted the following documents:

Petition of Fanny Eliza Dickieson and Viola Belle Gray;

Certified copy of letters probate of the last will and testament of William A. Dickieson;

Affidavit of Ralph Bowles Newell;

Affidavit of Viola Belle Gray;

Duplicate original copy of agreement dated June 3, 1965, between Fanny Eliza Dickieson, Albert E. Gray, Viola Belle Gray, Edward Gray, Muriel King, Gordon Gray, Walter Gray, Phyllis Girling, Annadale Gray and Glen Gray.

Mr. S. M. McBride, QC, appeared on behalf of the official guardian representing the infants and unborn children who have or may have an interest in the estate of the testator. Mr. McBride opposed the passage of the bill.

From the documents submitted and the representation made by the above-named solicitors it appears William A. Dickieson, late of the township of Eramosa, in the county of Wellington, died on October 17, 1937, having first made his last will and testament. The main asset of the estate was a farm. In respect of this farm he left a life interest to his widow and after her death a life interest to his daughter and provided that on the daughter's death the farm be sold and the proceeds thereof together with the residue of the estate be divided among the children of the said daughter with a provision that if any of her children died in her lifetime the children of such child were to take the parent's share.

The widow, Fanny Eliza Dickieson, together with the daughter Viola Belle Gray and the daughter's husband have continued since the date of the death of the said testator to reside on and operate the said farm.

The effect of the said Bill No. Pr28 would be to defeat the provisions of the will made by the testator with respect to his estate and to vest the title to the farm in the daughter Viola Belle Gray and her husband Albert E. Gray as joint tenants. It would divest the interest of the testator's widow in the estate including her right of encroachment on capital and it would extinguish the interest of the grandchildren of the testator and their issue in the estate.

It is alleged that the farm is in disrepair. There are available other procedures whereby there can be accomplished the object of raising money for the repair of the farm without resorting to the complete destruction of the intention of the testator as to the disposition of his estate as set out in his will.

We recommend in the strongest terms that this bill do not pass into law.

The bill duly signed by the commissioners and a copy of the petition for the same together with the documents referred to herein, are accordingly returned herewith.

Yours truly,

(signed)

F. G. MacKAY, JA.

A. KELLY, JA.

Commissioners of estate bills.

It was therefore ordered that Bill No. Pr7 together with the report of the commissioners of estate bills thereon, be referred to the standing committee on private bills.

THE FATAL ACCIDENTS ACT

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Fatal Accidents Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Mr. Speaker, in an action brought under The Fatal Accidents Act, the amount that may be awarded for necessary expenses incurred for the burial of the deceased is at present \$300. This bill, in the light of costs of funeral expenses, would raise the amount to an amount not exceeding \$800.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have a question of the hon. Minister

of Health (Mr. Dymond), notice of which has been given.

In light of the study by Dr. Harding Le Riche, would the hon. Minister inform this House what steps have been taken to correct the serious problem existing in our hospitals? Would the hon. Minister assure this House that the Ontario hospital services commission will check all hospitals in Ontario for similar inadequacies as stated in the study?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, I have not yet had the opportunity to read this study by Dr. Le Riche. It is a book of 341 pages. It only came into my hands a few days ago. It is an extensive and detailed study which will require a good deal of careful reading and consideration. However, in the light of the report in the newspaper this morning, I have already asked the OHSC to undertake a check of all hospitals in Ontario as quickly and as thoroughly as possible.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to direct a question to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree). It is actually in three parts.

1. Has the Ontario athletics commissioner authorized the staging in Toronto of a boxing match, purported to be for the heavyweight championship of the world, between Cassius Clay and Ernie Terrell?

2. If so, has the commissioner inquired into: (a) the bona fides of all those connected with the promotion of this match, including Main Bouts Inc. of New York; (b) alleged underworld connections of Terrell; (c) the reasons why authorization has been refused in several other jurisdictions?

3. What was the nature of the inquiry and what were the findings? In particular, why were the reasons for refusal of authorization in other jurisdictions not considered to be applicable here?

Mr. Speaker: As the member for Etobicoke (Mr. Braithwaite) has a similar type of question, I wonder if he would read it and the Minister would perhaps answer both questions together?

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have a two-part question for the hon. Minister.

First, would the hon. Minister inform this House of the nature of the representation, if any, that has been made to the government respecting the proposal that the heavyweight championship fight between Mr. Clay and Mr. Terrell be held in Toronto?

Second, is the hon. Minister now in a position to inform the House whether consideration is being given to refuse the offices of this city to such a pugilistic encounter in view of all the circumstances surrounding professional boxing and the character of the personalities involved?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I think I could answer both of these questions by giving some information of the House.

The present state of the matter is this: An application has been received by the Ontario athletic commissioner, Mr. McKenzie, to promote a fight between Messrs. Clay and Terrell on March 29 at Maple Leaf Gardens. The application has been made by an Ontario promoter, Mr. Frank Tunney. No decision has been made on this matter as yet.

I have asked Mr. McKenzie, with whom I met this morning—we went over certain aspects of this encounter—to get some additional information for me, and pending receipt of that information, no decision will be made.

Now, since no decision has been made, some of the questions are obviously inappropriate.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Maybe premature but not inappropriate.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: At this time, yes. I take it, however, that both of the sponsors of the questions are agreed in that they do not approve the encounter. Am I right in my conclusions?

Mr. Bryden: I do not think—

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I will make up my mind when I get all of the information before me.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to repeat the second part of my question. I realize the hon. Minister had a lot of questions before him and it was hard to keep track of them all. I do not think it is necessarily implicit in my question that I do not approve of the encounter, but I am interested in an explanation of it. I am particularly interested in the matter of the inquiries that are being conducted. I take it inquiries are still in process. Are inquiries into the matters referred to in my question being undertaken, as well as other matters?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Yes.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question in connection with the same

matter. There are two of them: First of all, would the hon. Minister assure the House that these questions will be answered if a decision is arrived at by his department? Second, if the hon. Minister does arrive at a decision which is in the affirmative, will he be in a position to assure this House that there will be no political repercussions as a result of the fight?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Quite frankly, I am unable to give that assurance.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). Is he aware of the study now being conducted by the New York state department of insurance and the automobile insurance industry designed to determine the accident rates of different makes and models of cars? If so, is the hon. Minister contemplating a similar study in Ontario?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I became aware that such a study was contemplated simply from the note that I read in the press. Officials of my department were then in touch with The Department of Insurance in the state of New York and we learned that such a study is in contemplation. But apparently the scope, the nature and the extent of the study has not yet been determined.

It is suggested, for instance, that the study is mainly concerned with the premiums to be charged for insurance on the small car or the large car, not so much in the field of accident and injury but with the cost of repair of the large car as against the small car, and so on.

The second part of the question, sir, inquires whether the Minister is contemplating a similar study in Ontario. I would say that at this time that I think it is too early to make a decision on that. We certainly will follow the study that is apparently getting under way in New York.

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman). What action is the hon. Minister taking following the inquest verdict last Friday in Kitchener respecting the death of Anatol Chomenko, a former inmate of the Guelph reformatory?

Mr. Speaker: Would the leader of the Opposition please read his question as it is of a similar nature?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member for Yorkview; as I have not yet received a copy of the report of the

coroner's inquest I am not in a position to comment on the inquest. However, when it is received it will be studied in detail and given the very serious consideration which is due to findings of a coroner's inquest.

After that I shall, of course, advise this House on the results of our study and any action taken as a result of the said report.

I take it, Mr. Speaker, that that satisfies the hon. leader of the Opposition in answer to his question?

Mr. Young: Mr. Speaker, could I ask if the hon. Minister will make copies of the transcript of the evidence available not to all members, but available so that members can study it?

Hon. Mr. Crossman: Mr. Speaker, I am not too sure whether I have the right to do this; it might come under the jurisdiction of the hon. Attorney General, but insofar as it is within my jurisdiction, I would be pleased to do so.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), notice of which has been given. It is a three-part question:

1. Would the hon. Minister inform this House whether there was any misuse of the powers of expropriation in the treatment of Napier Place homeowners and, if so, what steps are being taken to correct this situation?

2. What steps is the Ontario housing corporation taking to relocate the homeowners affected by the expropriation?

3. What consideration is being given to the suggestion of City Development Commissioner Walter Manthorpe of the 20-year programme?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, in answering the hon. member's question, the reply to question 1 is:

The expropriation of properties in connection with a redevelopment scheme is the responsibility of the municipality, in this case the city of Toronto. At this stage the federal and provincial levels of government, as represented by central mortgage and housing corporation and The Department of Municipal Affairs, are partners in the scheme to the extent of sharing in the costs of acquisition—50 per cent federal and 25 per cent provincial. The expropriation of properties in Napier place is being handled by the real estate department of the city of Toronto in conformity with The Expropriation Act.

A subcommittee of the urban renewal partnership, with representatives from the city, Metro, central mortgage and housing corporation and the province, review and approve all appraisals carried out by the real estate department before offers are made. In addition, the city uses independent appraisers to check the appraisals carried out by staff of the city's real estate department.

In answer to question 2: The Ontario housing corporation will fulfil the same role in Napier place as in previous redevelopment areas such as Alexandra park.

The city has a relocation office in the redevelopment area for the purpose of assisting residents to find alternate accommodation. Homeowners who are interested in purchasing elsewhere are provided with listings of property for sale, and those who wish to rent are given leads to private rental accommodation or are provided with application forms to apply for public housing. These applications are then processed through the Metropolitan Toronto central housing registry to whichever agency, either Ontario housing corporation or the housing authority of Toronto, is able to furnish accommodation.

Some applications have been received by the Ontario housing corporation in respect of the Napier place scheme, but no families have yet been provided with new accommodation due to the fact that their properties have not yet been acquired by the city. However, receiving these applications in advance does enable the Ontario housing corporation to schedule its properties for this purpose.

And answering question 3, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the suggestion by City Development Commissioner Walter Manthorpe, was that the urban renewal schemes should not be carried out on an *ad hoc* basis, but rather should be planned on a long-term basis, taking into account all of the factors involved. I am advised that city council has already asked Mr. Manthorpe to report on the ramifications of a long-term urban renewal programme in relation to the city's proposed official plan.

The planning and implementation of urban renewal schemes is, of course, the responsibility of the municipal level of government, operating in conjunction with The Department of Municipal Affairs and central mortgage and housing corporation. The role of Ontario housing corporation is that of providing accommodation for those families who are displaced as a result of the urban renewal scheme. However, I certainly support Mr. Manthorpe's suggestion that the process of redeveloping the downtown core of our cities

should follow a pattern laid down well in advance, and which takes into account not only the physical regeneration of blighted areas, but also the sociological and psychological factors inherent in the unavoidable relocation of the residents of these areas.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister accept a supplementary question?

In connection with part I, I wonder if the hon. Minister would be good enough to tell the House whether his department has made any independent investigation or inquiry into the procedures used in the Napier place scheme?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I cannot answer that at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe so. I believe we felt it was in the hands of the proper authorities, but I will make further inquiries and let the hon. member know.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), notice of which has been given.

The question is as follows: On what grounds were 14 men of the 20-man Queen's Park paint shop staff dismissed last Friday?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the grounds for dismissal is shortage of work.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Health a copy of which was sent to him.

Could the hon. Minister inform this House as to the steps being taken to correct the impression being given by the advertising campaign for the payment of the whole of a doctor's bill rather than 90 per cent of it?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, to be sure that the public is fully and accurately informed about OMSIP, a pamphlet—a copy of which was placed on the desk of each hon. member of this House—containing full details has been available at all chartered banks in Ontario since the beginning of March, and this pamphlet is now being distributed to every household in the province. This will give everyone an opportunity to study the plan in detail and to see exactly what it provides and what it pays.

It will be appreciated that one-minute announcements on radio and television cannot carry all the details of the plan. Indeed, it is our belief and our advice that to do so

would be impracticable and result in confusion among listeners. Therefore, all OMSIP advertising refers to the pamphlet and its availability.

However, as we have striven for clarity in OMSIP advertising, the radio and television commercials—as I understand from those I have listened to—do say, “will help pay doctors' bills,” and we are still confident that 90 per cent payment, as provided in our bill, will be accepted by most physicians as payment in full.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister accept a supplementary question? Is he aware of the statement made by the Ontario medical association which criticized the Ontario medical services insurance plan for implying that it will pay the whole of the doctor's bill instead of the 90 per cent? And this is a statement that has been made officially and has been published in the local papers.

Hon. Mr. Dymond: I am aware, Mr. Speaker, insofar as one can be made aware by reading newspaper reports.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), notice of which has been given.

Could the hon. Minister give the House a report on today's meeting between himself, his department officials and the farm marketing representatives and other farm groups?

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Does the hon. member want to ask the other question as well?

Mr. Gaunt: I have another question. Has the hon. Minister considered the possibility of holding an open hearing before considering trusteeship or dissolution as it relates to any of the marketing boards?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the questions of the hon. member, the last one was given to me first and that was why I thought perhaps he wanted it done that way.

My reply would be that consideration has been given to this. As far as I am concerned, each case that affects each particular marketing board is really different in many of its aspects. As far as I would be concerned, I do not think there would be any useful purpose served in forming such a hearing or holding of such public hearings.

In the second place, with regard to a report on this morning's meeting, I feel that the

meeting was called as a closed meeting. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that a question was given me last week in which it was asked whether or not the members of the Legislature were entitled to attend the meeting. At that time I suggested that inasmuch as the meeting was a closed meeting between The Department of Agriculture officials, the farm products marketing board and the commodity boards of all the marketing plans in the province of Ontario, it should be kept as a closed meeting and the press not admitted. I felt that this should apply to other segments of society as well.

This was adhered to, with one exception this morning, as it pertains to the hon. members of the Legislature. I want to say how much I appreciate the respect which the statement that I had made last week was given by all hon. members of the House. I am sure there were many who would like to have been there, as would members of the press. All of them respected my statement with the exception of the hon. leader of the Socialist party, the hon. member for York South who was there at the meeting this morning. I welcomed him there but I said that I felt an issue as important as this and affecting marketing boards generally should be beyond the realm of political partisanship and I maintain that today.

Mr. MacDonald: When the hon. Minister is in trouble, he does not want a partisan discussion.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: We will have all the discussion that the hon. member wants to have before this is over, if he wants to start, do not think I am not able to talk to him about it right down the line.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that if I were to make a report of the meeting this morning—as the hon. member requests—as much as I know he and others are interested in it, I think we might as well have said that it would be an open meeting and we would have had the press and everyone there to start with. I felt that we should respect the opinions of members of commodity boards who had said to me, “There are things we would like to say to you that we don’t want said before the press.” This is why I feel the meeting should have been kept that way and why I feel it is that way now.

With your permission, I would prefer not to make any other report than this on the meeting.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, the hon. Minister as usual has not

given a complete statement of what happened this morning. For the moment I just draw the attention of the House to two things. He refrained from inviting the farmers’ union and other organizations; they were there and admitted. He refrained from inviting the board that has been dismissed without any opportunity for a hearing; they were there, and permitted to stay. I acknowledge I was there and I will have more to say about it later.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: May I just say a word about this as well, if I can. The hon. member has suggested here that we refrained from inviting the former board members. A presentation was made to me over the weekend on behalf of the former bean board members, asking whether they were invited to the commodity board meeting this morning. I simply had to say on behalf of the farm products marketing board of Ontario that I felt the board, inasmuch as it was dissolved, was no longer a board and simply did not exist.

That was the reason why an invitation was not extended, but as far as I was concerned, if they were there and presented themselves, they would certainly be given the opportunity to sit in on the meeting. We had nothing to hide whatever. As far as we were concerned, it was a perfectly free and open discussion.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Was the hon. member for York South at the meeting?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: He was in the meeting this morning and I understand challenged the secretary of the farm products marketing board to have him thrown out.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: I consider the member’s question has been asked and an answer given. There have been a couple of points of order and I would think perhaps the matter should be closed.

Mr. MacDonald: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I respect your getting up, but not until after you got to your feet was the comment made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture that I challenged the secretary of the—

Mr. Speaker: I would say the member will have an opportunity at a later date to answer the Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have the opportunity, in view

of that completely malicious misinformation, to correct it right now.

Mr. Speaker: I would inform the member for York South that I did not hear the Minister's remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the comment of the hon. Minister of Agriculture was that I had challenged the secretary of the farm products marketing board and invited him to have me thrown out. I suggest that now is the time, if I have any objection to that, to make it. Have I your permission, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. Speaker: If you can do it by a few words—I am not going to allow a speech.

Mr. MacDonald: I had no intention of getting up again, Mr. Speaker, until we had this kind of characteristic outburst, which has no relation—

Mr. Speaker: Order! For the present I am going to consider the question closed. It can be raised tomorrow in another question or the member can reply before the orders of the day, if he wishes. The member can reply tomorrow in a statement if he wishes on a point of privilege to correct something that the Minister has said. I did not hear what the Minister said.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, many times earlier you said that if somebody got up and made a misstatement of fact in the House that the time to correct it was on a point of order at the time, and that is what I am seeking to do.

Mr. Speaker: I will stick to what I have already said now, since I did not hear the statement that the Minister supposedly made. I would like to read it first to see if he did make such a statement and then I will allow the member to correct it.

Mr. MacDonald: I trust that it was caught by *Hansard* then, because everybody else heard it, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted a supplementary question?

Mr. Speaker: I recognize the member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman).

Mr. Gaunt: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to my original question.

Mr. Speaker: If the Minister cares to answer it.

Mr. Gaunt: My supplementary question is this, Mr. Speaker, through you to the hon. Minister of Agriculture—

Mr. Speaker: The proper way is that the member should ask the Minister if he will answer a supplementary question.

Mr. Gaunt: Will the hon. Minister answer a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I will have to know what the question is, or how can I answer it?

Mr. Gaunt: My question is this, Mr. Speaker.

If some decisions were made this morning, will they eventually be made public; not only the decisions but the goings on at the meeting and the various expressions of opinion that were given at that time?

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, I suggested earlier that I felt the affairs of the meeting should remain closed. I fancy that if there are things that come out from the meeting from time to time they will be revealed in the fullness of time. But as far as I am concerned, I have no other report to make at this time to the House.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Health, a copy of which was submitted to his office a little too late to receive an answer on Friday.

In view of the press reports that three boys aged 10, 11 and 13 were ordered held in Toronto juvenile and family court detention home for observation and treatment after being caught sniffing model aeroplane glue, does the hon. Minister feel that there are dangerous health hazards from the sniffing of the aeroplane glue, and if so what measures is the hon. Minister contemplating to restrict the sale of this glue to juveniles?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, glue sniffing may result in a hazard to health depending upon the nature of the solvent mixture inhaled. There have fortunately been no reports of serious health effects in persons from this source in Ontario as yet.

Control by legislation is very difficult, nevertheless. Legislation has been introduced in New York city, California and elsewhere as the result of public pressure, but it is almost impossible to enforce. If hobby material, such as aeroplane glue, were removed from sale, there would still be plenty of access to other similar solvents, for example, nail polish

remover, lighter fluid, barbecue fluid, gasoline, and so on.

The only possibility seems to lie in the education of the general public, and the department is looking very closely at this possibility, with the division of maternal and child health in our own department, the addiction research foundation, and the social planning council of Metropolitan Toronto. In addition to this, we are in communication with The Department of Education authorities and with medical officers of health to the end that we may be able to develop a meaningful programme of education.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister. I have a second question.

In view of press reports that asbestos dust is a health hazard linked to cancer, what steps is the hon. Minister taking to assure the House that there is no health hazard to the school children of Ontario in the use of asbestos in their art work?

Hon. Mr. Dymond: Mr. Speaker, from the information that has been made immediately available to the department, the opportunity for children in our province to come in contact with asbestos in their school work appears to be very limited, and would not constitute a hazard to health.

Its use in some schools as a filler in making plaster mouldings several times a year, does not present a significant dust exposure since the material is used in a wet state. We are informed that in this province it is not used in place of sand in children's sand boxes.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, does the hon. Minister think it is proper that he should, in this House, indicate to young children what are the alternatives to aeroplane glue?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I have a question myself, but also one on behalf of the hon. member for Wentworth East (Mr. Gisbourn), who was not able to get to the House for this portion of the sitting, Mr. Speaker. A question to the hon. Minister of Labour, notice of which was given, on behalf of the hon. member for Wentworth East.

Does the hon. Minister plan to provide any special facilities to the 600 workers laid off when the Studebaker plant closed down, to assist with their re-employment, retraining and relocating?

Mr. Speaker: I wonder if the member for Timiskaming would have his question—

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Taylor), I have a question of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall).

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. This is about the Studebaker of Canada Limited, and goes to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development. The other is to the hon. Minister of Labour. I am sorry.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, in respect to the Studebaker matter, I, along with others, heard of the official announcement late on Friday afternoon last, and as a matter of record it is a matter which I think most people will regret that it ever had to take place. However, since that time we have been in touch with various authorities and it would be the policy of our department to attempt assistance in two areas. First, with respect to co-operation with the national employment service in the replacement of those people whose jobs have been terminated; and second, to provide retraining facilities wherever it will be helpful.

I would like to assure the House of our concern with respect to the matter.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan). Will the hon. Provincial Treasurer comment on the dispute between the harness racers and the jockey club at Greenwood racetrack, particularly if he can help to solve it?

Hon. J. N. Allan (Provincial Treasurer): Mr. Speaker, I may inform the hon. member that I understand discussion is being carried on between the Ontario harness horse association and the Ontario jockey club, with respect to purse moneys, but I have no information regarding the details of such discussion.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Labour, proper notice of which has been given.

Would the hon. Minister inform this House whether he has made any contact with Elmer Brown, president of international typographical union, on his statement to his willingness to come to Toronto to negotiate a settlement of the newspaper strike?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, my comment about this reference to a newspaper report is as follows: As the hon. member for Etobicoke must be aware, in April of last

year when negotiations were underway between the Toronto publishers and the ITU, I asked Mr. Brown to meet with me at the earliest opportunity, to discuss the international union's involvement in this dispute. The meeting was set for May 7 of 1965. I was subsequently informed that Mr. Brown was unable to attend and I have had no direct communication from him since. However, my invitation to discuss this particular dispute with Mr. Brown has remained open since that time. In fact, some months ago, Mr. Robert McCormack, the president of the Toronto local of the ITU, was asked through my office to reaffirm my invitation to Mr. Elmer Brown to come and meet with me on the matter. I have received no word whatever from Mr. McCormack with respect to his success or otherwise in conveying this invitation.

Now, apart from that, I have been in close and frequent touch with the international union's position through various offices, which include the Ontario federation of labour and the Canadian labour congress.

Mr. Speaker: The member for Timiskaming's question.

Mr. Farquhar: It has been answered.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order; House in committee of supply. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

On vote 802:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, under vote 802, I assume I could ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) if he has estimated a tender price index for the coming year, and whether it will be substantially higher or not, than the preceding year. This would be arrived at electronically.

Mr. Chairman: I think this is just the rental of equipment. Is this what you wanted to know?

Mr. Newman: No. I wanted to know, whether by means of this electronic equipment that the hon. Minister does have, he has been able to forecast the price index for the coming construction year?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I would say that should properly come up under vote 807. We do not, as the hon. member supposes, do this electronically. We work very closely with the Dominion bureau of statistics and arrive at our costs indices in this manner.

Mr. Newman: I will ask it then, under 807.

Vote 802 agreed to.

On vote 803:

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, there is an issue that I want to raise on this vote having to do with the head office operations.

Some months ago, the new research director of the New Democratic caucus wrote to the head office—to one of the officials in the department, in the first instance to Mr. D. A. Crosbie, director of the legal branch of the department, with regard to certain information that we wished. It is rather appropriate, I think, Mr. Chairman, that we should have a discussion of this issue after the earlier exchange I had with the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart), because it has to do with to what extent public business is really public, or to what extent it can be retained as the exclusive prerogative and property of the government.

I want to put these two letters on the record, and then I have some comments to make because I suggest that this is a matter of concern, specifically in this instance to The Department of Highways. But it has a broader application to the whole government. When our research director wrote to Mr. Crosbie, he did not get a reply. Interestingly enough, the reply came back from the hon. Minister himself. If I may just interject here, I am curious to know what would have happened if I, as a member of the Legislature, had sought this information, as, indeed, I have been seeking it down through the years, and I must add, Mr. Chairman, usually getting co-operation from the various departments including The Department of Highways, in the replies. But in this instance, the hon. Minister apparently felt that he was affronted because the information was sought by the research director of an Opposition caucus.

So the reply that he got from the hon. Minister was as follows:

I would point out that there is a well-defined procedure for obtaining the information which you requested, and I feel for very good and sufficient reasons that it should be strictly adhered to, because to

do otherwise would, in fact, be to usurp the function of the Legislature. I have reference, of course, to the use of the order paper and the device of questions before the orders of the day, in which manner answers to questions of this nature can be made available to the entire legislative assembly.

For this reason, I am not disposed to provide this information in the manner in which you have requested it, and would suggest that the procedural methods I have referred to, be followed.

That letter is undated. It was in reply to a letter of August 24, so I presume it was early in September or the latter part of August.

Mr. Chairman: I assume this is about the maintenance of roads and construction, and co-operation with the municipalities—

Mr. MacDonald: It was with regard to information sought from the head office of The Department of Highways. Vote 803—it is a matter of administration, yes.

On December 10, or prior to December 10, some further information was sought and this time the letter went to the Deputy Minister. Once again, the letter was short-circuited and the reply came back from the hon. Minister. He must be a very busy man—he answers all the correspondence for his department.

The reply in this instance was as follows:

In this instance, I would refer you to my order of a few months ago, at which time I stated that there is a well-defined procedure for obtaining this type of information, and I am of the same opinion and feel that the procedure should be strictly adhered to.

As in my previous letter, my reference was to the use of the order paper or the device of questions before the orders of the day, in which manner answers to questions of this nature can be made available to the entire legislative assembly.

Accordingly, I must deny your request for the information you sought from the Deputy Minister and, indeed, I have given instructions that all matters of this nature are to be referred to myself.

That was in December, Mr. Chairman.

The interesting thing is that the hon. Minister of Highways brings up a great principle here. To reply to this information, the hon. Minister intimated, would be usurping the functions of the Legislature. I

would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a fallacious argument. If the Legislature is sitting and members of the Legislature are seeking information I would agree with the hon. Minister that putting questions on the order paper—particularly if we could get replies in something less than six or eight weeks—or putting questions before the orders of the day, is the procedure for seeking public information.

But surely, Mr. Chairman, the proposition that when a member of the Legislature is seeking public information—information which the hon. Minister himself concedes is public—and seeks it sometime between the sessions, he is entitled to get an immediate reply. Alternatively, if you have research directors in Opposition caucuses who seek that information, in effect it is coming from a member of the Legislature and they are entitled to get that information.

By not giving it, all that the hon. Minister is doing is frustrating the work of the Opposition. Public moneys have finally been made available in this House so that Opposition groups can do a job in terms of gathering public information and analyzing that information and then coming into this House with it, so that they can do a more substantive and perhaps more incisive examination of what this government is doing.

But the hon. Minister is, in effect, saying that he will not give us this information and for reasons that I will come to in a moment. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister does not say that this is not public information. He concedes that sometime he will have to do it, but he is just a little huffy about it: "I will do it in my good time. Ask it in the Legislature."

If it happens to be the kind of question for the order paper, it will appear there. If hon. members care to look they will find that one of the questions submitted to the hon. Minister, provoked this correspondence. It is question No. 1, which has been on the order paper since this House opened on January 25, and we are still waiting for the reply.

This raises sharply, once again, the great unbalance between that side of the House and this side of the House in terms of access to public information. I will concede to this government that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Roberts), who takes a much more rational approach to this kind of thing, for the first time in this Legislature acknowledged that even though theoretically we on this side of the House have access to the civil service as much as the government side of the

House, in practice there are obvious limitations upon what civil servants can do in terms of providing information to an Opposition, which may ultimately be used in attacking the government.

Because of that unbalance, the hon. Prime Minister and the government have seen fit to make public moneys available so that we can have a staff to do that kind of a job. Having made public moneys available, this hon. Minister, in effect, now is going to frustrate their efforts to do a job effectively by saying that they seek information between sessions and that they are not going to get it. We have to wait until the procedures of the House become operative when the House is called to order; or when we put it on the order paper, then we have to wait another six or eight weeks, as we have waited in this instance.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): You don't want to hear the answers at all; you just want to ask the questions. You did not listen to the answer to the question you asked the Provincial Treasurer. While he was answering you turned around talking to one of your colleagues.

Mr. MacDonald: Oh, I got it! I got it, I make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman. Our little running interference back here—

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, this raises the whole question of the concept of secrecy in public administration. This is important enough because the hon. Prime Minister has said many times that they have nothing to hide. Says he, "I object to the Liberals getting up and saying that we are trying to hide things." And he becomes quite indignant about it. "We will make the information available."

I wish the hon. Prime Minister was here. I hope that he will read this debate afterwards, because the fact of the matter is that here at least is one hon. Minister who will not make the information available, except in his own good time, and the delay can have no result but to deny the public the information they want and to frustrate the effective operation of the Opposition.

This is important enough as a principle, in application to the hon. Minister of Agriculture who wants to hold secret meetings when he has touchy issues to discuss, or to the hon. Minister of Highways at the moment.

I want to put on record some comments of

a person in the academic world who is now studying the whole proposition of the secrecy of public administration. It happens to be Professor Donald C. Rowat of Carleton University, and his article can be found in the *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science* for November, 1965. What he said was this, Mr. Chairman:

There is so much evidence of the undesirable effects of administrative secrecy that I believe the time has come to question the entire tradition. After all, it is based on the earlier system of Royal rule in Britain that is unsuited to a modern democracy, in which the people must be fully informed about the activities of their government.

Has not this tradition been preserved by politicians and officials mainly for their own convenience? It is important to realize that any large measure of government secrecy is incompatible with democracy. Secrecy leads to distrust and fear on the part of the public. The people cannot control their government without knowledge. Yet the means available to the Opposition parties and to the public for obtaining information about administrative activities are woefully inadequate. Opposition MP's, —or MPP's in the instance of a provincial Legislature—usually have to dig vital information out of the reluctant government.

And we have a perfect example of it right now.

Often they do not know what to ask for because they do not know what is really going on behind the clouds surrounding Mount Olympus. Our system is based on the premise that we must trust the government and hope for the best. The problem is that handouts tend to become a substitute for access.

If the information service is emphasized —favourable public relations at the expense of factual information—we get secrecy by indirection. We are told only what the government wants us to know and a paper curtain of secrecy is drawn around the rest.

And then Professor Rowat in his paper goes on to point out that in Sweden, their tradition is absolutely the reverse of this. The important point is that it is principle that it is reversed.

Whereas in most countries all documents are secret unless a specific authority is given for their release, in Sweden they are all public unless legal provision has been made for them to be withheld.

And then it goes on to spell out, in the constitution, those things in relation to military matters and other matters that might be regarded, quite rightly, as meriting some secrecy that can, under the constitution, be secret.

And he concludes as follows:

As for the likelihood of revelations in government documents being embarrassing to senior officials or politicians, the answer is that he who accepts public responsibility can expect to be criticized. It is well recognized that public life has no room for personal sensitivity. Besides, officials are likely to give more considered judgments if they know that their record will be open to the public view.

An important benefit of open access is the participation of the public in the formation of policy. The public has a chance to criticize and discuss proposals, before decisions are made. One of the disabilities of our present system is that the government has no easy way of testing public reaction to a measure before it is presented in almost final form to Parliament, hence the government must resort to Royal commissions to stir up interest and to form public opinion on proposed measures. There is no doubt the Cabinet responsibility would work somewhat differently under the principle of publicity. But, this may be all to the good; it may make the Cabinet more responsible.

Under a system of administrative publicity, on the other hand, the government is constantly exposed to criticism and must move much more carefully. Since it will receive advice and suggestions from a much wider public, it will act much more wisely. And Ministers must act with forthright propriety or their sins will be quickly discovered.

Under our present system the government's monopoly of information means that the Opposition are unable to find the soft spots. Since knowledge is power, governments hide reports prepared by senior officials or other experts and reveal them only if it is to their advantage. Under the publicity rule this is not possible.

Now, I grant you that I am moving off into a solution of this in broader terms—in terms of challenging the whole traditional concept of secrecy and the question of whether or not we should consider in this House, as they are considering through a private bill in Ottawa, the proposition that all things will

be public automatically, by principle, except those that are listed by some acknowledged acceptance of everybody involved, as to merit a degree of secrecy, at least for a time.

However, Mr. Chairman, just to show you how ludicrous this has become: After we had asked these questions of the hon. Minister and the hon. Minister had refused a reply, a member of the press asked the hon. Minister a question. And I repeat, if we had not raised the matter he likely would have gotten a reply. But things are getting worse instead of better. The hon. Minister is becoming more exclusive in terms of holding his information.

Just let me bring this to the attention of the House. On January 22, 1965, a story carried in the *Globe and Mail* under the by-line of David Scott. I will read the first few paragraphs:

How many passenger vehicles does the Ontario government operate? It's a simple question. And the answer can be found in the insurance records of The Department of Highways, but the government won't answer. The reason given by Highways Minister Charles MacNaughton to the *Globe and Mail* yesterday was straightforward. The New Democratic Party asked the question first. "We have to consider where these questions are leading," Mr. MacNaughton explained.

You see, Mr. Chairman, it is not that we are not entitled to this information—the hon. Minister does not argue that—but he is so afraid of where this information may be leading. Conceivably, it may reveal a weakness in government policy so he is going to deliberately withhold the information as long as he can. So he held it for all the months between the session and now he has held it for another six to eight weeks, since the session began, even though it was put on the order paper, in accordance with the rules that he said we would have to live by.

Let me continue, Mr. Chairman, just to show to what lengths the hon. Minister of Highways has gone.

The Minister said yesterday he told the NDP that such questions could be asked in the normal manner once the Legislature is in session. He was reminded that a reporter, who had no access to these channels, was also being refused the answer. "Had it not been for the other situation, namely, the NDP letter and request, you might have been given the information. In fact, I think you would," said Mr. MacNaughton.

In other words, here is the hon. Minister saying that because we in the Opposition asked for this information, when a member of the fourth estate asked for it, then he must be denied it, too. I repeat, we are going from bad to worse.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will have something to say about this in a minute.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister certainly should have something to say. "There has to be some recognition of the prerogatives of the government," he said. This is the hon. Minister of Highways talking again.

We can't make the government open to the Opposition. We might as well just open the files to these fellows.

The hon. Minister concedes this is public information, but he is going to sit on it, because if we get it, we may use it to attack the weaknesses of the government.

This, Mr. Chairman, is undermining and frustrating the whole democratic process. And yet, this hon. Minister thinks he is doing the right thing, and he is going to have something to say about it. I quote the *Toronto Globe and Mail* again:

Mr. MacNaughton said he had taken the stand that researchers' questions must be asked by the party in the Legislature in the normal manner. "However," he conceded—

and here was the one brilliant flash of light, Mr. Chairman—

"However," he conceded, "I could be altogether wrong in this thing. I think there is room for two ways of looking at it."

And what I have been trying to do this afternoon is to present the opposite way, because I suggest this to you, Mr. Chairman, that this hon. Minister and this government—indeed, if they are going to live up to the proposal of the hon. Prime Minister—cannot sit on information that even the hon. Minister himself concedes is public information.

He is resorting to the technicalities of the House to frustrate the Opposition in getting that information for all of the six, seven or eight months that the House is not in session. He makes it all the worse when we put it on the order paper when he does not answer it for six or eight weeks.

I was interested in reading a revision of Professor Donald Rowat's study that was in the *Canadian Journal of Political Science* last November, a reprint that has just come out in the *Canadian Journal of Economics*. He has updated his study, and he concludes with a sentence which I think is highly appropri-

ate, Mr. Chairman, and I will conclude with it, too:

As James Madison once said, "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it, is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both."

And I suggest that the conduct of this hon. Minister, in withholding this information, is fulfilling that suggestion of Madison. I would hope that the Minister, even the hon. Prime Minister, would review this whole situation. I can remember the day, Mr. Chairman, some years ago, when if we put a question to The Department of Education any time during the year, the question was never answered by the civil service in the department, because they had all been instructed—as indeed this hon. Minister has now instructed his officials—and the answer was channeled forward to the Minister's office and lo and behold, the Minister's office would say, when the annual report is printed in February, you will be able to get the information. The hon. Minister is adopting, in his own particular way, somewhat the same kind of approach. I suggest it is indefensible and if he can defend it, I, for one, would like to hear it right now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member himself suggested, in his comments, that there are, properly, certain areas of information that may well be regarded as classified.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): This is not one of them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Thank you very much. I was going to pursue the point a little more broadly than that smug interjection of yours, if you do not mind.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, this is not one of them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, all right. The point is this, I make it, and I emphasize it, and support it by the fact that, on each and every occasion that you, as the leader of the party that you represent in this House, have taken the trouble to ask me for information, as the Minister, I can recall no single circumstance when I have not provided you with that information myself, or if I was unable to do it, certainly someone was assigned to make it available to you.

Mr. MacDonald: I acknowledge that. Now I ask—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right. This is step one. I take the stand quite properly that

there are people on the staff of any department who cannot possibly be fully aware of either departmental or government policy.

Now, I am not saying that there was anything associated with government policy in the questions that were proposed here but there might have been, and I simply suggest that, if you want information, as the leader of the party, that possibly, there are only two people in the department that should be called upon to determine what is policy and what is not, firstly the Minister, and secondly—in the majority of circumstances—the Deputy Minister.

Mr. MacDonald: The second letter went to the Deputy Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, all right. But I am talking about the first letter, and I want to read this letter into the record. Mr. Hesse, presumably upon direction from his leader, addressed the letter to the director of legal services of the department. Just why he was chosen I do not know. It does not really matter. The first paragraph left us in some doubt as to the purpose of the information.

I need the total number of passenger vehicles operated by the Ontario government for research purposes.

Our first problem was whether he needed the information for research purposes, or whether it was the number of cars we were using for research purposes.

Mr. MacDonald: So what?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We assumed it was the latter.

Mr. MacDonald: So what?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, that is beside the point, too. I would have to say that.

Mr. Bryden: Yes, everything is beside the point.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just let me pursue this a little further. The only information the Minister of Highways or anyone in his department under any set of circumstances can provide, is the number of cars operated by his department.

So, first of all, we have the matter of someone having to decide whether it is a policy question or not; secondly, we have the matter of what the policy of 19 other departments is in this respect. We do not know whether they have individual departmental policies or not. So I suggest to you the

person that turned that letter back to his Minister for consideration was quite correct.

Mr. MacDonald: I am not objecting to that. I am looking for an answer from the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: My purpose in taking the stand that I did in indicating to Mr. Hesse—and the hon. member is right there is no date on the copy of this letter, it is probably on the original, but it must have been shortly after August 25—was simply in this instance to outline the procedure that I felt was a valid one.

Now, I heard nothing from the leader of the party. There was no comment on this, neither in argument of, nor in support of the stand I had taken. There was nothing from him at all until December 2, and another letter was addressed at that time to the Deputy Minister. Now, having taken the stand I took in the first instance, then in my opinion it became quite appropriate to do it this way again.

Mr. MacDonald: Why?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That was my opinion.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. Minister just said that if it came to him or his top policy administrator, it would be okay. This time it went to the administrator and the hon. Minister turned it down again.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly, because we had taken a sensible stand we thought the first time, in view of the approach that you made.

Mr. Bryden: A pig-headed stand.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we will pursue this a little bit more too, and talk about pig-headedness and transparencies before we are through here. In any case, the same stand was taken. At this point, it was a matter of weeks, as the hon. member points out, until the Legislature was going to convene anyway, so at this time it was not too serious, really.

Mr. MacDonald: We have waited for eight weeks now.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have said yourself that a few weeks in advance of the sitting of the House, it does not really matter.

Mr. MacDonald: When did I say that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You said that when you opened your remarks.

Mr. MacDonald: No, I did not.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, you did. *Hansard* will record that you did. Notwithstanding that, we took the same stand, to be consistent, rightly or wrongly, the same stand was taken, at least consistently.

Mr. MacDonald: You are consistently wrong.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, all right, that is a matter of opinion, too. Then the hon. leader of the New Democratic Party did phone me. Over a weekend I reconsidered the matter. I called him back and said I had not changed my mind. Now here is where the transparency enters into this whole kettle of fish. Again, rightly or wrongly, he was not able to obtain this information, and I say if he wants to know about a matter, it is quite appropriate to either call or address the Minister in writing. If that had happened, I am here to assure him the letter would have been directed into appropriate channels, and he likely would have got the information. Now when he asks, or anybody asks, where there is some doubt as to policy matters, it is quite appropriate to have it done the other way. What is wrong with writing me? What is wrong with writing the Minister? Have I ever refused you any information, or have I ever refused to make it available to you through some source or other in the department? Have I? Now you admitted a little earlier that I had not.

Mr. MacDonald: I will answer it. I have already conceded this.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, all right then. I do not propose to have people at any level of the staff of The Department of Highways concerned about dealing with matters that may involve policy. I simply do not think that is fair. But now let me tell the House the approach that the hon. member took when after a phone call I stuck to the stand I had taken. His next device was to try and get this through the back door. He told me on the phone that he could politically embarrass me about the situation. I told him I have never had any doubt about his ability to try and embarrass anybody and everybody politically. This is a great attitude to express.

He uses the back door, a device that is quite well known to him. He is quite skilful

in that respect, may I say. He uses a member of the press to approach me, hoping I will disclose some information that I did not give to him. And if I had then I ask you what he would have said in this assembly?

Mr. Bryden: It was public all along.

Mr. MacDonald: Then it was public all along.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Then I ask you what he would have said in this assembly.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I have already indicated that rightly or wrongly I took a stand. I think it is a defensible stand. I am not going to ask anybody on my staff to make decisions on matters that relate to policy, and frankly, I do not think they should have to make these determinations. I simply suggest to anyone in this House, there is no information other than of a policy or classified character in The Department of Highways, that is not available to them, if they will employ the proper channels to get it.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister says if we will employ the proper channels. I wish he would not be so petulant.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not petulant, I am—

Mr. MacDonald: If the hon. Minister really believed then what he now says, namely, that the question must come to him so that he can screen it for policy purposes, all he had to do was to say it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am saying it now.

Mr. MacDonald: But what is the record? The record is that we wrote to somebody who is in the legal department, which, rightly or wrongly, we thought was the place where you could get this information. It went to the hon. Minister. Okay. The hon. Minister has changed his mind. He realizes his position is indefensible.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, he does not.

Mr. MacDonald: He realizes his position is indefensible and he has changed his mind. If his view then was as it is now, when the letter came from his legal branch and he would have said to me, "Please send your

letters to me, I want to screen them for political purposes" then he would have the right, if he so desires, to pass it on to anybody in his department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Precisely correct.

Mr. MacDonald: But that is not what you did. I have the floor now, if you want to come back.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Go ahead.

Mr. MacDonald: What you did was to say you cannot get the answer at all, in any way, except to wait until the House meets. Put a question on the order paper! Now you have changed your position. You acknowledge that your position then was indefensible. What you are saying now is the letter should be sent to you. I assure you, Mr. Chairman, I will send a letter to him.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Fine.

Mr. MacDonald: I will send a letter to the hon. Minister. He and I hail from the same rural parts of southern Quebec, and when I talk to the hon. Minister I talk to him as if we were both farm boys from back in that area.

When he refused to give me the information, I said: "Look, Charlie, if you want to frustrate the Opposition in getting information they are entitled to, you give me a weapon that can be politically embarrassing and I will make it embarrassing."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Right.

Mr. MacDonald: And I repeat it here, and I have no hesitation to say it. You know it is embarrassing, so you have now changed your policy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not embarrassed.

Mr. MacDonald: You have changed your policy because in the letter which is now on the record, if any information is sought of this department, your reply is: "You cannot have it until the House meets." Now you say: "Send a letter to me so I can screen it." Okay, we will send the letter to you so you can screen it, so you can protect this government which is so vulnerable. I can understand your sensitivity; it is very vulnerable. But we will send the letters to you. I appreciate the hon. Minister changing his mind although I wish he had done it with a bit more grace instead of under pressure in the House here.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, wait a minute; I have one more comment to make on this. I have already said—and the hon. member for York South, the leader of the NDP, cannot deny it—but I am going to repeat, he has never ever asked me for information by letter or otherwise that he has not received, and if he had employed the same device in the first place, he would have had it. Now, that is not inconsistent.

Mr. Bryden: Why did you not say so?

Mr. MacDonald: You did not say so.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did say so.

Mr. MacDonald: You did not say so.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right then, let me ask you something if I may.

Mr. MacDonald: Go ahead!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Why did it take from either late August—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on vote 803, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, it is actually. I would think it has to do with what is referred to here as administration; I think that is quite appropriate.

Then may I ask him why a position that was taken either in late August or early September was not contested in any way until December or January? You never contested my first letter to you.

Mr. MacDonald: Is that a question to me?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, why was it not? By the way, why did you not come back then and call me on the phone? Why did you not speak to me? You did not do it—

Mr. MacDonald: You have asked me two questions.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, two questions.

Mr. MacDonald: I will try to give you two answers.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That will be very interesting.

Mr. MacDonald: The first question was asked on August 19. There were many things going on last fall that many of us were involved in and when I got back into normal routine later in the fall, we reviewed the fact that we had asked a question and got

a categorical refusal to give the information. Next time we wanted more information, our approach was somewhat in tune with the hon. Minister—we sent it to his deputy. But what was the hon. Minister's answer? "Oh, no, even when you sent it to the deputy, that won't do, you've got to come to God."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh! nonsense, utter nonsense!

Mr. MacDonald: Well, you set yourself up as God.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nonsense, utter nonsense.

Mr. MacDonald: However, Mr. Chairman, I have made my point. The hon. Minister took a wrong position. Now he says that if any information is needed, I will have to instruct my research director to have a letter to the hon. Minister over my signature, I will sign it, and we will get the information and all will be fine. I wonder why we could not have reached this conclusion without all this fuss.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: And we would not have had all this nonsense about back-door procedures either, by the way.

Mr. Chairman: What is the point of order?

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): On this precise question, I just have a short follow-up question to the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, two members stood in their places at the same time, and I happen to have recognized the member for Downsview (Mr. Singer).

Mr. S. Lewis: May I raise a point of order?

Mr. Chairman: If the member for Downsview will yield the floor to you, fine.

Mr. S. Lewis: I have a short question. I simply want to say the hon. member for Downsview is always magnanimous.

I simply want to ask the hon. Minister, since this same question has now been on the order paper for almost seven weeks, why has he not answered it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I might say, Mr. Chairman, the information requested as it pertains to The Department of Highways has been filed in the appropriate quarters. I assume that when the rest of the departments have filed theirs, the composite answer to a composite question will be tabled. I am quite confident that it will.

Mr. MacDonald: In the fullness of time.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, I did not really intend to address myself to the point that the hon. member for York South is engaging the hon. Minister in, but since it has arisen there are several queries that come to my mind.

As any member of this House from time to time has questions to ask, surely the hon. Minister is not suggesting that in each case we have to seek out the Minister. In a department as large as highways—or take any department you want—there are department heads, subdepartment heads, people who have specific knowledge. Someone publishes at great expense a complicated and helpful telephone directory telling us on which local we can find each individual. Surely the government's business is expedited by being able to direct queries to the proper person.

Is it the significance of the hon. Minister's reply to the hon. member for York South—that if there are any questions they have to be directed to the Minister?

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): The Department of Public Welfare would break down if that were so.

Mr. Singer: I would like an answer to that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suggested to the House when the hon. member for York South was discussing the matter that there—

Mr. Sopha: The whole system would break down.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not think that would happen for a while.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suggested that in those areas where there may be some policy connotations there would appear to be two people capable of answering them, the Minister and the Deputy Minister. This is what I said.

I did not say all questions had to come to me but I did assure the House that all questions that came to me, other than of a classified or policy character, would be answered. I might not answer them but I assured him of that. I think I could give the same assurance as far as the Deputy Minister is concerned.

But there is a level in The Department of Highways where no one can know matters of policy. I am concerned about people being put in the untenable position of maybe answering a question that is associated with

policy and I do not think it is fair to put them in that position.

Mr. Singer: I can agree with that, but as to the particular question—this is the question that is No. 1 on the order paper—I cannot see how that possibly relates to policy.

Mr. MacDonald: How many vehicles are there?

Mr. Singer: That is a factual question. I had occasion this morning to call some official in your department. I wanted some information; I got it very simply. I would hope that he would have enough intelligence that if I asked him if there was going to be a new highway somewhere that he would say, "I do not know; refer to the Minister." But I would not ask him that sort of a question.

When I have gone to departmental officials in your department or anywhere else, I only ask them about factual or procedural matters. What I was trying to do was get the hon. Minister to draw a line and as I understood what he said—and I hope I am wrong—all questions have to be directed to him or the deputy. I hope this is not what he really meant.

Well, enough of that at the moment. I wanted to ask the hon. Minister about a question that my colleague the hon. member for Sudbury and I dealt with at some length in the public accounts committee last year, relating to outside legal advice and assistance. The hon. Minister, I would think next to the Attorney-General's department, has the largest legal staff of any government department. You have Mr. Crosbie—yes, I think I am in the right vote; head office vote, am I not?

Mr. Chairman: We can deal with it here as well as any place. Actually this deals with construction and co-operation with municipalities, but if you have no objection, Mr. Minister, shall we deal with it here?

Mr. Singer: This vote deals with head office administration. Somewhere along the line The Department of Highways retains outside legal help.

An hon. member: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Singer: I think that is a result of a question I asked last year. The information was made available by the department that The Department of Highways paid some \$47,000 in retaining outside legal assistance. As I was saying, this department has, I think, next to the Attorney-General's department, the largest legal department of any depart-

ment of government. You have Mr. Crosbie and, I think, some six lawyers working with him.

It has occurred to me over a number of years—and I state this again, not only as a thought, Mr. Chairman, but as my definite opinion—that the legal work done by government should be substantially done within the department, and particularly in this department. There is another point I am going to make at a later time with the hon. Attorney-General (Mr. Wishart). Particularly in this department where you have a legal staff of five or six solicitors on strength, what is the necessity for hiring outside legal help?

These items that made up the \$47,000 were listed one by one. By and large they seemed to be routine matters. I can understand that if a matter of unusual legal significance arises on which your departmental advisers want outside opinions, there would be some reason for going outside. While \$47,000 does not loom as a tremendously large figure against the total expenditure of \$300 million, why was it still necessary to go outside either your own legal advisers or outside The Department of the Attorney-General to get legal advice last year to the extent of \$47,000, and this year I do not know to what extent?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member, of course, has indicated his feeling that \$47,000 is not a large amount of money and I can frankly assure the House that it is not if you embrace the value of the total amount of legal work that is done. Most of the work of the solicitors of The Department of Highways is done in terms of property acquisition—a very great deal of it, of course—and among routine matters was drawing orders-in-council. I hardly need to go on because the hon. member would be quite familiar with it.

This \$47,000, if not all, would be largely spent for solicitors, or barristers if you wish, engaged to represent the department before the municipal board in terms of expropriation arbitration. Fortunately there are not too many of those. We do settle most of these matters by negotiation as the figure would indicate, so I would like to reassure the hon. member that by and large the volume of legal work in The Department of Highways is done by our legal staff.

This would be the only area, other than some of those cases that come before the courts that he is also aware of. I think that this would represent the only areas where we depart from this policy and procedure.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, as a final brief word on this, it occurs to me that even though the figure of \$47,000 is small, not only in comparison with the total expenditures, but in comparison to similar expenditures in other departments, it still would represent a salary higher than the going salary in government service for three senior lawyers. If you have expropriation matters, you could perhaps take \$20,000 of this money and get yourself a top expropriation lawyer, who would save you a lot of money in the long run, and put him in your department along with Mr. Crosbie.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, before you leave vote 803, I would like to ask a perhaps routine type of question, merely for the information of myself and others in interpreting the estimates and public accounts of the department in the future.

The department has made substantial changes in its method of presenting its estimates which I think are to the good, but some of us—or at any rate I will speak for myself: I am not entirely clear as to precisely what is covered by these various headings. I wonder if the hon. Minister could outline, very briefly, what is covered by vote 803 described as "Operations, Head Office Administration"; and how that is differentiated from vote 801, which is described as "General Administration."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I suppose this explanation may indicate some doubt as to whether the little bit of debate we have had here is properly in order, but there did not seem to be a better place for it—

Mr. Bryden: We can perhaps justify it on the ground that we did not fully understand what was included in the various votes?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Well, vote 803 provides for head office administration of the department's construction, highway maintenance and municipal assistance programme. These sections of the operations branch, for instance, would be involved in this vote—there would be the construction engineer, the contract control engineer, the maintenance engineer, the municipal engineers and the signs and buildings permit section. That is actually how this vote was made up.

If it is not out of order, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to go back to vote 801—the hon. member made references to this, too.

Mr. Bryden: Just as to an outline on exactly what it includes, and not any more than that, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Vote 801 covers the administration branch which includes the Minister's office and the Deputy Minister's office, the legal branch, the financial controller's branch, and this includes our toll collection operations and the personnel branch. Those are the branches that are involved in vote 801.

Mr. Bryden: So that they are really the central operating branch, and this is the actual operation on the highways. This is really head office.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right.

Mr. Bryden: Now, under "operations" you have, of course, a head office staff; but you also have a very substantial field setup. What vote would the field setup come under?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The next vote, 804.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, I have a question and I think that this is the place to put it, in light of what the hon. Minister just said.

I want to raise the question of whether or not the hon. Minister has given serious thought to the whole matter of the design of highways from the point of view of safety and research into this field.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the hon. member—and I confess that it is taking me some time to get used to these new votes myself—but this is not the appropriate vote.

Mr. Chairman: I think it would probably come under vote 808.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, if I can just ask the hon. Minister—and I am willing to abide by what he says—the question that would be asked is: "Why do accidents occur on the highway system?" Delving into that sort of thing would come under vote 808?

Mr. Chairman: Yes.

Mr. Young: Thank you. I will leave it until we come to that point.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Chairman, did I understand the hon. Minister to say that the issuing of permits for signs would come under 803?

Mr. Chairman: I just want to say a few words about this. Rightly or wrongly there is

considerable criticism of The Department of Highways in various areas of the province, particularly in my own, that the department does not allow enough signs on the various highways.

Now there is one thing I will say and that is that in some parts of the province there are different rules than in other parts. I would be interested to hear the hon. Minister make some comment on that, particularly insofar as it concerns tourist localities.

I know perfectly well—and I am not being critical of this at all—that in the Muskoka area there are many more signs allowed on the highways there than there are in Bruce county. Because of this I am under constant criticism as the member for Bruce as to why these signs are not allowed in an area that we regard as equally important as far as tourists are concerned as the great area of Muskoka.

Second, I noticed that there are some exceptions throughout the province as to when the issuing of signs is allowed by The Department of Highways. I would like to ask the hon. Minister just what right the Canadian national exhibition has to put signs about every three miles on every highway in the province of Ontario? You can imagine the criticism a member such as myself comes under when people who have lived in an area for 25 or 30 or even 50 years are not allowed to put up a sign and then all of a sudden, three weeks before the Canadian national exhibition starts—or a month before—a sign is put on every corner fence.

Now we in rural Ontario think this is wrong. We certainly have nothing against the exhibition, we want it to be a great success; but on the other hand, if they are allowed to put up these signs why are people who carry on legitimate, 365-days-a-year businesses not allowed to put up signs of a similar nature?

To stress this point, may I ask the hon. Minister what right has the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) to have signs put up saying: "Follow two miles for a provincial park." Mr. Chairman, provincial parks are a wonderful thing in this province and I, for one, want people to know where they are located; but on the other hand we have hundreds of people who are paying taxes and who are in the business of free enterprise who do not, and are not allowed, to put up signs on your highways showing where their particular park of tenting area is.

So my question, Mr. Chairman, is in three parts: First, why is it that in some areas of the province more signs are allowed than in others, and I quoted the Muskoka area as

against Bruce county? Why is it that the Canadian national exhibition is allowed to plaster signs all over the province, by the thousands I would suggest? Third, would he give some remarks about the signs that show where provincial parks are located?

Mr. Chairman: Are you suggesting this properly comes under this vote, Mr. Minister; on signs?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

First of all, I am going to accept the hon. member's word that there is a difference between Muskoka and Bruce in terms of signs, but really there is no reason why there should be. There are designated tourist areas in the province and we do have a relaxed signing policy there to permit tourist operators to do something about advertising their facilities. As long as they come within the control limits and control regulations of our signing policy, there is not any reason why similar establishments in Bruce should not have the same right to signs that they have in Muskoka.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, could I just interrupt the hon. Minister? All I can say is that we must have different controls, because with the control in Muskoka it is not uncommon to see a sign, these finger signs pointing to Gull lake or Crow pass or something, where there might be 20 signs. This is not allowed in Bruce county. Now I respectfully ask the hon. Minister to look into it, because these people like to have their areas of business pointed out equally as much as they do in other areas of the province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I certainly cannot quarrel with the hon. member there. I think it might be fair to say that there is probably a greater density of these sort of things in Muskoka than there are in Bruce.

Mr. Whicher: Only by the signs.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I do not know, I think probably there are, but certainly if any one of these circumstances conform with the regulations, then there is no reason why these people cannot have the same signs. I say that to the hon. member.

Now, with the Canadian national exhibition, there is no reason why they should not have to obey the rules either.

Mr. Whicher: Would the hon. Minister suggest that they do obey the rules?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is a worthwhile suggestion, I will say that to the hon. member. Mind you, probably we do not enforce

fall fairs and that sort of thing quite as much as we do other things, but I grant you these people seemingly put up thousands overnight.

Mr. Whicher: That is right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Possibly it is a little difficult to get into enforcement there, but—

Mr. Whicher: All you would have to do is tell them to stop.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I agree with the hon. member, and it is something we will pursue.

Now, with regard to the trail blazers, I think the hon. member is referring to what we call "trail blazers," they are a trail blazer sign, they are all of standard design and they do lead you throughout the province to our provincial parks. This is something we have worked out with The Department of Tourism and Information and The Department of Lands and Forests and we think there is real merit in this. I certainly have no apologies to offer for the fact that we have these trail blazers leading to the St. Lawrence parks and all these other excellent parks throughout the province.

But I can assure the hon. member that to try to develop a policy to do the same for private establishments would be of a somewhat different character. There are literally hundreds and hundreds of small tourist establishments and small park facilities adjoining tourist establishments. To provide anything of a sensible uniform character for signs there I suggest to the hon. member that if it is not impossible it would be almost impossible, and certainly very difficult.

We think we have adopted a good policy for directing the travelling public to our parks, our provincial parks. We want them to go there, and this is why we have done it in that manner.

Mr. Whicher: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have no quarrel with the hon. Minister, but I hope he does look into the Canadian national exhibition signs for this reason. They come up approximately in the civic holiday, when we are right in the middle of the tourist business. They try to take the tourists away from areas such as Muskoka or Bruce, and naturally we are a little concerned about it. While wishing the exhibition all possible success, we ask them to obey the same laws that we obey. Surely that is fair enough.

Now secondly, as far as the private tourist establishments are concerned, if the hon. Min-

ister would allow these finger signs in areas such as Bruce and Grey, as he allows them in Muskoka—and I will take this up with him privately later—I am sure it would be most acceptable.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, under this heading, is it the policy of the hon. Minister in regards to advertising on 401 provincial parks such as Rondeau park?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We did have a sign up along 401 advertising Rondeau provincial park, but the sign has been removed.

Mr. Spence: Has the policy of the hon. Minister changed with the removal of this sign?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we are really back to the point raised by the hon. member for Bruce. We did develop this uniform method of signing the parks, and we have developed what we referred to as a trail blazer. Wherever you go and see that trail blazer identification you know you are on your way to a provincial park. It is not one type of sign here and another type there. This is the uniform policy we have adopted to direct people to our provincial parks.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): I have to crave the hon. Minister's indulgence. I am thinking, under the heading of office administration, about the use of films. I notice that it is under general administration, but I would assume under head office perhaps you have a PR setup showing the work of the department.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think the hon. leader of the Opposition should ask the indulgence of the chair. It is not up to me to say whether these things should be asked under one vote or another. Really this was on vote 801.

Mr. Thompson: Yes. Mr. Chairman, could I ask—

Mr. Chairman: I do not think we should revert back to 801 unless it is with the concurrence of the House.

Mr. Thompson: I see. I thought we had a principle that you could go back again at the end—I thought at the end of the estimates we could go back.

Mr. Chairman: That was at the end of each individual vote. There was some flexibility with the vote, but we left 801, 802 and now we are dealing with 803.

Mr. Thompson: Can I not at any point, then, ask this question on the use of films?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I think a good many hon. members were a little uncertain as to the proper point at which to raise questions this year because of the new method of presentation. Perhaps we could have this resolved by a certain amount of indulgence.

Mr. Chairman: I think it is true, as the member for Woodbine has pointed out, that because we have changed from the three votes—where there was considerable elasticity last time—and we have embodied it now into 11 votes. These have been broken down; perhaps it is not known under which vote questions should be asked. I think at this particular time we do not want to strifle a question, if the leader of the Opposition would try to make it brief.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, may I make a point here? I concur here, but on the other hand if we are going to revert back to votes all the time I suggest the House will never get finished.

Mr. Chairman: This is true, I realize it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right.

Mr. Thompson: I appreciate this, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister will answer this question. I am concerned about the use of these films, highways films. Are they for the general public? Are they for tourists in the States? To whom are they shown?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would suggest to the hon. leader of the Opposition that these films are produced to get as widespread a distribution as we can give them. Films are no good unless people see them. I think that is a pretty obvious statement.

I can tell you this, that some of our films—and this may not be the point the hon. leader of the Opposition is pursuing—have been sufficiently well regarded to have been procured by the national film board for distribution on a much broader scale than we could have possibly accomplished ourselves. They reviewed our films. Now, we are planning a motion picture dealing with opportunities in the department. We are planning that for this year. We have other motion pictures. One was called "Roads to Prosperity," one was called "Carnival Country," for the purpose of bringing people to our winter tourist attractions.

We distribute these films throughout Ontario. They are available for adjoining provinces and the northern states. The photo-

graphic section maintains a complete library of photographs of the province.

We want as much distribution of these films as we can get for the purpose of helping to develop our tourist industry and enticing people to come up to Ontario. You cannot get too many people seeing them, I think.

Mr. Thompson: Would I be unfair, Mr. Chairman, to say that they are used for propaganda by the Conservative Party?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, I think that would be unfair.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask the hon. Minister then?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I would have to say no. You might quarrel with my opinion. I guess that is what you would expect me to say. But I would have to say no.

Mr. Whicher: We want you to be truthful.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I do try to tell the truth.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask the hon. Minister why one of his films was used on a political broadcast "Provincial Affairs"?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, you may. You may ask me that. I do not think I would have participated in that thing myself to any degree, I did not feel it was associated with good publicity. Only portions of the film were shown. When you get an opportunity and the free use of the facilities to broadcast a film that was developed for that purpose, it seems to me the sensible thing is to grasp the opportunity. That film was seen by many, many people across the province. I do not detect anything that was said in terms of the narration or the comments of the Minister, or the film itself that could possibly have had any serious political overtones. I say that honestly. You people have a little different attitude towards that sort of thing than most people do, I might say.

Mr. Bryden: Politicians are always politicians.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You can see wrong motives in most things that we do not consider too important over here, may I put it that way?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could I pursue this? This was a free broadcast. Oh, but it is a very important principle. This was a political broadcast. There was an

actor, first of all, who was used to laud the state of the highways. Now, as I understand the film was not paid for and produced by the Conservative Party, it was produced by the taxpayers of Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Right!

Mr. Thompson: Therefore I suggest it was highly improper for that film to be cut apart, for an actor to be used in it, and that it was for the purpose, or else there is something wrong with your party, it was for the purpose of obtaining the best show to try to get voters to vote Conservative.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 803; the member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Well, is the hon. Minister going to reply to the statement here?

Mr. Chairman: No. Out of courtesy here, we have reopened this. I think the leader of the Opposition has made his point and I would ask you now to speak on 803.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have no more to say on it anyway, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Newman: Several of the questions that I asked earlier in the day actually come under vote 801 and I was told to ask them later. After the hon. Minister had given the breakdown of the functions of the various votes, I found that some of them come under the legal branch, comptroller's branch, and all of this would have been in an earlier vote. But I will ask them at the vote you suggested.

Now in my original comments in replying to the hon. Minister's statement, concerning the work of his department, I brought up the problem of signing on Highway 401. Now I did not mention indiscriminate signing, Mr. Chairman. I mentioned informative signing, so that communities adjacent to 401 would have an opportunity of selling maybe one or two of their outstanding features in an attempt to lure the traffic dollar into their area. I still think it is good policy to do this.

Now I will make a suggestion to the hon. Minister at this time, that does not refer to 401 and this refers to the provincial parks. When it comes to a provincial park that is adjacent to a well built up area, such as the county of Essex, I think the signing policy should be a little more elaborate.

I think you would need more informative signs, or I think there was a special term the hon. Minister used concerning the signs indicating to the tourists the way to the provincial parks.

We in Essex county have a park of which we are very proud, and it is used extensively. However, it is difficult for one to find the park, unless one follows strictly the King's highways, and not everyone in the community is going to take the long method of following the King's highways to get to this park. Were the hon. Minister to have his department put a few more signs leading to the Holiday Beach provincial park, it would be a real asset to the tourists and to the people in Essex county.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 803.

Mr. Spence: Mr. Chairman, under vote 803, we have met the hon. Minister's officials of the signing branch. Of course some of the municipalities have parks—beautiful parks, Mr. Minister—and they are greatly interested in having some of the tourists stop and make use of the parks, leave some money in the area, and advertise their community. But the officials say that it is impossible to make any signs on 401 for municipal parks. I wonder if the hon. Minister would give any consideration for this, or are there any changes being considered by your department, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Chairman, I think really I am back to the answer I provided to a question of the hon. member for Bruce and I have explained that it is impossible for us to direct people to the hundreds of private parks around the province. I think I have to simply let it stand on that, supported by the comments I made to the question of the hon. member for Bruce.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago we had a discussion here about the propriety of approaching the hon. Minister directly on certain points of information. As all the hon. members know, from time to time, constituents come to us with some difficulties involving The Department of Highways. It may be a small matter, involving a culvert or an entrance to a field. I would like the hon. Minister to give us his own view as to whether these things should be settled on the scene between the hon. member and the engineer, or whether in fact we should approach the hon. Minister and his deputy in this connection?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, no. Certainly those matters of a routine character should be dealt with on the spot, the way they always have been dealt with, I would say to the hon. member.

Mr. Nixon: I get the impression, actually, Mr. Chairman, that in some areas where this may be convenient, the member himself has to set himself up in almost a professional capacity, in making these judgments. I would hope that the hon. Minister would feel that there would be nothing inappropriate in dealing with these people on the scene, through the department officials, rather than going out and giving directions to the engineers themselves.

You do not see anything wrong at all then, with a member going out and telling the engineer what should be done?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would suggest that the member can go out and tell the engineer what should be done, but I would have to rely on his good judgment to some extent as to whether he did it.

Mr. Sopha: This is a point which has interested me a great deal over the years and I wonder to what extent the local engineer is beholden to the local Tory member?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say he is not beholden to the local Tory member, or any member, or any person. He is beholden to his immediate superior, and his superiors in the department. Now I think it is fair to say he is there to co-operate with everybody, to the greatest extent he can. He is not beholden, and I make that very, very plain to the House. The district engineer is not beholden to anybody except his superiors.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I think if we may speak a bit frankly in this forum, I think it is fairly well known in the province that some of the local Tory members fairly drive the local engineers to distraction, in importuning them with requests to suit their own political advantage.

Now I am thinking of a case in point, of which the hon. Minister is probably aware, where it is said of a person who used to occupy a place up where the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. R. G. Hodgson) now sits, and who has since gone on to higher rewards, that the pressure he exerted on the district engineer, made it almost impossible for that man to carry out his duties.

I think that is fairly common knowledge and I just wondered whether the hon. Minister would not be able, with a word of kindly advice to his local engineers, tell them they are not there at the beck and call of the local sitting member.

Because the matter of highways is so competently handled by the city administration of the city which I represent, there is no

need for me to intervene, but on the rare occasions that I have spoken—and they have been rare—to the district engineer I have elicited the utmost co-operation and courtesy from him.

But I do not think that impression is too well-founded, because one of the mechanisms of political advantage that the populous number of members that we see in this House uses is the channelling of communications from irate users of roads through to the district engineer. Because of their political position and the access they have to the ear of the hon. Minister and the contact they have with him, it must, to a large degree, make the job of the district engineer that much more difficult to bear.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me say this to the hon. member, that the first responsibility of a district engineer, or any of his district staff, is recognition of the fact that he and his staff are there to serve the public and this is said on each and every occasion when district engineers come to Downsview for their conferences, as they do frequently.

If the hon. member is suspicious that certain things of an untoward character are taking place, maybe it would be wise if he quietly documented those to me. I do not think that is true; I think it is possible that there are situations where some members of any political persuasion are more aggressive than others. I think this is quite a possible thing to believe and in those cases, in the course of conducting their responsibilities aggressively, they may be in the office of the district engineer more frequently than others.

If that is the case, then I am not going to quarrel one bit with the way they represent their ridings whatever political persuasion they have. That is their job and I think that the better they do the job, the more chance they have of coming back here and resuming their seats from time to time—again, of whatever political persuasion they happen to be.

But these are the terms of reference for the staff of The Department of Highways. They exist for the sole purpose of serving the public of the province of Ontario.

I really should not do this, but I can tell you that I remember—some of you would not—a day and time, a little over 20 years ago when that definitely was not the case. There have been tremendous changes made in this field of policy, I can assure the hon. member.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister does not have to go back 20 years.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. I am going back just a little over 20 years, when you either espoused a certain political line of conduct or you did not have a job at all.

Mr. Nixon: There have even been some Ministers of Highways since that point 20 years ago who lost their jobs themselves because of their administration of this department. I think that the hon. Minister's comments are uncalled for.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not introduce the topic in the first place.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I introduced the topic, and I wanted some information from him. Surely the hon. Minister has taken it beyond the point of reasonableness when he raises this ridiculous topic.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Chairman, not one bit of it. If the suggestion that emanated from over there is that there are political considerations given to members of Parliament of a certain political stripe by certain district engineers, I find that categorically wrong. I followed up by saying that there was a day when it was so much different to what it is today, that I think the House might be aware of what we are trying to accomplish to see that this is not the case.

Mr. Nixon: Mr. Chairman, I am sure that the motives of the hon. Minister are of the highest and I am sure that the motives of previous Ministers of Highways have been very high indeed, but if he is going to go back into ancient history, he certainly should not forget the fact that some of his predecessors who were members of the Conservative Party have had to be dismissed from office for this sort of thing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not forgetting—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: This is not finished yet—not finished yet. He says “no consideration”—is that the way he put it?—is given to the local member in respect of highway matters.

I am looking at an announcement in the *Sudbury Daily Star*—a very fine newspaper and one that ordinarily supports this government, although I am glad to say that it supports me, too.

On October 12, 1965, it referred to a young man whose name I do not mention in this House because I have a high regard for him and leave him alone in a way that I did not

leave his predecessor, the senator, alone when he was here. But they were a different stripe. You might be interested to know that he wants to be called “the honourable, the senator”—how high some people have got!

A couple of weeks ago—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803, please.

Mr. Sopha: A couple of weeks ago when a couple of hon. Cabinet Ministers were up there, they described him in the programme as Rheal Belisle and he tore up the programme because he was not called “senator.”

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: However, it says this:

A member announced today the letting of one road construction tender and the calling of two contract tenders along the route of the proposed Sudbury-Timmins highway.

Why should that announcement be made by the local member? What has he got to do with it? This is a government decision—a decision for which the Minister is responsible, and in the making of that decision the local member had very little part to play.

These decisions are made at a very high level; this one was made as a result of importunings by the people of Sudbury since 1924. That is when the genesis of the Sudbury-Timmins highway saw the light of day—long before this young local member was born.

You should all note that the hon. Minister has put the halo on and the impression is that his department is completely non-political. It is operating on some aerie height above politics. One would think that he was the Minister of External Affairs, rather than the Minister of Highways—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803, please!

Mr. Sopha: But I would say to him, “Face up to it; an integral part of the politics of this government is the use of the local member to make announcements of this nature, and make them through his mouth as though he had played some part in it—”

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: As my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) so aptly points out, the sparks really fly if an announcement is made in the riding of the hon. member for Simcoe East and he is not a part of it—

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): I make the announcement—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Sopha: Let us just adjust this halo and get it on straight. As my hon. leader so aptly pointed out, this department blandly used a film prepared at public expense on a television programme which very few people watched, because it was not a very good film, and then he wants to come here and display for us some objective attitude that indicated they are all apart from politics, they are working for the good of the people of the province. The truth is that they are using public money to ensure the re-election of the government. That is the—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Letherby: Why, certainly—

Mr. Sopha: As the leader of the Opposition at Ottawa said on Friday, "Let us have that in the record," that the hon. member for Simcoe East said, "Why, certainly."

Mr. Letherby: I say I will make my announcements in my own way in East Simcoe.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please; order!

Mr. Sopha: He said in reference to my remarks, and we were not talking about Mun-singer or Monseignor—

Mr. Letherby: We were talking about announcements—

Mr. Chairman: Vote 803, please.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question regarding permits for fruit and vegetable stands. Does that come under the operations branch?

I believe, under subsection 10, that should the properties change hands, the permit to operate the stand is not transferable, only at the discretion of the district engineer. I just wonder, in case of the existing stands being placed too close to the highway in the current thinking of The Department of Highways, what action is taken in this regard?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think it is fair to say that those who are in possession of the permit would be allowed to stay there until their permit expires. We would like to get them back within the control limits of the particular highway itself.

The control area varies with the type of highway. On King's highways they can be closer; on a controlled access, of course, they

must be farther away from centre line—I think that is the place where the measurement is taken from. But once you have issued a permit, I would presume that you do nothing until it expires and then you would certainly make every attempt to see that the regulations were lived up to.

Mr. Paterson: Therefore, if there is a transfer of property, the solicitors in such a case should be aware of this Department of Highway clause in order to inform the purchaser that this permit would be void. Is that essentially correct?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, well, I think that is correct and I suggest to the hon. member that if he has knowledge of certain specific instances it would be useful to make reference to them. We can then look into the specific situation and see just what is involved and advise the hon. member in each and every circumstance, if he would like to do that.

Mr. Paterson: I have occasions of this in my area. I do have an occasion of a stand that is put on wheels and mobile, and apparently this is legal according to the department's regulations, that a property owner can wheel a fruit and vegetable stand out close to the shoulders of the road and at the end of the day wheel it back and this is permissible.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He certainly cannot get out onto our right-of-way though, at least he should not. He may be doing this, but he should not be on any part of the right-of-way, that is the road surface off the shoulders and whatever is contained in the right-of-way. Basically, I would be inclined to the opinion, Mr. Chairman, that he must abide by the same rules and regulations as anybody who has a permanent installation.

Mr. Paterson: Therefore, if I advise the district engineer of these infractions, this would be looked after?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Paterson: Is it in order to ask questions regarding highways signs under this vote?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Chairman: Highway signs? That is right.

Mr. Paterson: Is The Department of Highways working on designation signs for federal parks as well as the provincial parks? We do have three national parks in our province.

I just wonder if this is being looked after for them.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Generally, we would not permit this on a controlled-access highway. The regulations are relaxed very considerably once you get onto a King's highway. Again I suggest to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, if he would like to indicate these specific locations, we would be happy to acquaint him with the applicable regulations.

Mr. Paterson: Another matter, I have had requests to me regarding these signs designating tourist camps, the Egyptian hieroglyphics. It has been suggested to me that these are very confusing. First of all, a person passing down the highway has to look at these hieroglyphics and then beneath them the resort operator has his name and below that there are more hieroglyphics showing what he has. In my opinion, I think this is a hazard, and certainly is not the ultimate in benefit to the tourist operator. One good sign with clear wording, I think, would be of more benefit.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I recall that not too long ago a committee of the tourist outfitters took this matter up with us. These signs are symbolic, as the hon. member says. If there is a fish there is supposed to be fishing, is that what the hon. member means?

Mr. Paterson: That is the type.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, this was done by agreement, I think, at that time with the tourist outfitters association and certain other associated agencies. I agree with the hon. member, you almost should stop your car and go up and take a look at them, because if you are going to be rubbernecking at them it could be a little dangerous.

Mr. Sopha: There may be some outside the confines of the House who would criticize me for not adducing enough evidence to bolster the case I want to put before the House. So that there shall be no ambiguity or doubt about the nature of the evidence, I should like to read this part into the record to make the record complete, and invite the hon. Minister's comment of the remarks.

I read from the *Eganville Leader*, no doubt an organ of opinion of much influence in that part of Ontario where it is published. It says this:

Quadeville-Foymount road to be assumed as a secondary highway.

That is the heading.

Mr. Paul Yakabuski, MPP, Renfrew South, read a letter from the Hon. C. S. MacNaughton, Ontario Minister of Highways, in which he said that the department had taken the necessary steps to assume the Quadeville-Foymount road as a continuation of secondary Highway 515 from Combermere by way of Palmer Rapids to Quadeville, and connect it with Highway 512, Quadeville to Eganville by way of Cormac. Effective date of assumption April 1st, 1965.

That is not very distant history. Then it goes on, and will hon. members particularly note the prose that is used?

The Department of Highways was impressed by the magnificent majorities which the electors of both Quadeville and Palmer Rapids polls had consistently given the government over a lengthy period, and in this way the government was showing its appreciation for past favours.

My query is this: One, does the hon. Minister endorse those remarks? Two, are those remarks part of the letter from the hon. Minister to the hon. member? Are they contained in that letter? He said he had received a letter. It may be that that was part. Maybe that phraseology was invented in the head office of the department.

If it is invented in the head office—that part about past favours—then I would ask a subsidiary question: Are civil servants employed to write such things? And, are the remarks true?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I neither started nor stopped beating my wife, let us put it that way.

Mr. MacDonald: What about the rules—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think maybe I shall search the files and substantiate to the hon. members some time that these things are not written by civil servants in letters. Beyond that, I cannot speak for the comments of any member in this House. I do not propose to. Private members have a perfect right to say what they like.

Mr. Sopha: The hon. Minister thinks they have a perfect right to say what they like, even if it is not true?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot put a muzzle on anybody.

Mr. Sopha: Well, does not the hon. Minister exercise supervision in the same way the hon. leader of the Opposition does over

us? Surely the executive council of the province has a responsibility—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on 803?

Mr. Sopha: Yes. The head office of The Department of Highways has the responsibility to ensure that this type of statement is not given currency among our people, unless, of course, there is more than a grain of truth to it.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could we ask, has the hon. Minister repudiated this remark? Surely this is of interest to his department. This is a very serious charge on his department. It is an inference of patronage, the ugly shadow that can ruin a department. I think it very fair that the hon. member for Sudbury is asking the hon. Minister, was it true? And if it was not true, what steps did he take to have the hon. member withdraw such a remark? I think it is a very serious reflection on the department and on the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: I think the Minister pointed out that the civil servants were not employed for the purpose, and this is a remark that perhaps appeared in the press and we do not know whether it was said by the member or not.

Mr. Bryden: Well, Mr. Chairman, there is only one question that has not been answered and I think it was quite straightforward and quite relevant. It was, I think, the third question of the hon. member for Sudbury. Simply, is the statement true that this is the reason why the road was being built, because of favourable Conservative majorities in certain polling places? This is a fair question, and I think it should be answered.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This road was built to provide a connection between two King's highways. In the opinion, the good solid, sensible opinion of the department and the Minister of Highways, it was needed. I could pursue this a little further and maybe attribute something to the hon. leader of the Opposition and the conduct of the people who sit behind him. I do not propose to do that.

Mr. Thompson: I would be very glad if you did.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I do not propose to do that.

Mr. Thompson: Please do.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would rather pursue the estimates of the department than simply see whether every vestige of everything that is written in these estimates must have a political connotation.

Mr. MacDonald: Well, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: I would point out to the hon. Minister that the political connotation was not given by the Opposition in this case, but by one of his own members who, unfortunately, is not here. We had a similar situation arise out of comments of his last year. His explanation given last year certainly confirmed the political connotations. But I wish to confirm that the hon. Minister's statement means that that statement attributed in the press to the hon. member for Renfrew South is untrue. Am I right in assuming that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is rather a miserable question to ask anybody to comment on.

Mr. MacDonald: This is the underworld of politics.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have told you why the road was assumed—now, surely, that is enough. I have told you why we did it—

Mr. Bryden: You mean, you do not want to come right out and say it but, in fact, we can draw our own conclusions.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Draw your own conclusions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Renfrew South is not in his seat. May we, sir, in view of the seriousness of this, and the apparent attempt by the hon. member for Renfrew South—and I do not want to criticize him in his absence—to mislead the people of that part of Ontario; could we raise this again in a later vote when he returns to his seat? The House might be given the advantage of some explanation from him, personally, of why he would say this sort of thing down in eastern Ontario, when the only inference from the hon. Minister of Highways is clear, and the records should declare it, that any basis for such a statement by the hon. member for Renfrew South is, clearly, very tenuous and very ephemeral, if it exists at all. Out of

fairness to him, when he returns to the House—and I was criticized once before for saying things in reference to a member when he was not in his place—in fairness to him when he returns, with your permission, sir, we might revert to this.

Mr. Chairman: I am going to suggest to the member for Sudbury that we will deal with vote 803 at this particular time. If the member is not here and if he wishes to rise on a point of personal privilege at that time, he may do so. I think, as far as this House is concerned, we are dealing with the vote at this particular time, and if it is the wish of the members of this House, we will pass this vote now.

Mr. Sopha: Sir, I am not impugned by anything said. I am not impugned, and there is no personal privilege in me. It is the hon. member for Renfrew South who is impugned.

Mr. Chairman: It was the member for Renfrew South to whom I made reference.

Mr. Sopha: Oh, I see.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member is reading a press report, and I think everyone in this House knows that the last member for Renfrew South was a member of the Opposition. No one is going to go up there and deny that, and he could not tell the people of Renfrew South that they had always elected someone who was on the government's side of the House. So, take it in that light, and think about it for a second.

An hon. member: What light is that, again?

Hon. Mr. Simonett: You know who the last member for Renfrew South was.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am not going to pursue this but I just want to come back to one point. The hon. Minister was a little lofty in his sermon to us a moment ago about patronage being eliminated from the government and its operations. But we had the hon. member for Simcoe East get up and say: Fur would fly if I did not get the information and make the announcement!

Mr. Letherby: That is right.

Mr. MacDonald: There we are! I appreciate the emphasis. In other words, the Minister might as well subside in his seat and cut out the double talk about patronage, because

the hon. member for Simcoe East has just said, bluntly, that when anything is done by The Department of Highways in his area, he is going to be the mouthpiece and he will know it. Nobody on this side of the House gets that privilege.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Why should they?

Mr. MacDonald: What do you mean, why should they?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Why should they?

Mr. MacDonald: The proposition that the whole machinery of government should be tied in with the operation of the Tory Party is patronage.

An hon. member: No.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Do not get up and preach about it.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would suggest to the member for York South that, on vote 803, as far as patronage is concerned, I would be inclined to think that an announcement is not necessarily patronage.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, could we ask perhaps the hon. member for Simcoe East, if there was a Liberal member for Simcoe East, would he announce the highway?

Mr. Letherby: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask if I may rise on a point of order. First of all, we allowed a—

Mr. Chairman: I would like you to stay with vote 803, if you will, please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton:—very brief comment over here that was out of order. I suggest to you that for the last half-hour, sir, we have been out of order. We have relaxed the rules here a little bit because we are not too familiar with them—the eleven votes versus the three. I have already explained to the House what this vote encompasses and we are a mile out of order, sir.

Mr. Thompson: With all respect, Mr. Chairman, we are trying to clarify whether the Conservative Party runs this administration or whether it is the executive.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Wishful thinking on your part.

Mr. Letherby: I just want to make this—

Mr. MacDonald: Why do you not sit down, you will just start some fights.

Mr. Letherby: I do not think any privilege comes to me that does not go to any hon. member of this House, regardless of what party he happens to sit on. Now, if The Department of Highways, or any other department—Public Works or whatever it is—if they have made a decision to do something in my riding, and it comes to my attention, I do not phone the newspapers and say: “Has it come to your attention yet that we are going to do so-and-so?”

Mr. Thompson: How does it come to your attention?

Mr. Letherby: I merely say that this is what the department of so-and-so intends to do in my riding of Simcoe East, and I give it my blessing. If they will flash my picture on TV or put it in the paper, all the better for me.

Mr. MacDonald: Why does it have to have your blessing?

Mr. Thompson: Why does it have to have your blessing?

Vote 803 agreed to.

On vote 804:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Bruce.

Mr. Whicher: Mr. Chairman, there are many subheadings in this vote that I am actually unable to—

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to you that we keep them in sequence—subheading number one: Is there someone who would like to speak on vote 804, under subsection one?

Mr. Whicher: Yes, I think mine will be under that. I cannot find any heading in there dealing with the cost of salt on our provincial highways, and yet, undoubtedly, it is well known that it costs a great deal of money. I wonder if the hon. Minister could elaborate on the number of tons that were used last year and the cost.

In the reconstruction of this particular vote I am surprised that there has not been a heading dealing with this. There are some costs that are over \$300,000; one for \$250,000, and, I am sure, one such as the cost of salt is much higher than that. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect to the depart-

ment that this is of a somewhat embarrassing nature. Ever since I have been in this House for the past 11 years, it has been talked about and each and every year the Minister concerned—

Mr. Chairman: Do you mind if I just find out if that comes under section 2, winter maintenance?

Mr. Whicher: No, it comes under—

Mr. Chairman: Section 2, winter maintenance.

Mr. Whicher:—control costs.

Mr. Chairman: Under number 2, under 804, the first heading. I think you will find that it comes under section 2, winter maintenance.

Mr. Whicher: All right, I will talk about it then.

Mr. Chairman: Section 1, please!

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under section 1, general maintenance, I would assume that the topic of salt would come. The department has conducted experiments concerning the effect of salt.

Mr. Chairman: I think we can deal with it in number two.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, supposing I have a topic that should have come under 804, item 1, will I be allowed to bring it up later? It is so confusing.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, as long as the entire vote is not passed.

Mr. Newman: All right, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. Paterson: Under dust laying, I wonder if it is the policy of the department to see their patrol officers spread calcium along the shoulders of the road at the entrance ways to businesses, such as these fruit and vegetable stands I was speaking about, and other retail establishments, for fear dust is a factor in accidents?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We just lay it on our own road shoulders, Mr. Chairman. We do not put dust on private property of any kind.

Mr. Paterson: Would it be your policy then to spread this on the shoulders of the road

owned by the highways and thus reduce the dust hazards?

Mr. J. Renwick (Riverdale): On item 1 of 804, Mr. Chairman, are there any of the items listed in item 1 of 804, such as gravel crushing or dust laying, or surface treatment, where part of the work is done by government crews in one area, and in another area part of it is done by private contractors?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Gravel crushing would in many circumstances be done by outside contractors who would be employed for that purpose. We contract with people who own gravel deposits and have crushing equipment for much of our gravel and gravel crushing.

Mr. Renwick: Perhaps I have not made myself clear, Mr. Chairman. Would some of the gravel crushing be done under a government operation and some under private contracting, or would some of the dust-laying be done by government crews, and some be done by private contractors?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All our gravel crushing is done by outside contractors. Most of our dust-laying and surface treatment is done by contract, although we do some of it in the department.

Mr. Renwick: Are there any other items where part is done by government crews and part by private contractors, apart from dust-laying?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Surface treatment, hot mix patching, is done both ways—some by contractors, some by department forces and equipment.

Mr. Renwick: Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the matters which concerns us, is the whole question of comparing cost of work which is done by private contractors, compared with work which is done by the government crews. In this department it is very, very difficult for us in the Opposition to get the kind of comparative information which would let us make some assessment as to whether the operations of the department are carried on in an economic way.

To that purpose, I would like to ask whether you have comparative figures, on, say, a per mile basis, or whatever the other unit is, for work done by government crews, and work done by private contractors, on whatever comparable basis the hon. Minister may suggest would be comparable, so that we would have the figures in each case to decide which is the most economic way to have the work done.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman. First of all we can provide some comparative figures for the hon. member. I will have to ask him to give me time to get them, but I will. Secondly, I can say to the hon. member that one of the important cost factors in doing this with departmental forces is associated with the ownership, and the cost associated with ownership of great quantities of equipment, that is not used, shall we say, over a full 12-month period. I think the figures I produce for you will substantiate that we have found this to be the most economical method of getting the work done.

Mr. Renwick: If I might just interrupt the hon. Minister. What has he found to be the most economical way of having the work done?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The way we do it, by contract. I will attempt to substantiate that for you. I will get you some comparative figures. I did mention, and you probably heard me, that one of the cost factors associated with departmental forces involves tremendous amounts of money tied up in equipment not operable over a full 12-month period. Associated with that, too, are payroll costs of the people that cannot be employed over a 12-month period. The cost of and maintenance of equipment and so on, turns out to be quite high.

Mr. Renwick: Mr. Chairman, I do not quite understand what the hon. Minister is saying. Is he saying that it is impossible to compare the cost of work done by the government as compared with the cost of work done by private contractors?

Mr. Chairman: No, he said he would give you them later.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will give you this comparison. But until you do get these factual and actual comparisons, I am saying that this will be one of the things that affects the cost and the difference in the cost. I am telling you now that this is a factor. We will produce facts and comparable figures to show this.

Mr. Renwick: Could I ask the hon. Minister when he would think this could be done? Does he mean during the course of the discussion on this vote, or is this a matter to be left over until some later time?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can assure the hon. member that we will not take any longer than is required. If we can make it available during the course of the estimates, I think

you might even get back to it on 807, because a similar situation applies when you come to that vote, with respect to construction. It would be basically similar. We will see if we can produce it by then, but it depends on how long it takes to get these estimates through.

Mr. Renwick: I would hope that the hon. Minister would give us as full and complete information as possible, because he must recognize our difficulty, in deciding when large amounts of money are being expended, as to whether it is being done in an economic way.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring up the question of Highway 401, between the Windsor area and Tilbury. Apparently last year you had undergone some experimentation in repaving a stretch of the road.

Mr. Chairman: Is this reconstruction, or is this under maintenance?

Mr. Newman: This is under general maintenance. Apparently you are aware that that is probably the roughest section of 401 anywhere in Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is right.

Mr. Newman: Why is it so rough, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, for one reason, Mr. Chairman, and I think we have discussed this in the House before, it was the first piece of 401 that was put down. It is the oldest section of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway in the province. As you point out so often, that makes it pretty ancient, because we did start it quite some time ago. Roads simply do not stand up forever, and presumably we have learned a little more about road building in the terms of years that are involved than when that was first put down. I do not think there was ever too much problem with the surface, but there may be some deficiencies in the sub-grade.

However, we did put down this experimental section last year, to see how this would work and if this was a measure of economy we could effect to smooth out that section of road. I think when the test has been there long enough—and it should not take much longer—we should know that this summer.

I hope that the hon. member would say and agree with me that if we can improve the deficiencies in that section of Highway 401, Macdonald-Cartier freeway, by this means—which is more economical than complete reconstruction—then this is the sensible way to do it. That was the purpose of the trial surfacing job that was undertaken.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, we would be more than pleased to save the department any money we possibly can in the local area, if you can correct the fault that is presently in the roadway. But I understand, Mr. Minister, that the surface is not cracked at all—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Newman: Apparently it was an experiment in construction in the early days, was it not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I would not say that. In those days we probably did not use the same reinforcing measures that we have now learned to use, or a number of other construction techniques. In this case, I think that some of the techniques we employ today in road construction were not available to us then. This may very well be one of the facts which caused that condition to develop. But we are going to find out if we can remedy it this way. If we cannot, I can assure the hon. member that it will have to be reconstructed. There is no question about that.

Mr. Newman: I am quite aware of that, Mr. Chairman, because we will press the hon. Minister to reconstruct—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member will not have to; we will do it anyway.

Mr. Newman: The thing I had heard—and I do not know how true it is—was that the reason for the road being so rough is that it was built in 20-foot lengths—the slabs themselves were 20 feet—and not the 50-foot lengths from which the freeway is normally constructed. Is there any truth in that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Newman: None whatsoever? Then we can let the people back home know that after the hon. Minister has decided from experimentation the proper procedure to follow, the situation will be remedied between the Windsor and Tilbury line on Highway 401.

Mr. Paterson: I should like to ask a question regarding the subsidy for the operation of the ferries. I recall several years ago when the now Deputy Minister for the hon. Attorney General was the solicitor for The Department of Highways was in my home community discussing the Pelee Island ferry. I wonder what connection The Ontario Department of Highways has with the operation of this ferry, in view of the press reports that this is strictly an Ottawa problem.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is a federally operated ferry, as the hon. member mentioned. The policy with respect to ferries is simply this: If it takes a ferry to be an extension of the King's highway, then we take care of all the costs; if it is a ferry that is operated by a municipality, they would get their applicable rate of subsidy on the operational costs of the ferry, but in this case the ferry is operated entirely by the federal government so the costs are all borne by them.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the hon. Minister that he assign Highway 401 between the two spots that I mentioned earlier with some signs designating, "Road bumpy for next 28 miles," because when you first get off that road—and especially an American coming into our area—you stop, thinking that there is something wrong with the car. I think signs would give the individual enough knowledge that it was the highway at fault, not the car.

There was one other topic I would like to suggest to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, and that is some method of keeping the highways clean by picking up refuse and garbage. I noticed that British Columbia uses a garbage "gobbler." Has the province ever considered a mechanical means of picking up litter from the side of the road? The hon. Minister does have a policy whereby the individual who litters the road is fined \$50, but I doubt that anyone at all has been prosecuted.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not too many. Our patrols that maintain the roads certainly clean them up at intervals and I can tell the hon. member that he is quite right that there have been very few, if any, people prosecuted because they have to be caught in the act. It is one thing to have a sign up there, but unless they are caught throwing some kind of refuse on the road, there is nothing that can be done about it.

Our maintenance crews—or patrols, as we call them—do clean up the roadsides on a

schedule basis. We do not have a garbage gobbler yet.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister if the department can assure us that studded tires have no effect on the maintenance of the roads and no deteriorating effect on them?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I would not like to say that the department can assure anyone that these studs in tires do not do damage to highway surfaces. Rather, we would be of the opinion that they do material damage to the surface of a highway. This matter is being studied very thoroughly by our research branch at the moment.

This is really a matter for The Department of Transport to associate itself with. We have some doubts as to the legality of these tires, but the reason I think that there has been no determination on it is because there is a test case on this very matter before the courts in Manitoba. I think that the legality of them, or otherwise, will be determined, so probably we can wait until the courts decide.

Mr. Newman: Has the hon. Minister any information from other jurisdictions concerning the use of studded tires and—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This properly would come under The Department of Transport.

Mr. Newman: No, highway maintenance—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are dealing with the maintenance of—

Mr. Newman: That is right; and I am talking about highway maintenance at this time. If studded tires are affecting the roads, we would like to know. That is all.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think that the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) would be able to give a report on his research in connection with it.

I would make just this observation: There are some 20 states in the United States where they are banned. One of them is your neighbouring state of Michigan; they are banned in that state. Other states are investigating the use of them and we are waiting a decision by the courts of Manitoba to know what should be done. But, apart from that, their legality is a matter for The Department of Transport.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I am interested in the safety factor, rather than the

legality factor. If it is safer to have studded tires, then I think the legality of them can be taken care of by the Attorney General's office.

The next question concerns railway crossings. Municipalities are confronted with railroad crossings all the time. In my own community we happen to have had a very serious accident just recently. To what extent is the department—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This comes under another vote.

Mr. Paterson: I would like to pose a question regarding maintenance, specifically on Highway 77, which I note that the hon. Minister has allocated for repaving. Is there a point in the breakup of a road of this nature that warrants the department making a decision to reconstruct such a route? I assume that this is the case where this road is concerned.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: These roads are examined annually, or sometimes oftener, by various districts to determine their deficiency rating or their condition and when they reach the point where they are more costly to maintain than reconstruct, then of course they are reconstructed.

Mr. Paterson: I just hope you can get a good bid.

Mr. Spence: I should like to ask the hon. Minister a question with regard to the MacDonald-Cartier freeway. If a vehicle goes off the road and goes through a fence, is it the responsibility of the farmer to replace the fence where it has been destroyed, or is it the responsibility of The Department of Highways?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think that in the majority of cases, if not all of them, that would be the responsibility of the driver and his insurance company. I do not think that we could be held responsible for the actions of the driver in those circumstances.

Mr. Spence: Suppose the vehicle which damaged the fence is not found? Is it then the responsibility of the farmer?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If there is anything in the area of negligence on the part of The Department of Highways, or a condition associated with the road itself that can be proven to have caused the accident, then I would say that the department would undertake to make redress for the cost involved. Otherwise I think it is the responsi-

bility of the driver and his insurer, and if he is not caught then I do not know what to tell the hon. member, except that it is tough luck.

Mr. Spence: You mean the farmer's hard luck.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it would look that way.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, might I suggest to the hon. Minister that something might be done about the fence along Highway 27 right in the median connecting Highways 27 and 401? It certainly is a mess; it is apparently being run into all the time. Could the hon. Minister not put fences along both sides of the road rather than down the median so that the youngsters would have two fences to climb were they interested in crossing from one side of Highway 27 to the other side? Possibly the answer to the problem might be a pedestrian walk-over in areas where you have a lot of pedestrian traffic.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I suppose, Mr. Chairman, there might be a number of things considered there. This has been put up as a temporary measure of keeping children from crossing Highway 27. Highway 27 will shortly be completely reconstructed. Plans for the widening of 27 are imminent, you might say. When I say imminent, that could be several months. But we are going to widen it, we are going to have to build new service roads, and I think maybe we should minimize the expenditures that are made on it for now.

Mr. Newman: Good enough.

Mr. Chairman: Section 1 agreed to.

On section 2:

Mr. Thompson: I do not know whether this comes under it, Mr. Chairman. I was interested in knowing the policy of the department concerning trees growing in the dividing area between two highway lanes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In the median?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, on the Queen Elizabeth.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That practice, Mr. Chairman, has been discontinued.

Mr. Thompson: Could I ask why it has been discontinued?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In many cases they were not surviving, and in other cases they could be a major traffic hazard. For a variety of reasons we discontinued them.

Nothing is more arresting than a tree in the wrong place, I would point out to the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Thompson: I am just wondering on this point, whether on the Queen Elizabeth, where there are trees growing, does the hon. Minister consider them a dangerous hazard?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Does the hon. leader of the Opposition mean down the median strip?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are very few of them left. There are so very few that possibly they will all disappear in a short period of time. There are very few sections of the Queen Elizabeth left where there are any trees down the median strip.

Mr. Paterson: The hon. member for Bruce was going to ask some questions regarding salt, but I might question the hon. Minister regarding salt inhibitors. I recall a few enjoyable moments in the House last year on the question regarding salt inhibitors. But I would specifically ask, in the survey that was conducted by the department in the various municipalities in southwestern Ontario, what percentage of the municipalities replied to the questionnaire of the department and what percentage indicated that they would enjoy going along with having inhibitors?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you what the precise percentage was, but a fair number indicated they would go along and a fair percentage of municipalities did not respond at all. That is information I will have to get; I do not have it immediately available.

Mr. Paterson: Are tests still being conducted in the department in regard to inhibitors and so forth?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I say to the hon. member that we have a very full and intensive research programme under way. It is about a year old now, I guess. It will probably take two years to complete. We propose to run it through from October of last fall to May, 1967. We instituted it last fall.

We are carrying out the main test at Downsview where we have five rigs fixed with pieces of auto body steel. The rigs will simulate actual road conditions. Rig 1 will test natural conditions with no salt added; rig 2 will test natural conditions with salt added as required; rigs 3, 4 and 5 will test natural conditions with salt added as required. Each of the last three rigs will use a different type of corrosion inhibitor.

Further tests are being carried out—and this is part of our research programme—in five parts of the province, and in Alberta and the Maritimes, with strips of auto body steel mounted on cars. In all test areas, corrosion due to atmospheric conditions will also be determined.

We hope that the results of this research programme will determine such matters as the extent to which de-icing salt causes corrosion, how effective are corrosion inhibitors and which is the best inhibitor, and will the amount of corrosion prevented by an inhibitor justify its cost. These are the things we are trying to determine and we are doing it on this broad-range basis that I made reference to.

It being 6 o'clock p.m., the House took recess.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Monday, March 7, 1966
Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Monday, March 7, 1966

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1229
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1253

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

Mr. Chairman: Vote 804, section 2. The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I will ask this a little later, instead of under this item.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, on section 3, "Repaving present roads."

This might be a suitable place to inquire about the Indian roads. Very specifically a good many of the hon. members would remember the paving of the road through the Six Nations reservation, which has been completed for a full year now, and a bit more. There have been many complaints about the final finish on this road and I wonder if the hon. Minister has something that he could say definitely about the possibility of this road being repaved. I have heard from members of the Indian council that the road would be repaved, but I would like to hear from the hon. Minister what plans there are for this job.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): I would say to the hon. member that we treat roads on Indian reservations basically the same as we would if they were in a township or municipality. They are entitled to subsidies at the same rate as the basic rate to a municipality.

You are talking about the Six Nations reserve now, of course. As to the precise details on why the road is not in an acceptable condition or why repaving or further maintenance work is required, I would have to look into it. But basically, the township or the reserve, which in this instance is the counterpart of a township, initiates the work; we just subsidize it.

Mr. Nixon: I think with the exception of this road then, you subsidize

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Is this a reserve road? Is it a King's highway, the one you have reference to?

Mr. Nixon: It is a reserve road, Mr. Chairman, but I understand that the original financing of the road was established under a special procedure. When the road was built, I would say that the work done on it in general was excellent, except for the final finish. There has been some complaint about it, that it began breaking up almost immediately, and it has become in fairly bad shape. I would recommend to you, sir, that the basic financing of that particular road should be continued, with respect to the resurfacing.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, it will be. The gesture that will be advanced to the reserve would be the same as we would advance to a municipality. If they want to put this in their expenditure bylaw, there is no reason to believe that the bylaw would not be approved, and the work on improvements that you indicate are required would be subsidized in the normal manner.

It may be that this was built as a development road. I do not think it was in this circumstance.

Mr. Nixon: I do not think it was, either. It was a special mode of financing for this road.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Nevertheless, it is now, for all intent and purposes, a township road, a municipal road as far as subsidization is concerned by our department. The Indian band simply passes the expenditure bylaw, involving the amount of money that is required to do the work.

If they wish to talk about something above and beyond the normal rate of subsidy that is applicable, because of what you describe as somewhat different circumstances, certainly they can take this up with the district municipal engineer, or the chief municipal engineer at Downsview. If there are circumstances that warrant something above and beyond the normal rate of subsidy, for a variety of reasons, this can all be considered, but they will

have to do it by initiating a bylaw for approval purposes.

Mr. Nixon: One of the difficulties that this government has in dealing with the Indians on the reservations is that they insist on regarding them as municipalities, or similar to municipalities. This works out quite well, in some connections, as the hon. Minister well knows, but not all.

Unfortunately, the Indians are hardly in a position to pass what the hon. Minister has called a bylaw. Their funds actually come from the federal government for most of this work, and the people that you have to deal with are, of course, the Indian council primarily, but in a secondary position, and a position of great importance, are the people who are going to provide the rest of the funds, and that is the Indian office in Ottawa.

One further difficulty that would delay the repaving of this road, Mr. Chairman, is the manner in which the subsidies are made available to the municipalities, if you will. The expenditure is made and then the department reimburses them. Is this not so?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but the hon. member may recall that two or three years ago we introduced a means of making payment on approved subsidies. I think three times a year we can make an interim payment, and their moneys are made available much more frequently than they used to be.

But let me ask the hon. member, if I may, Mr. Chairman, to recall a meeting I am sure he attended with officers of the Indian band—the chief and a number of others. There was a representative there—his name escapes me at the moment—from the Indian affairs branch. If the hon. member recalls, I would say to him, we at that time stated rather categorically to the representative of the federal authority that we would welcome the time when they would take the place of a municipality as far as Indian bands were concerned.

Our statute permits us only to subsidize up to the level that is set up in the statute. We recognize very well that these Indian bands do not have the resources that townships do nor the means of obtaining these resources. Surely I must at this point reiterate what I did at that meeting—I think it is something the federal government should approach very quickly, that they then should be the counterpart of the municipality in terms of making provision for the extra funds that are required. We are limited by statute as to how much we can put up. We are limited by

statute as to the amount we can subsidize municipalities, as the hon. member knows.

In the absence of something like that in terms of these Indian bands, if we are going to do what has to be done on these reserves then the federal authorities have to recognize that they are going to have to put up the difference or a greater portion of it than they now do, because I could not agree with the hon. member more that bands have not access to the resources and the funds to do it themselves. And yet statutorily we cannot do anything more, and we think frankly it is a responsibility of the federal government or at least for the moment it is responsible for these situations.

I am not trying to shift any responsibility here, but certainly something has to be recognized, or we are going to be confronted with this problem. Now if the hon. member is suggesting that we should move in and pick up something that the federal authority does not make available to these Indian bands, I am sure that is a topic of another discussion. This is one of the great problems at the moment, I assure you.

Mr. Nixon: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear the hon. Minister expand on this difficult subject. I would agree with him that there is much that the federal government could do to improve the situation. But the flexibility must surely lie with the hon. Minister's department as well. Specifically this is the main difficulty, that after an agreement is made whereby the Indians can expect some subsidy from The Department of Highways, the road is built and paid for, then the subsidy returns to what you would call the municipality but what is, in fact, in this case the consolidated revenue fund of the government of Canada, and it is lost to the Indian branch entirely.

It may well be that the accommodation should all be made at the federal level but another alternative would be that the regulations governing the payments by the hon. Minister's department to the Indian band could be made more flexible so that the funds would be available for the actual operation, the actual paving operation in this case, and not after it has been completed. The Indian affairs branch apparently has some difficulty in this connection, and it is something to bear in mind.

Before I sit down, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask again specifically about the resurfacing of this new road that was financed in a manner other than the manner that the hon. Minister has described. I would submit, sir,

that there is a continuing responsibility for this particular road, that it be put in condition that is satisfactory to the Indians living on the Six Nations reserve. I would appeal to the hon. Minister to look into it very carefully so that in the coming paving season, if possible, this can be put in tip-top shape. Then the regular rules can apply until such time as the flexibility that both of us look for comes into effect.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will just conclude this by saying to the hon. member that we will look into the original circumstances and the original conditions under which the road was built. It may very well be that there is some deficiency in the road and the surface is not what it should be. Maybe the same terms of reference should apply now that applied in the initial circumstances. I will have to pursue that, of course, and see what it is all about.

Mr. Nixon: Do your best.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister, about the Burlington skyway. Is the Burlington skyway going to be resurfaced this year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we contemplate resurfacing the skyway.

Mr. Newman: How long is it since it was originally surfaced?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not know for sure. I think it is the original surface that is on there.

Mr. Newman: The original surface is on it now?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Likely, yes.

Mr. Newman: What lifespan has it had? What is it, about four years old?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, no, it is more like ten years.

Mr. Newman: I do not know, I am asking the hon. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: More like ten years.

Mr. Newman: Is that the life expectancy of the road surface?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The life expectancy of any surface is related to the amount of vehicular use and wear that it gets. There is a very heavy amount of traffic over

the Burlington skyway, and particularly since the tolls were reduced there is a tremendous amount more. As I pointed out to the hon. member under a previous vote, truck traffic has increased tremendously. Heavy truck traffic in volume certainly means that a road surface will not stand up as long as it otherwise would. So you cannot say there is any particular period of life to a road; it is associated with the amount of traffic, and the kind of traffic that is using it.

Mr. Newman: Then, Mr. Minister, was the engineering in the first instance satisfactory or not, for it has only lasted ten years?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I would say if it lasted ten years the engineering must have been very good, when you consider the volume of traffic that uses it.

Mr. Newman: May I continue with another subject? What is the status of Highway 3; and does the Minister plan on paving it the full length in the foreseeable future?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not know what you call the foreseeable future. I might say, Mr. Chairman, Highway 3 runs all the way from Windsor to Fort Erie—

An hon. member: All bad, too.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is a very long highway. We certainly have a plan for the eventual reconstruction of Highway 3, and we have started at the Fort Erie end. Some work has been done and some more will be done. I think it will probably be done in terms of priorities. We will do those areas that require it the most. But, to say that in the short-term future, No. 3 will be reconstructed in its entirety, is quite another story. What is it—250 miles, maybe more than that?

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, to follow up on these remarks, I note, in the construction projects, where the department has announced that on section 3 in the Port Alma area, they are going to reconstruct a couple of bridges and drains. I wonder in that specific area—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Which area is that again?

Mr. Paterson: Port Alma, Kent county east of Wheatley. I discussed this with the member for that area and we are very hopeful that some work will be done in that area as far as reconstructing the whole area.

Mr. L. C. Henderson (Lambton East): Not this year.

Mr. Paterson: Is there any indication that this eight or nine miles will be resurfaced this coming year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I can find that out very readily for the hon. member, but I do not have it at my finger tips. Certainly, there is a complete rehabilitation programme on Highway 3, but it will be done in stages, as I have pointed out. It will be done in those stages and areas that need it the most.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 804.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): None of us over here are engineers, therefore we cannot speak with any expert knowledge about the technical aspect of maintaining King's highways, but then, again, neither is the political head of this department, an engineer. What I do not understand is, comparing this item of \$150,000, which may be spent pursuant to section 90 of The Highway Improvement Act, with the item which I believe is No. 5 under "Capital Disbursements," under the same section of this same Act, of \$17 million. I am rather startled by the smallness of the amount.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not see any amount of that—

Mr. Sopha: Pardon?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Did you say \$150,000?

Mr. Sopha: Yes, \$150,000.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: In item No. 1?

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 804, section 5, the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, I am sorry; \$500,000. It strikes me that when you are spending as in the last fiscal year—I look at the public accounts for the last fiscal year for which we have record and that is March 31, 1965, apparently \$14,368,000 and change was spent in capital costs. It strikes me that the disparity between the two is too great. A half million dollars for the maintenance of roads which presumably are already built and are being kept up to a certain standard.

I do not know, because I belong to the Macaulay school of mathematics, what percentage \$500,000 is of \$14 million, but that small percentage rather drives me to the conclusion that these discretionary expenditures which I do not like in the first place—I do not believe Ministers of the Crown should be left with the discretion to spend money

according to their whim to any large extent, and that is what section 90 says:

The Minister may designate as a development road, a road or proposed road under the jurisdiction and control of a municipality, other than a city-separated town or village.

It might have said a township and saved a bit of verbiage, because apparently that is what is meant when you rule out all the rest. All that is left are townships; perhaps a police village or perhaps an improvement district—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That was amended last year, you will recall.

Mr. Sopha: It does not say "as amended" in the estimates.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Are those the revised statutes, 1960?

Mr. Sopha: It says "Highway Improvement Act, section 90," and if you mean as amended, it should be put in.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right, we will put it in now.

Mr. Sopha: I do not speak to the hon. Minister directly, Mr. Chairman; forgive me, through you. If he means as amended, he should put it in.

I digress because I do not believe the statutes should give Ministers discretion to spend money according to their whim, because there is always a danger with respect to parts of the province that are not consonant with the trend of government at the particular moment.

Five hundred thousand dollars in respect of a cumulative number of years of spending of \$14 million does not seem to be a very generous amount of money. I do not belong to the Sargent school of economics—let me say that—and I am not one who uses the floor of this Legislature to condemn or to criticize the vast amounts of money for Toronto subways or the \$14 million a mile—mark you—for the Gardiner expressway. But still I am conscious that a great many people come down south of the French. They sort of cross the French to look at civilization and they see the large networks of roads down here.

I might say in conjunction with the next item, "Roads in Unincorporated Townships"—because the two rather go together—that there is a good deal of feeling in northern and northwestern Ontario that the road-building process is like the mills of the gods—it grinds exceedingly slow. When one remembers that

four-fifths of the land area of this province is north of the French, there is a good deal of real estate waiting to be opened up by these development roads.

It is all very well for the first citizen to come up to Sudbury, as he did a few weeks ago, and talk about what great people we are and what a great future we have. And in the process, of course, expose himself to getting some advice from the senator. He was not here before supper when I said something about the senator, but I understand that the senator gave him some advice on running the government of Ontario. That is what I am told; my spies tell me that. Let me tell the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner)—the senator made a speech that was published in the paper and it was so good the hon. Minister wanted 100 copies of it, to bring back with him.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Well, they like to hear the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) say those things. But every place, for example, the mining committee went in its chores consistent with its responsibilities, perhaps the first item they spoke to us about was the absence of roads.

In Wawa, that is what concerned them, and Manitowadge, Fort Frances, Kenora, Sioux Lookout, Red Lake, Timmins. They talked about roads and they are asking for roads because they know the only way of opening up that country up there is through the building of roads. As John Wintermeyer used to say here, one of the wise things he often referred to was that people follow roads. Roads ought not to follow the people. Open up the country first.

Those in the north who are aware of the affluence of the southern part of the province, where albeit their wealth comes down to generate a considerable amount of that affluence, would like to hear from the hon. Minister about some acceleration in respect of this road-building programme.

Now to return to—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is what I have been waiting for.

Mr. Sopha: —to where my remarks initiated. This section, as I say, grants to the Minister a discretion. I do not like that. I would like to hear from him whether he has a programme of where his \$500,000 is going to be spent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is already in. I have been waiting to tell the hon. member that.

Mr. Sopha: Five hundred thousand dollars is not enough for it. Following a practice that is now in a high stage of development in this government, he can go to the Treasury board any time before the end of the fiscal year and he can get the Treasury board, which apparently has very loose regulations, as the *Globe and Mail* so aptly points out, which will grant them large amounts of money within this vote for him to spend where and as he will, as his conscience and his whims may dictate. The hon. Minister shakes his head, but the *Globe and Mail* points out that last year the Treasury board granted, under Treasury board orders, \$35 million—more than the whole budget of this province in 1919 or 1922, somewhere around there, which we are looking at in the public accounts. I try not to be parochial, but if one lives in northern Ontario—

Some hon. members: Carried.

Mr. Sopha: It will not be carried until I am finished and have my say on behalf of those citizens north of the French. I hope to have a voice here.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury has the floor.

Mr. Sopha: One wonders what the intentions are in respect of doing something concrete and tangible. Perhaps people may turn around and say to me: "Well, Mr. Member from Sudbury, if you do not get more parochial, you view the whole province as your constituency rather than looking after the interests of the area you come from, maybe we had better not send you back there any more." That might be a very wise decision; I have always belonged to that school that felt the sun will not fail to rise tomorrow if that happened. There has come a point in our affairs—and this is a very touchy subject with us—where we are just wondering what our future is after 23 years in office of this government. I can say that I firmly—

Mr. Chairman: We are on vote 804.

Mr. Sopha: I am talking about development roads in northern Ontario; it is just what I am talking about as being a symptom of neglect of that part of the province.

Although I like the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) as persons—affable, honourable people, as they are—one can look with a considerable degree of want and paucity about what they have accomplished in sitting

in the Cabinet councils of this province for this length of time for the area which they represent—the north. One of them is a very powerful member of the Cabinet, the hon. member from Timmins. The other is not such an influential member of the Cabinet.

But if you want to point to roads in the wilderness of northern Ontario, you will not find very many of recent vintage that you are going to name the Spooner-Wardrope highways. The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, I can say to him through you, Mr. Chairman, has just about worn out, from the point of view of elections, the road from Timmins to Foleyet; he had better come up with another pretty soon. That one has been good for about three or four elections.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are away past Foleyet now.

Mr. Sopha: You know, in respect of this symptom of neglect, in northern Ontario in the past four or five months one again hears—the notion had disappeared for perhaps a decade—more and more people north of the French talking about the possibility of the establishment of another province, separating from the rest of the province. We now hear that again.

Mr. L. Letherby (Simcoe East): We cannot help that.

Mr. Sopha: You cannot help it, but you are doing your best to encourage it. Apart from the expressions, the homilies, the shibboleths that we have had to listen to for a quarter of a century now about what great people we are, and the great future we have and how God-fearing we appear to be, we get from leader after leader of the government—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 804:

Mr. Sopha: —we want something concrete and tangible in the way of a network of roads throughout that important part of this country that produces so much wealth.

So I will not have to ask at a later time, so I can carry it back to the bases, will the hon. Minister tell them when the road to Timmins will be finished; what is the projected date?

Go down to the Gardiner expressway, go down and look at the subway. You do not see any delay. The jack-hammers, the riveters, the cement trucks, the engineers, the technicians are working around the clock to get them finished and into use.

And properly so; large numbers of people can be carried through those arteries. But if you are building a road through the wilderness north of Sudbury to link up the two biggest metropolitan centres, and to give Sudbury some contact with its hinterland, instead of confining it to an east-west access, as it has been, then all you bring is smiles from the hon. Minister of Highways in the House, who will not tell you what year we might expect that artery will be opened. So it goes from year to year. For all that the people of Sudbury are anxious about that type of thing, all they can do is continue to protest to the government about it. The good supporter of the government, J. R. Leach can write editorials in the *Sudbury Star*; the member can lay it on the floor of the House, but apparently none of it does any good.

Wait for an answer, some type of response from the hon. Minister of Highways! Wait for him to get up and say: "Here, in recognition of the importance of your community in the economy of this province, we can tell you that we will have that road finished and opened by 1968." Oh, no! That would be a realistic and sensible and honourable way of doing it. The hon. Minister merely smiles and votes another 15 miles of road in these estimates.

My plea to the hon. Minister—and he understands the position I am in, and what impels me to say these things on the floor of the House—my plea to him is to do the right thing, the proper thing, by an important community in northern Ontario. The Lord knows we are small in numbers up there, only one in ten of the people in this province live in that part of Ontario, but the wealth we create and the jobs we provide for people in the rest of the province are just immense and absolutely invaluable to the economy of this province.

Decidedly, let us have enough of the speeches and let us get on with the job of work that can crystallize itself in real terms of doing something for the opening up of the hinterland of this province.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I do propose to answer the questions of the hon. member as they relate to item 5 of vote 804. It did occur to me that there was a rather wide range in comment over an item that involves a half a million dollars this year, and I would like to tell him just what that involves.

Last year the amount was \$150,000, this year it has reached to half a million dollars

and I would like to tell the hon. member why. But first, this amount of money is required to keep under maintenance those sections of development roads that are under construction. Development roads are a matter of two designations.

The first one, and I am sure the hon. member may be very well aware of this, is what is known as a pre-engineering designation. It is followed then by a construction designation, after the engineering requirements, the acquisition of land and all those associated matters have been provided for. When that engineering work is done and the land is acquired a construction designation follows. During that period of time completed sections of the road require maintenance; because after the completion of a road and for a period of time during those weeks or months when the department and the involved municipality make sure that the road has been built according to the specifications of the contract, we do assist the municipalities with interim maintenance. But when that is all done, a revocation order is the next item in the process of things and the road then reverts back to the municipality in which it is built, be it township or county. It then becomes the responsibility of the county.

Now this little bit of money, \$150,000 is set up for that purpose. Necessary maintenance on roads built as development roads where it appears that the expenditure in some instances is beyond the financial capacity of the local jurisdiction. Regravelling of such roads is an item in here.

But then to get back to the reason why it is up from \$150,000 to \$500,000 this year, and this may well answer a question that was proposed by the hon. member for Kent East (Mr. Spence), it has been explained to the House on a number of occasions, we dwelt on it in our introductory remarks and we dwelt on it to some extent last week. In the southern part of the province we have just completed, or the counties have completed in association with The Department of Highways, a needs study. I have indicated to the House why that needs study was undertaken. As a result of the recommendations of the needs studies in each county certain roads were assumed into the county system—or they were recommended for assumption, let me put it that way—if they were found to be desirable county roads. In other situations there were roads in the county system that upon review, in terms of the study, it was indicated and agreed to by the local jurisdictions should not be the responsibility of the county. In these circumstances, either now, or over the period of five years, these

roads will revert back to the townships, the jurisdictions that should properly have owned and maintained them.

However, it was felt, and I think properly so, that to countenance, if you like, a county reverting mileage of road to a township could impose a burden on that township that they had not been able to contemplate. Consequently, this \$350,000 that is over and above the \$150,000 last year is going to be given to the various counties of the province in order that they in turn may compensate these townships for the cost of maintenance over a five-year period, as a result of reversion of these roads.

Now that makes up the \$500,000 that is referred to here. The other comments of the hon. member for Sudbury, I would point out to him, might more properly have been brought up on the capital construction vote, No. 807. Frankly I would prefer to discuss them under that vote, because they are not appropriate to this vote at all.

I might also point out to him that the development road capital vote is not in this vote here at all. This is a maintenance vote entirely.

Now, I hope I have explained to his satisfaction how this vote is broken down. I have only one more comment to make on that as it applies to the north.

A year ago, following a trip to the north as a matter of fact, and I will be specific about it, to the riding of Parry Sound, we discovered two circumstances up there where urban municipalities required some assistance on their roads, but there was no statutory provision for a development road designation as there is in the southern part of the province.

Let me explain that to the hon. member: In the southern part of the province—where townships or villages, or towns that are part of the county, that is, they are contributing to the funds of the county, the county system, if you like—in these municipalities the county has the authority to assume a road in a township or a town or a village for the purposes of construction or reconstruction, and upon completion revert the road to the municipality. They can do this under bylaw and get the appropriate rate of subsidy, or they can do this under a direct assistance programme, a development road if you wish, where 100 per cent of the cost with the exception of property and fencing is provided for, and again revert it to the municipality.

This was not possible in the north and we simply felt that they were entitled to the same privileges that were available to the

municipalities in that area of the province where the counties and the county system exists. Consequently there was an amendment to that statute last year which now enables us to do in municipalities, urban municipalities, villages and towns in the northern parts of the province, exactly what we can do and had been able to do for some years in the southern part of the province.

I would like to suggest to the hon. member that this is giving some fair and sensible recognition to those northern communities that could not get this type of assistance before. I can tell this hon. member from the north, through you, Mr. Chairman, and any hon. member from the north, that two municipalities, one the town of Parry Sound and the other the village of Powassan, have already—

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, let me finish. —have already moved to implement this new legislation, and I hope there will be more.

Mr. Sopha: Is that the north?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is the north as far as the application of this statutory amendment is concerned. It is applicable in Parry Sound, it is applicable in the district of Sudbury, Kenora, North Cochrane—wherever it was not applicable before.

Really, Mr. Chairman, this is all that I can appropriately say on this vote. The other matters that the hon. member commented upon before the House we will probably come to under vote 807, where they belong.

Mr. Sopha: I have an additional comment. This is all very interesting, this journey through the statutes. Now, apparently, we are told that section 90 has been interpreted to aid counties, county councils; at least the hon. Minister spent a good deal of time talking about county roads in southern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Municipalities.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I notice that the section refers to—"may designate a road under the jurisdiction and control of a municipality."

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right, I said that.

Mr. Sopha: Municipality is not defined in The Highway Improvement Act. I looked in The Interpretation Act to see if it is defined there, but it is not defined in that statute either. I would question whether a municipality includes a county council.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: A county is a municipality.

Mr. Sopha: I would wonder if there has been a perversion of the meaning of this section. I notice in the statute, to me, development means development, that is just what it means; development in the sense of opening up areas of territory in its original state, a state of nature. That description does not appertain to southern Ontario, which is largely opened up. That is one thing.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me.

Mr. Sopha: I am speaking. I say to you that I am speaking on this item and none other.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I was wondering if the member for Sudbury is discussing the development road which comes under vote 807, as a new road for construction, rather than for maintenance under this section.

Mr. Sopha: Well, I am speaking about this item.

Mr. Chairman: You see, under this particular section we are dealing with maintenance and under 807 we are dealing with the construction of new roads.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I am dealing with the spending of \$500,000 under section 90. I am asking some questions which I hope are important. I have made my point that I question whether there is authority to spend money under county roads, under that section, and I am not attempting to give any opinion which would be appropriate to the law officers of the Crown. The hon. Minister talked about county roads. Now, I have gone on to the second point, the development; the heading of that part, part 11 of The Highway Improvement Act, being development roads, I would think it was the intention of the Legislature that passed that section to mean original, to mean territory in northern Ontario still in a state of nature, and bring about its development. Now the hon. Minister tells us that large amounts of money are spent in southern Ontario, and I suggest to him that that might be a perversion of the intent of the statute.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Sopha: The third point that I make is that, by way of contiguity, part 11 of the statute, dealing with development roads, is right next door to part 12, roads in territory without municipal organization, so the Legislature that passed that original statute was at

least thinking of these two in proximity to each other.

As in many other aspects of affairs one notes that northern Ontario comes at the tail end of the statute, part 11, 12, as I pointed out, the only other part 13 is general. The general part of the statute. I submit to you, Mr. Chairman, it was probably the original intent that this amount of \$500,000 asked to be voted this year was intended to be spent with those municipalities in northern Ontario, organized municipalities, where the roads in the words of the statute: "should be constructed, improved or maintained to a higher standard that is reasonable having regard to the economic situation of the municipality." And that fits to a T.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is it. Yes.

Mr. Sopha: That fits to a T. The poorest municipalities in the province are the ones in northern Ontario, because of the smallness of the population. The paucity of a goodly group of ratepayers—they are the ones who need help—which fortifies my argument that that Legislature once again indicates that it had in mind municipalities in northern Ontario. Now we arrive at the point where the hon. Minister comes along, says that he dips his hand into the fund, holus-bolus, and he spends it for county councils.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I did not say that at all.

Mr. Sopha: That brings me to another interesting point. It has long struck me—I do not know if it has struck the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs or the hon. Minister of Mines—but it has long struck me, that one of the reasons for the relatively good roads in southern Ontario is the fact that you have to have the pressure group in the form of a county council that can make the area's needs—that political area, that political unit—known to the government. In northern Ontario, we are not blessed with any comparable organization.

Apparently we have not arrived at the state of political majority or development where any form of territorial organization has superseded the largely unorganized character of governance in northern Ontario. We have not got it. But it is revealing—I will remember this at an appropriate time—it is revealing that the hon. Minister now comes along to having development roads, which all my kinsmen, colleagues, brethren, in northern Ontario would agree with me once they saw that, they would agree with me, "that's for us, development."

As soon as you use the adjective "development" that means new Ontario and that is what it is meant to appertain to. But, I will remember this, that we are now informed by the hon. Minister of Highways that apparently most of the money is spent in southern Ontario.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I did not say that.

Mr. Sopha: All right, that is that point. We will wait with great gusto. I, for one, speaking for my own part—Laurier's phrase—speaking for my own part, I will wait with great gusto till we come to the appropriate votes where we discuss the larger issue and I would like—and I throw out the challenge—that once we get into the subject of building roads in the district of Thunder Bay, and the district of Kenora and Fort Frances and Cochrane, Sudbury, Nipissing and Algoma—that is northern Ontario. That is not—what do you call that posh place up here?

An hon. member: Muskoka?

Mr. Sopha: Not Muskoka—not Parry Sound—north of the French river—northern Ontario and I offer the challenge, to complete my sentence to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, to get up and tell us what he has done lately—as the voter said to Duplessis' men, "What have you done for me lately?" I offer him the challenge to tell us what he has done lately for northern Ontario in this road building programme.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: The last word is for my colleagues.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that I did not make myself quite clear. I should like to attempt to do that now. Certainly, development road funds are available for expenditure in any part of the northern part of the province. They always have been and they always will be. I simply tried to point out two examples where we have made it possible in the north—albeit I referred to Parry Sound, but it does not really matter because it is the same that is available from Kenora right through to North Cochrane.

There have been many millions of dollars spent on development roads through the north and I will be surprised if some of the hon. members do not attest to that. I might also comment that for the purposes of The Highway Improvement Act, I think The Municipal Act and any Act that is associated in

the province and the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs can correct me on this, a county is a municipality, for all practical purposes, all legal purposes.

Again, I simply want to set the record straight; a portion of the development road vote under 807—when we come to it—will be available for the municipalities in the north on the same warrant or appraisal basis as any municipality in the south. I simply tried to explain how this \$500,000 vote was arrived at.

Mr. Sopha: Before we leave that point—I just did not want the record to be incorrect. I say a county is not a municipality for the purposes of this Act.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You say that; I say differently. So there you are.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Sopha: Perhaps the provincial auditor had better look into the hon. Minister's department. There is no definition of a county being a municipality in this statute.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is probably defined in The Municipal Act.

Mr. Sopha: No, it does not apply there. I give that opinion without the necessity of being paid \$3.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we will probably refer that to the law officers of the Crown. But we are getting by very nicely on the assumption that a county is a municipality—very nicely, I assure you.

Mr. Sopha: Maybe you are spending money illegally.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I simply want to say now, though we should do it under vote 807, but having raised it and having suggested it on this vote, there is no reason that if the same criteria, the same warrants and everything else, are met in any northern township, development roads cannot be built in the north just the same as they can in the south. They have been, are now and will continue to be.

Mr. Sopha: You are spending most of the money in southern Ontario.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise two questions with the hon. Minister of Highways under vote 804, item 6, "Municipal subsidies." I am sure the hon. Minister will recognize the problem I want to raise with him, and that

is the apparent running battle with himself and his department and his worship, the mayor of Hamilton, over what is termed equal grants and equal treatment in regard to special road building costs.

I have been accused—and other members from Hamilton have been accused—of not supporting the mayor and his colleagues in city council in putting some pressure on the government to see that Hamilton is treated on an equal basis with Toronto. And we know that his worship, the mayor uses such terms as "outright discrimination"—he says that Hamilton is treated as a "has-not" and "thrown only crumbs" and that "the province ends on the boundaries of Metro," and so on.

Mr. Chairman, I admit that some time ago, as the hon. Minister may recall, I met with a delegation from Hamilton council and with the hon. Minister and his staff, and I thought at the time that the hon. Minister had explained quite logically why the city of Hamilton could not get 50 per cent subsidy on their east-west Burlington street project, and that they were only entitled to one-third. But his worship, the mayor does not give up quite so easily.

I would ask the hon. Minister to tell us once and for all what the problem is. Is Hamilton entitled to equal grants, the same as the city of Toronto? Is there some reason why they should not have the 50 per cent subsidy on their east-west Burlington street project? If not, I would hope that the hon. Minister would take some time and clear up this subject, because I am getting a little tired of having some of the colleagues of his worship, the mayor cast aspersions at myself and other hon. members from the Hamilton area for not going to bat as strongly as one might think we should in this regard.

Would the hon. Minister tell us the reason why the city of Hamilton is not entitled to 50 per cent subsidy on its road project? If there is a chance that they might get it, and if not, we should know about it at the present time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I can shed some light on that, Mr. Chairman. This has been mentioned before; city streets in any city—by statute—are eligible for a subsidy of 33½ per cent. Connecting links in any city, or separated town, are entitled to a subsidy of 75 per cent.

In the city of Toronto—and I would like to elaborate on this at some length—the city of Toronto has no connecting links. The city of Toronto is entitled to 33½ per cent on its streets, the same as any other metropolitan

community. But by virtue of The Metropolitan Toronto Act, Metro roads are eligible for a 50 per cent subsidy. It is impossible at this moment to compare Hamilton with Metropolitan Toronto, because in all frankness, the statute under which rates of subsidy are set up in Hamilton is The Highway Improvement Act. In Toronto, the subsidy for Metro roads is under The Metropolitan Toronto Municipal Act—or whatever the title is.

With respect to Mayor Copps—he presumably is interested in getting what he can for the city of Hamilton. I think his principal concern, from which all this conversation has emanated, stems from the fact that he believes he is faced with the rebuilding of Burlington street. Burlington street, as such, is a city street and statutorily it is eligible for a subsidy of 33½ per cent. It is not a connecting link; it is not an extension of the King's highway through the city of Hamilton; it cannot, under any set of circumstances, be categorized as a connecting link.

On the other hand, reference has been made by the hon. member to the downtown expressway. The downtown expressway is part of a stage recommended in the Hamilton transportation study report, prepared by C. C. Parker and Associates.

The Hamilton transportation study recommended a 20-year programme for the city of Hamilton, broken into three stages. I think the first is seven years, the second is seven years, and probably the third stage is six. And it is all set out in categorical fashion in the report.

Upon completion of the report, the mayor of Hamilton, in company with some of his elected and appointed officials, came to see me and officials of my department. They brought the report with them. We had had an opportunity to study it. In basic principle, we accepted the recommendations in the plan and on that occasion we indicated this to the mayor. We accepted the basic recommendations of the plan.

As a matter of fact, I was privileged and pleased to go to Hamilton to officially open the first section of Highway 403, sometimes referred to as the Chedoke expressway. On that occasion it was another privilege to make a few remarks. And on that occasion, which was precisely November 27, 1963, I was able to tell the mayor and those who were in attendance at the function where the remarks were made, that Hamilton stood well to be one of the first cities who could take advantage of an amendment to The Highway Improvement Act, with respect to urban expressways.

The hon. members will probably recall that we introduced this amending legislation into the House in the spring of 1963. This made it possible for us to enter into agreements with urban municipalities with respect to urban expressways. And the downtown expressway referred to in Hamilton meets all the criteria to make it eligible for a subsidy of 75 per cent across the board; 75 per cent against the cost of the required property, 75 per cent of the cost of capital construction and 75 per cent of the subsequent maintenance. A very generous subsidy arrangement.

That was on November 27, when we made this announcement in Hamilton. A few days later, we repeated the offer in my office. I can say to you that, until two months ago, we were engaged in a rather sharp difference of opinion vis-à-vis Burlington street, which by statute is not eligible for more than 33½ per cent. We had many opportunities to say this, shall I put it that way? Until as recently as two months ago, the first move in the direction of getting for the people of Hamilton, 75 per cent, across the board, for their downtown expressway—nothing has been done about it. We set up the technical co-ordinating committee two months ago to get on with the job. It will take them at least a year to get into the technical and engineering aspects and the functional work, all associated with this downtown expressway, before a foot of it can be built.

So I simply point out to the hon. member that I can only view this as two to three years of the first seven-year stage lost to the people of Hamilton entirely.

I do not know whether this is the information the hon. member required. I believe it to be; I think this is it. If there is anything more, we would be happy to answer it.

I have already pointed out that the council delayed in appointing the technical co-ordinating committee until two months ago. This is a step which is associated with this type of development in every urban community where an urban expressway is to be built, and there is a very good reason for the appointment of a technical co-ordinating committee. It can examine into the matters of property acquisition; certainly it can pay great importance to doing as little damage to property as it can. It does its best to find a precise alignment through the city, or through any city. This work takes a great deal of time, if it is going to be done properly. I point out to you that we had the privilege a week ago Friday of turning the sod for the first contract in the city of Kitchener as part of its urban expressway programme. They moved very

quickly, but that technical co-ordinating committee has been working for some time before we could get on with this job, before all the myriad of details can be resolved. So it may very well be that the city of Hamilton has lost a great deal of time. Of course, we recognized this when they came down, the necessity of the downtown expressway as part of the first seven-year stage, recommended by the report of C. C. Parker and Associates.

So there, Mr. Chairman, is really where we stand with respect to this situation in Hamilton. We have been ready to go on it for quite some time.

Mr. Gisborn: I thank the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, for the explanation. This may clear up some of the feeling in Hamilton. I feel sometimes that his worship, the mayor had a habit of setting up a straw man so he himself could take a whack at it once in a while. I feel that now we have got a few of the facts straight, we may be able to deal a little more straightforwardly with what is going on. I was interested in the east-west expressway that the hon. Minister has just mentioned. There may be some reason for apparent delay by the city, and I would question the hon. Minister as to how his department looks at these plans. What kind of a method, if any, is used in overseeing that the plan is one that is justifiable, logical and economical in basing their go-ahead to receive the grant? There must be some yardstick to come to the conclusion that the project is worthy of agreement from the province, but I notice that there was held, on February 4, the international conference on urban traffic. Alderman Kostyk from Hamilton city council attended, on behalf of the city, I presume. While he was there he discussed the Hamilton plan with Wilbur Smith, considered to be a world-famous traffic consultant. From the press story and what I have heard since, he apparently felt there was a big mistake made in the planning of the Hamilton freeway, the uptown freeway, the east-west freeway, inasmuch as it was planned only to carry private vehicles, and that there had been no consideration given to the need for development of public transportation for the present and for the future. The press story infers that the city may hire Mr. Smith and his company to take another look at the programme to see if it needs some revising to provide for public transportation in the future.

Can the hon. Minister give me some idea of what this situation would involve?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I can certainly assure the hon. member that

the Hamilton transportation study report was reviewed by our planning and design people; I have already mentioned the high regard in which I hold them. They found that the report and the recommendations were quite acceptable from the standpoint of improving the traffic problems of the city of Hamilton. I certainly cannot offer too many comments on why the gentleman to whom the hon. member made reference would have different opinions. Certainly the expressway, when it is finished, will carry any type of traffic—automobiles, trucks and buses. There can be no question about that. It will be a four-lane facility, provided with complete access control. It will be built to a standard that will accommodate any type of traffic, so what would prompt a comment such as the hon. member made reference to? I must confess I do not know. But I do know, as I say, that it has certainly been looked into thoroughly in terms of evaluation by our people. We find it not an unsatisfactory report and the recommendations are quite good and quite valid. I would add that all the related matters to which I have already made reference are now under examination by the technical co-ordinating committee. One of the serious matters associated with the delay in getting on with it is, of course, the matter of protection of the property involved for the route the expressway will take. I hardly need to explain to the hon. members of the House the very serious factors that can develop if you do not move quickly to protect this property. If development is allowed to take place on or near it, or would affect the construction of the road, it becomes very costly to remove those obstacles. I think this is very obvious, and the serious things that are associated with delay in these projects once they are proposed and announced.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, I would assume that the department will be keeping their eye on any change or revision, but I will let the matter drop. I just want to put this on the record because my attention was drawn to it; it is a major project in Hamilton and is going to cost a lot of money, of course. And I just quote briefly from the news article in respect to this, February 4, 1966:

City traffic chairman Alderman Joe Kostyk said the 20-year plan was designed for one aspect of travel only, private vehicle transportation. The scheme may have to be rewritten to accommodate public transit services, he said.

Then it goes on to say that Wilbur Smith and Company have agreed to look the situa-

tion over, because of new technological ideas in urban transportation. So I thank the hon. Minister and I hope that the project goes ahead and is done properly.

Mrs. A. Pritchard (Hamilton Centre): Mr. Chairman, with the hon. Minister's consent, I have listened very carefully to the discussion here tonight and, as a member of the board of control, I can say that when the transportation report came in it was accepted and qualified by the technical committee. I was very pleased to hear the hon. Minister mention tonight the 75 per cent for the downtown expressway; and all I can say to the hon. member for Wentworth East, is that if they delay it any longer in Hamilton, not only will they have wasted the money that they have now wasted, but they are going to have to rewrite the whole city ordinance, because there has been delay after delay, comment after comment, about this government not giving them the same subsidy as Toronto. I think the hon. Minister has very well and, to me, very happily cleared up a very untenable situation.

Mr. Gisborn: I would just say, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member for Hamilton Centre has just now heard of the 75 per cent subsidy for the east-west freeway, it is no wonder no one else has heard about it.

Mrs. Pritchard: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that, I knew about it at the beginning. I was saying that I was very pleased to have it on the record here, that it was 75 per cent and not the 50 and the 33 that we have been hearing about from the mayor of Hamilton.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Don Valley parkway, Dr. Shulman and others have said that the planning of concrete light standards, straight guardrails, steep banks, and so on, along the parkway had ignored the safety precaution "don'ts" of at least ten years. Now, it has been shown that the removal of roadside obstacles would greatly reduce the number of accidents.

I wonder if the hon. Minister would be good enough to give us some idea of what his department is planning or has done in connection with these problems on the Don Valley parkway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, again through you to the hon. member, we are aware of Dr. Shulman's criticisms. We have been in communication with Dr. Shulman. I do not think it is a matter of whether

we agree entirely or not with his observations. First of all, the Don Valley parkway is a Metro road, it is not a King's highway. It was built by Metro—subsidized, of course, by the department—but it was built by Metro, it is maintained by Metro, and, to a very considerable degree, it was designed by Metropolitan Toronto engineers. However, I can assure the hon. member that we are as much interested in matters related to safety on any road or thoroughfare, as is Dr. Shulman, and to that extent we have now agreed to enter into a study of this matter of safety in conjunction with Metro. This we have already done, this we did several weeks ago, following up Dr. Shulman's criticisms or observations, if you like.

So against that background then and recognizing that there may be areas where we are not right, where we may be wrong—although we are not completely sure we are—nevertheless we have jointly undertaken this study with Metro. We will share the cost with them and we hope that we can find out—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Will this include the Gardiner expressway, too?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The whole city, the whole of Metro.

Mr. Bryden: As regards expressways only or—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Just expressways.

Mr. Braithwaite: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us, since the accidents occurred late in the summer of last year, if his department has anything concrete in mind or any concrete suggestions that he might tell the House about in this connection, besides the study that is going on?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, Mr. Chairman, I ask the hon. member to be a little more specific about the particular accident, the location of it, the description of it, I do not know just what he is referring to, if I may say so.

Mr. Braithwaite: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am talking about, in particular, the light standards and the guardrails on the Don Valley parkway. There seems to be—even among the experts—some discussion as to whether or not there is a safety problem. I wonder if the hon. Minister has had his people make any studies that he could tell us something about tonight.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member that on similar facilities, if

I may use that word, that we build ourselves, we placed the light standards behind the guardrail. I do not know whether or not that is the answer to the question of the hon. member. Again, as I pointed out, the Don Valley parkway, the Gardiner expressway and these expressways in general were built by Metro. They were not built by our department, but, because of the probability of it being a safety factor, we do, as I pointed out, put the light standards behind the guardrails, not in front of them.

These are the things, I think it is fair to say, that we hope to examine thoroughly in conjunction with Metro. It is situations like this, and many others, that we hope to study thoroughly to see if there is any validity in the claims or the observations that have been made about the extent to which certain features of expressways may be considered accident-prone, if you wish. I am not prepared to comment specifically beyond that but we do hope to find out.

Mr. Braithwaite: Just to conclude this, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the hon. Minister, in view of the fact that his department's money is involved in part—well, just take the Don Valley parkway for example, was there any discussion between his department and Metro, prior to the building of the parkway, for instance, in the planning stage? Now he has told us that his department does not build them in this way, they put the light standards outside the guardrails. I am wondering if there was any discussion held with Metro, and if this was pointed out to them before the thing was built? I presume there is some sort of consultation in the planning stage between the department and Metro's people and I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us about that?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Actually the Don Valley parkway and the Gardiner expressway were designed many, many years in advance of construction. I am confident that there is an exchange of views, of course, with respect to these plans, between Metro and our department. The extent, I think, to which we could impose certain conditions, with respect to the construction of this, would be very difficult, very difficult. Above and beyond the matter of certain frills that you might put on these things, we might say we will only subsidize you so far. But to go back to the time when this particular facility was originally conceived and designed, and then, somewhat latterly, constructed, I am not in a position to comment on it now, except to repeat again that this really is why we will join with Metro in what we hope will be a

rather exhaustive study, and I hope a study that will reveal something to both building authorities that will be beneficial in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I must submit to the hon. member I cannot comment too intelligently on the question that he raised.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister a question under this heading? The counties have carried out a county road needs study. As I understand it, a number of the county roads are going to be handed back to the municipalities. Could the hon. Minister inform me in regard to the county of Kent and the county of Elgin, if there is going to be a greater charge or cost on the little municipalities on account of handing back county roads as township roads? I understand that the province pays 50 per cent for county roads and 50 per cent of the township roads. Nevertheless, the standards for county roads are a great deal higher than they are for township roads, and a good many of these county roads which are going to be handed back are paved. That is my understanding. Could the hon. Minister inform me if this is going to be a burden in cost or more costs to the little municipalities?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I suppose I would have to say, in a broad general sense, that at some stage more cost will accrue to the township. Certainly the maintenance of a greater mileage of roads than they had previously is bound to involve some costs. But, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member probably heard me say when I was discussing this matter with the hon. member for Sudbury that we have anticipated that there will be some maintenance costs. We have or will place funds at the disposal of the counties in order that they can give to these townships in their respective counties an amount in cash equivalent to the cost of maintenance based on last year's maintenance costs over a period of five years. This is recognizing, I think, that there will be some costs. The amount of money that we will provide to the counties who, in turn will give it to these townships, should offset these maintenance costs, at least for a period of five years.

The reason we suggest a period of five years is, of course, in terms of the needs study. We have always suggested that these studies should be updated every five or ten years; certainly they should be reviewed every five years. Some counties, I think, will do it every year and reach certain conclusions at the end of five years. Some will do it at

the end of five years, and they will update the study report. As the traffic pattern in any township changes, the status of the roads changes. I can assure the hon. member and the House that these roads that have been reverted to townships should not have been in the county system in the first place, and this is recognized. I can say to the House that for a variety of reasons, none very valid, mileages of roads were built in townships and counties that should never have been put there. Perhaps what I am trying to say is that x number of years ago, political roads were built that really did not serve the purpose that a road should.

Mr. Bryden: Some of the hon. Minister's predecessors back in the 1920s.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I do not want to get into that, but this whole process—and I am glad the hon. member raised it, I attach great importance to it—is to bring the county road system of the province of Ontario up to what you can call a desirable system. In other words, the mileages of roads in any county should be no more than roads that can appropriately be called county roads. What we have done in this particular situation is help the counties to define what constitutes a desirable system of county roads. Sometimes it was a saw-off; they took back some roads that should be in the county system, and at the same time they gave some back. Certainly townships do not like taking back roads that are going to cost them some money.

But I have already indicated to the hon. member and the House that we recognize this and we have ensured that they will not incur any costs for a period of five years. At that time we should and will review the whole thing again, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Spence: I am glad to hear the hon. Minister say that they would review them in five years, but I will say to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that the location of interchanges on Highway 401 has decided whether a road should be handed back to the township, or whether it should not, in some cases.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member says that the location of an interchange on Highway 401 should have some bearing—

Mr. Spence: On whether a road is handed back to a municipality or not. An interchange decides whether a road now is used more than it was before Highway 401 was built.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would not like to say that would automatically follow. I

think it is probably fair to assume that in a number of instances interchanges would be at county roads. I think it might more often be the case that interchanges would be built at township roads. I think that is true, but it would not necessarily follow.

Mr. Spence: But, Mr. Chairman, we cannot have interchanges at every county road.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, of course not.

Mr. Spence: So naturally one of the county roads where they put the interchange was naturally going to be the heavily travelled road.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Is the hon. member suggesting that that particular road has been taken out of the county road system?

Mr. Spence: No. I understood that it was going to be handed back to the municipality on account of that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would have to look into that specific instance, Mr. Chairman. I would be glad to do that for the hon. member.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of the hon. Minister? Now that annexation has become a reality in the city of Windsor, there are six provincial highways coming into the city that will be in the city proper. They were in the suburbs before. What is the policy of the department in relation to the maintenance of these new highways that are now going to be in the city?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They will have the same privileges they have now with respect to King's highway extensions or connecting links. Within the new city boundary, they can discuss with us at any time the matter of a connecting link agreement on a King's highway within city boundaries.

Mr. Newman: Up until annexation it was the responsibility of the department, was it not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right.

Mr. Newman: Now, with annexation, will the city immediately assume the maintenance charges on the roads?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, there will be a period of adjustment, but eventually—

Mr. Newman: How long a period? A five-year period, as you mentioned on this county road system?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no. I made reference the other day to the assumption of local roads, township roads, as well.

Mr. Newman: Right.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, there is a five-year adjustment period, but eventually they will have to become connecting links.

Mr. Newman: Right. Now, there were certain projects in the offing prior to annexation. Will those projects be carried out at the expense of the department rather than the municipality, now that annexation is a reality?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Could you be specific about one of them?

Mr. Newman: Yes. Traffic lights and interchange on Dougall avenue or Highway 3 and Tecumseh road and Highway 3.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, any contract or project that is underway now will be completed, just as it would before annexation.

Mr. Newman: In other words, it will not be a charge on the municipality at all, it will be carried out by the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: That is right. Any King's highway or capital construction project that is presently the responsibility of the department will be completed if it is underway.

Mr. Newman: I was going to ask a question concerning the intersection of Highway 3 and Tecumseh road, but I think it would be better to ask that under the capital construction.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 804 carried?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, with respect to item 6 under vote 804, I would like to pursue briefly on a broader basis an item that the hon. Minister referred to, with specific reference to the city of Hamilton, namely, the provision under which the department will assume 75 per cent of the cost of urban expressways. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us in what urban municipalities projects have now been approved that qualify for that grant?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Projects have been approved and are underway at the Lakehead. Agreement has been entered into with the city of Port Arthur. We hope shortly to conclude an agreement with the city of Fort William.

The Kitchener-Waterloo expressway is underway, so we have an agreement there. We will shortly have an agreement with Windsor with respect to what will be called the E. C. Rowe expressway, and the technical co-ordinating committee to pursue this that was set up probably two or three months ago. I forget just when it was, but it was not too long ago. They are operating; they are active.

So as time progresses and the technical co-ordinating committee go through those responsibilities that are assigned to them, and reach the point where all the matters that are involved, the many technical matters involved are resolved, then we will enter into an agreement with the city of Windsor to build E. C. Rowe as an urban expressway.

I think probably at the moment that constitutes all the ones either in agreement with us or contemplating an agreement with us. But I am quite confident when I say there will be more. We expect more very shortly.

Mr. Bryden: Does this policy apply to Metropolitan Toronto, or is Metro excluded by virtue of The Municipality of Metropolitan Toronto Act?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say that the latter is correct.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may pursue the E. C. Rowe ring road—how far has the planning for the road developed?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is subsidized, so I think it is probably appropriate to discuss it here, because of subsidization. I can get a report for the hon. member from the technical co-ordinating committee on this and see just where they stand.

Mr. Newman: Have any plans actually been drawn for the construction of the road?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Functional plans, general alignment, this is resolved and that is what the committee is for—to get into the precise matters of alignment.

Mr. Newman: The plans are simply general. The statement here—that the plans are already complete, making it seem to look excellent—is not correct then, is it?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, the functional plan does appear to look excellent. It appears to look very good, and I think it is fair to say the city of Windsor feels the same way about it. They are more or less in complete agreement with that. Yes, the technical co-ordinating committee has had four meet-

ings. The extent to which they have pursued the matter, I cannot tell you. But I can find out.

This committee is set up, by the way, and is headed usually—I think in all circumstances so far—by our district engineer. The balance of the committee is made up to include the city engineer from Windsor, the city planning commissioner and so on, and this is the technical group, along with the consulting engineers that sit down and determine the precise nature of what has to be done.

But generally the functional plan has been approved.

Mr. Newman: Now that the functional plan has been approved, how long would it take before any actual construction could get under way?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would be very much surprised if anything could be done in less than a year, and probably more than that. First of all, the property must be acquired. Once we get a little further on with the work of the technical committee, we will know the precise nature of property requirements, and at that point the city can start out to acquire the property. In fact, they can start out just as soon as they know what the precise requirements are. That can take place any day.

But certainly we cannot build the expressway itself until the property has been acquired. And this process can sometimes take longer than others. We do not like to ride roughshod over property owners, but it can occasion some delays.

I would point out to the hon. member that the preparation of contract drawings takes time. After all the pertinent factors are known, then the preparation of precise contract drawings and the preparation of contract documents takes time. The hon. member will recall when he was up at Downsview and we showed him and the committee just something of the nature of what is involved. But certainly we will move along as fast as it is possible to do so. I would not contemplate any construction in less than 12 months, and I would be surprised if it did not take a little longer.

Mr. Newman: Has the department set a target date at all for construction or completion? Have you a target date in mind, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Really, it is impossible to set a target date, Mr. Chairman. I would say through you to the hon. member. We are committed to do this job with Wind-

sor. We are committed to the rates of subsidy that are prescribed, and we are committed to move along just as soon as it is possible to do it.

Mr. Newman: Then it is entirely up to Windsor really, to set the target date. Is that it, Mr. Minister?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Partly. It is a joint operation. But again watch the information I have referred to, the information required by the committee that is working on it, these technical people. As soon as they have the information that is required—in terms of property acquisition, property requirements—as soon as that is available, the city can start to buy property and we will reimburse them as they buy it. They can invoice us every month, for our portion of it, and get their money back. This can be done.

Then again, when we reach the point where the design engineers and the consultants, in company with our own people, can prepare design drawings, and look after all the matters associated with engineering—then we can prepare the contract documents, the actual contract itself, to advertise and award to a contractor, a road builder, and we are in business. But I cannot tell you how long it will take, Mr. Chairman. I simply cannot do it.

Mr. Newman: Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 804 agreed to?

Mr. Sopha: Just one moment. I wanted to raise with the hon. Minister, under this section, another very sore point with the citizens of my municipality and their elected political representatives. That is the quality of the streets in the city of Sudbury, which are well below average and compare very unfavourably with cities of similar size in southern Ontario.

Some of the streets in some parts of our city are just disgraceful. They are hardly fit for vehicular or even human pedestrian traffic, let alone animals that might be wandering around them. And as the years go by, there seems to be no solace or amelioration or respite for the yearnings of the citizens.

Leaving that aside, we have a crossing in the southern part of the city, which has claimed the lives of—one hesitates to contemplate the numbers of people that have lost their lives at that crossing. The crossing, I can inform the House, is at the end of a highway belonging to the Queen. Highway 69 ends at that crossing, and even in recent months there have been additional deaths as

trains run into moving vehicles at an intersection controlled by a very complex system of lights.

One can wonder to oneself whether the government cares about its own highways and how those highways are interchanged or intertwined with municipal streets. Without expressing any criticism, or doing disservice to the Deputy Minister of Highways, that very fine public servant and very affable and pleasant individual, when taxed about this in the absence of the hon. Minister, his political head, one day, passed it off by saying it was well known that the citizens of Sudbury were the worst drivers in North America, if not the world—I forget which part of the universe, whether he took it all in or just reserved it to North America—leaving the impression, almost, that because trains run into vehicles at this crossing, Regent, Lorne, Riverside and Ontario—four streets run in together at the crossing—leaving the impression, almost, as the *Sudbury Star* said, that:

There was almost an abandon of care for oneself—their driving habits were of such a low quality.

The time has come, I think, when the hon. Minister of Highways, a representative of the government in this connection, might seriously consider whether that crossing might not be improved, at the government's expense.

And, of course, this is all merely symptomatic of the larger problem. Sudbury and Sudburians cannot have better roads and streets because of the niggardly amounts they receive under this vote and the absence of industrial assessment. The amount we get in lieu of industrial assessment from the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs is so niggardly that it hardly marks him as a representative of northern Ontario.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Is \$2 million niggardly, my dear boy?

Mr. Sopha: What would it be if the mines and installations of the International Nickel Company were taxable by the municipalities—

Hon. Mr. Spooner: But they are not located in the city of Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: How much would it be if they were located in the city? If another annexation, to include the town of Copper Cliff, were advanced to the municipal board—how much would it be and, while we are on that score—you see the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs will do, backhandedly, that which he has not the courage to do directly. He will not take the bull by the horns and solve the problem once and for all.

Now there is another place where he and I can discuss these things. Sudbury, in short, has not got the money—it just has not got the money to provide better streets than it has and, really, it is questionable whether we have not come to a point in our political maturity where citizens in all parts of the province should be treated fairly, equally, justly and equitably and, above all, reasonably.

Once again I say, although I am not a charter member of the club with my friend in the back row here, that these are the things that bother the people of our community. When you go to the north end of the city, in that section known as the “power mill,” and you see the type of roads and streets that the people in that part have—people in the lower economic scale—and I have been in politics long enough to know that the lower you are in the economic scale, the less influence you have in the opinion-forming and decision-making process—the higher you are in that scale, the more influence you have. There is a direct correlation. In the more affluent parts of the city, there are better roads and streets, but in some of the outlying parts there are streets that are only worthy of a reflection of a generation ago in the Ferguson highway—the Ferguson highway which was a very historic route of transportation in the early 1930's, and no credit to the first citizen of this province after whom it was named.

Now the other thing is, of course, that the absence of—the inability to maintain streets and byways in the city is a direct reflection of the fact that the city was required to incorporate within its boundaries the townships of McKim without the town of Copper Cliff, and was forced to take on the form of municipal organization of a city.

Had the area been allowed to remain a township, then the grants under The Highway Improvement Act would have been larger, instead of being scaled down to those appropriate to a city. This is a very complex problem. The only easy solution is that the purse strings be somewhat loosened by this government but, of course, before that can be done, we have to get past that point—the sound barrier or the speed of light barrier—proposed by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs—that is to say, the report of the Smith commission.

Everything stopped—we are in a state of suspended Spoonerism! Until we get the report of the Smith commission—whenever that will be—so that these things can be looked at again, from the point of view of municipal grants; but I use my voice and the

time of this House and the indulgence of hon. members, but not the sympathy of those from the executive council, albeit, in expressing this, which is a very anxious problem to the citizens of that community, which is very important.

I will never be inhibited from underlining the importance of that metropolis of the north in the economy of this province and the wealth that it produces, the jobs, and the affluence, and the benefits that it stimulates elsewhere in the province.

In regard to the plight of municipalities like Sudbury, and other important municipalities in northern Ontario, I should like to hear what representations have been made lately by the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs about that, to The Department of Highways—as representative of northern Ontario and albeit, supposedly, a champion of our interests in the governing councils of this province.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: You are trying to be sarcastic now.

Mr. Sopha: If I am, I learned it from you.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like to make a comment here for the edification of the hon. member for Sudbury. It is not too long ago since the mayor—as he sometimes says, “once removed”—was down here with his city engineer and others, and brought down to us a long-awaited transportation study report, that we engaged ourselves, with the city, to undertake some time ago, and I would suggest to you we contributed to the cost of the report to the extent of 75 per cent.

Now that report was completed not too long ago and the then mayor and engineer—Hennessy, I believe—and others were down and left this report with us and we undertook a process of evaluation on that report and we have set out for the mayor and the governing fathers of Sudbury, the extent to which we can subsidize their road and street requirements, above and beyond the normal street rate of subsidy, which is 33½ per cent.

I say to the hon. member that we went to some pains to do this and I would point out to him first, and at this time, we really do not decide here where a city improves its streets. The hon. member made reference to the affluent, on the one hand, and the less affluent, on the other, and that there are more street improvements in the affluent section of the splendid city of Sudbury and less in the others. Now that is a decision we have nothing to do with! This is a city

decision that is made entirely by the local government. But I can tell the hon. member that in the process of examining the study report we have, where we could apply connecting link subsidies, applied them; we have, where we could, applied expressway subsidies, the like of which I discussed with the hon. member for Wentworth East, to the extent of offering to the city, the most advantageous combination of subsidies that we can, within the framework of the statutes, of the criteria associated with our policy, offer the city.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I presume that is being studied at this point to see how much the transportation study recommendations can be implemented, in the various stages that are set out, and in keeping with the extent to which we can assist them. It may fall short of what Sudbury requires but I can assure him, as I have said, that we have leaned over in the direction of generosity, within the framework of the statutes and those other matters that I mentioned, to the greatest extent possible. And I am prepared to say that it is going to mean a very great deal to Sudbury if they can provide the funds to do the side associated with their responsibility.

I think, as a matter of fact, if I had those figures before me the hon. member would agree that we have done just what I set out here for the House, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: Has the hon. Minister ever thought of changing the statutes? He used the phrase “within the framework of the statutes” about four times during the course of his remarks. The problem I relate has nothing to do with the statutes. The problem that I seek to describe in the limited way that I do is the reflection of the very simple, plain, basic fact that we have not got the money; we just do not have it. We have no industrial assessment, and our patience is getting to an end. The last mayor but one that you speak of, who came down here, was defeated. One of the reasons he was defeated was probably the lack of success in getting more money from Ministers such as the hon. Minister of Highways for municipal road maintenance, the money under this vote. He was a Tory, in addition. Now we have a Liberal mayor. We do not know whether he will be more successful or not.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Neither do we. We have not heard from him yet.

Mr. Sopha: They have almost got to the point where they come on their hands and knees now. They come down with the most prestigious Tories from the community—people not even in the municipal government—in order to plead their case.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have yet to see anyone from Sudbury on their hands and knees.

Mr. Sopha: It has almost come to that point; they have tried everything else to attempt to bring home to this government that the community has not got the advantage of taxing the International Nickel Company. That in itself may be wrong, but maybe the time has come when someone has to examine that problem very closely in order to determine what our future as a community is going to be. This business has reached a crisis almost when the water resources commission came in there a week or so ago, just like the court of the Imperial Czar, and issued a ukase—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think we are a little off the estimates here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Sopha: —to the city to build a sewage-treatment plant.

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the speaker we are on the municipal subsidies clause.

Mr. Sopha: It is all symptomatic of the same problem—the absence of money to maintain our roads and streets up to a decent standard comparable to that reached in other parts of the province. I have looked through, in this statute, those several sections enumerated under this vote. By the time I got to around 76 I had read through the first to the eighth sections, which dealt with counties.

Great attention has been paid to counties, which would signify the state of political development in the southern part of the province. We have not got county organizations in northern Ontario, as I adverted to earlier in my remarks, that can put pressure on the hon. Minister and his officials. All we have is the political heads of our municipality who come down here time after time. They contribute greatly to the dividends paid by the CPR, coming down and pleading. Eleven years ago I was in the office of the dairy man from Dunnville, when he occupied the position that this hon. Minister now occupies, when the place was the same to him. That was the time when the whole question of amalgamation and annexation was in its early

genesis. He was asked at that time; “What is the future for us? What may we expect if we annex these outlying parts?”

If the hon. Minister does not know it, I will tell him that when we got the outlying hinterland, half the township of Neelon, and the whole of the township of McKim, we got additional burdens and no revenues—just additional burdens after a long look at it by the Ontario municipal board. We did not want the additional burdens. The whole object of the amalgamation and annexation application was to get Copper Cliff.

The hon. leader of the New Democratic Party hit the nail on the head when he made the reply a few minutes ago to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who so unwisely intervened in the debate. We hope his remarks went into *Hansard*, because we are getting impatient of the whole process of continually asking this government for more financial assistance and getting the cold shoulder, the delaying little shibboleth, and then the visit of four Cabinet Ministers, the hon. Prime Minister and three of his cohorts—the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs among them—into the community to tell us what great people we are; what a great future we have; what a fine community it is—but no money. No financial aid.

The hon. Minister overlooked my remarks about the end of his highway at Regent and Lorne and the great amount of human suffering that has been caused by the myriad number of people who have been killed at that intersection. Three, four or five a year are killed by cars going across those railway tracks. I do not exaggerate; there are that many. Just a few months ago, the last one, a young fellow leaving a young widow and a couple of children for the community to look after, lost his life, long after the Deputy Minister's statement about the quality of the driving in the community. The government does not care. This hon. Minister does not care about the type of situation, the trap, that the end of one of his highways creates. That is his highway. One of the main arteries in the province, Highway No. 69, comes to an end in Sudbury. That railroad crossing at Regent and Lorne is the end of his highway as it comes into the city. There it comes in in such an admixture of streets that would defy an engineer in an opiate orgy. A mixture of streets—Regent coming there and Riverside coming in here, and Ontario street here and Lorne coming in this way. Four different streets cross that ending at the railway crossing, the main line of the CPR to Sault Ste. Marie. With the complex system

of lights, and human error being such, the lights are working, the wigwags are going but cars manage to get in front of their trains. I must relate, for the purposes of clarity, to a situation farther to the east of it, at the Riverside crossing put up with for a number of years, until finally they built an underpass there. Mark you, the CPR, the great model, put in several hundred thousand dollars of its money, along with some money from the government of Ontario, and the balance debentured by the citizens of Sudbury, to correct that death trap. All these things cost money. We have not got the money. If you lean over to the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, he is going to tell you that we are at the limit of our borrowing power. We are debentured right up to here. For the record, I pointed to my esophagus. We have not got the money to debenture and the people of our community well know it. Taxes are right up to here. For the record, I pointed to about three feet over my head. Taxpayers cannot bear any more municipal burden.

If I do nothing else this session which may be, you will be happy to hear, my penultimate here—I will use it to put on the record and to display, so far as my limited capacities enable me, the plight of the citizens of our community, to etch them and defy hon. members of the executive council, and particularly the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, to get up and dispute what I say about the financial position of our community.

Tomorrow, if any want to attend and hear, I am going to say something about the financial condition, so far as it relates to water, and the grave problems that it has created. So that is an invitation to any who may want to attend to be here at 5 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. Chairman: Is vote 804 carried?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on vote 804, can the hon. Minister inform me whether regulations have been changed concerning work on roads and bridges within a municipality in the past three or four months? There has been a change in regulations, has there?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Regulations with?

Mr. Newman: In relation to governing work on roads and bridges within municipalities.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No.

Mr. Newman: No change at all?

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions to ask the

hon. Minister about the Queensway. Is this the proper vote? The Ottawa Queensway—maintenance.

First of all I would like to find out what share of the cost of maintenance of the Queensway is being paid by the city of Ottawa.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They are subsidized 50 per cent.

Mr. Racine: Pardon me?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They pay 50 per cent of the cost of maintenance of the Queensway. That is their share.

Mr. Racine: Now, Mr. Chairman, is not the Ottawa Queensway considered as a King's highway, or should it not be? After all, it is a highway running across from the east end, right through to the west end of the city. Is there any difference in the cost of upkeep of the Queensway and the upkeep of 401 that runs through Toronto?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, there is a material difference there. This particular road was built originally on a basis of cost sharing worked out between the city, the federal Department of Public Works, which was associated with the national capital commission, and ourselves. So in that respect, it is not completely the counterpart of a King's highway.

As a matter of fact, there are no King's highways running through urban municipalities. They become connecting links at that point, or they become something of another category, but there are no King's highways, as such, with one exception, and that happens to be the bypass section of 401 in Toronto. So this was the method by which the original costs were worked out. And I am given to understand that the cost sharing with respect to maintenance now, and by agreement, I would say, with Ottawa and the Queensway, is 50 per cent.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 804?

Mr. Newman: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Just prior to the hon. member for Ottawa East asking the question concerning the Queensway, I had asked the hon. Minister about new Ontario Department of Highways regulations. Now the city clerk back in my community has received a letter from Mr. J. E. Weiss, district municipal engineer of The Department of Highways, which sets out new rules. According to the new regulations effective January 1st, the department's approval will be required by the city before it

can accept any road or bridge contracts which would be subsidized by the department. Can the hon. Minister elaborate on this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is nothing new about that really. That is construction. It is not maintenance. Their maintenance expenditure bylaws are approved and handled in the same way now as they have always been.

Mr. Newman: No change at all?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, it is simply reaffirming what has always been the case.

Mr. Newman: The reason I get this is, I have a press clipping here which states there has been a change. It would entail a lot more red tape, as is mentioned in the article. Mr. Adamac said the new rules would impose more red tape on municipal administration. The new regulations are unfair to municipal engineers on the scene and familiar with municipal projects. The regulations, he said, would give the power to overrule their decisions to other engineers from outside the area, concerning roads and bridges in a municipality.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, well, I do not think that is any real change in the regulations. If the hon. member would like to send me that, I will pursue it a little further for him.

I might, if I may, Mr. Chairman, get back to this Queensway. I would like to pursue that and give you some more precise information than I have. It is quite an involved procedure, because of the various agencies involved in the cost sharing process. If the hon. member will permit me, I will acquaint him with that in detail.

Mr. Racine: Thank you.

Vote 804 agreed to.

On vote 805:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under 805, has this department considered getting together with other departments of the government to institute centralized purchasing, as was recommended by the committee that dealt with this last year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. This matter was discussed when The Department of Highways was before the public accounts committee. As I recall it, I am of the opinion we substantiated before that committee, that because of the extensive volume of supplies

that we buy, we could not see any material advantage in what was proposed.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, could not that be an asset to other departments then, the fact that you purchase so much?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There may be areas where this may be helpful, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member, not across the board. Many of the things we purchase are exclusively the requirements of The Department of Highways. I would say a broad list of things we purchase are items not used in any other department, because they could not make use of them.

Mr. Newman: Vehicles, for example, could be used by other departments in the government. Would it not be better for you then, possibly to do all the purchasing for the other departments?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would point out to the hon. member now the extent to which it is done. We do buy vehicles for certain other departments. I can think of one. We buy all the vehicles for the Ontario water resources commission, and there may be other places where we act as purchasers.

Mr. Newman: Yes, this is good. This is what I have suggested. Why not then for Public Works and other departments of the government, seeing that you do it for the water resources commission? I think it is a good policy.

Vote 805 agreed to.

On vote 806:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, on vote 806 I would like to speak about the revenue from the commuter service. I am thinking of the whole broad basis of it. I happened to notice that his worship, the mayor of Toronto is present. This is not influencing me to speak of another sister city in any disparaging way because I represent the province in the Liberal Party's interests, but I also have a deep admiration for the mayor and for the city in which I live.

However, at this point I want to talk about the study which was done—the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study—and I think that quite rightly there was some concern by the city of Hamilton that they were not consulted in this—

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. We discussed this with the Chairman. I explained a few

days ago that I wanted to bring something up on this, and he explained to me at that time that we would have to, if we were to discuss anything to do with Hamilton, bring it up under vote 811.

Now vote 806 has nothing to do with the commuter service as far as Hamilton is concerned, and I would presume that you would only discuss what is concerned in vote 806—which is only operation of the commuter rail project; the rest of it comes under vote 811.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, on the point of order; I had also discussed this with the Chairman and he said that provided I was relating this to revenue, it was quite correct for me to speak at this time on the vote. And I am referring to revenue.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, it should be properly related to revenue—

Mr. Thompson: And it will be properly related to revenue—

Mr. Bryden: All that this point deals with—

Mr. Thompson: I am speaking on a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Bryden: I am speaking on a point of order.

Mr. Thompson: I had the floor and I am speaking on the point of order, and I am saying that it will be properly related to revenue, if I have the opportunity to speak and explain it.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, the regular Chairman of the committee—I do not know if he left the information with you—discussed this with the parties. We agreed and thought it was understood that this vote relates only to the actual operation of the commuter line as it is now envisaged, and that as far as capital construction is concerned, which would cover such matters as possible extensions and so on, this would be properly dealt with under vote 811. That being the view of the Chairman and seeming to us to be a reasonable division and one that was logical in terms of the votes, we accepted it.

I would suggest to you, sir, that you should follow that procedure and rule that we, at this time, deal only with those matters relating to the immediate operation of the service as it is now envisaged.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I may comment? Not because I want to cut off the hon. leader of the

Opposition at all. I think it is more appropriate under vote 811, and certainly, if the Deputy Speaker and Chairman made a commitment to this extent to anyone, I think it should be lived up to by all of us. I am quite prepared to accept this.

But I would say this, in all honesty, to the hon. leader of the Opposition—it more appropriately comes under the capital vote; it very definitely does.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I am quite happy to take it under the capital vote, but I simply say that when I talked to the Chairman, he sent a note to the Deputy Speaker, and he sent a note to me, saying that if I talked on revenue then it would be quite legitimate to talk under this vote.

However, I say that if the other party feels that there was some kind of an arrangement made, I want to state again that it was not made for me, but I will abide by it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will leave it up to you, Mr. Chairman, of course.

Mr. Chairman: I would rule in this case that the whole section, including vote 806, deals almost entirely with maintenance and I think that is the tenor of each part right up to this point, and throughout, so I feel that we should restrict the discussion on vote 806 to the maintenance of the commuter rail project with a free opportunity for discussion in the later votes under the "Capital Disbursements" section, during which revenue can be taken into consideration as well.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, under "Planning Studies" may I ask questions then on this vote?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, under "Maintenance."

Mr. Newman: In the studies conducted by the department, to what points east and west of the Metro area have the studies indicated that it would be financially feasible to operate at a profit, the commuter service?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I point out to the hon. member that again this is not related to this vote. He is confusing the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study will the commuter rail vote. You recall that at the last session an Act respecting commuter rail services was introduced. Now the studies to which he has made reference are not this type of study at all. This involves the cost of studying things—I suppose, like signal requirements, parking locations; this type of study is involved and I do not think that that is what the hon. member has in mind at the moment.

Mr. Newman: No, I did not have that in mind. How about the estimated operating loss? What would that refer to in this vote, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As I recall it, the original projections that were made when the service was announced during the last session of the Legislature, were to be something on the order of \$1.5 million to \$2 million during the trial period.

Mr. Chairman, I would have to say to the hon. member that these are no more than projections; these are based on the result of the data research programme that was undertaken, and that led up to this particular project becoming, shall we say, a matter of fact.

Mr. Bryden: What period of time does this relate to?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This relates to that portion of the year that we may be able to get the service operative.

Mr. Bryden: That is exactly what I am getting at. I appreciate it only goes to March 31, 1967 and I was wondering in drawing up your estimates what period prior to that you had in mind?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member that we will, of course, attempt to implement the service as soon as possible, but because of the variety of matters that require to be resolved, we cannot be sure whether we can get it operative on February 1 or March 1 or April 1, but we have made some provision here in the event that we do become operative for a portion of the fiscal year represented by these estimates.

Mr. Bryden: Then the figures appearing here are, shall be say, nominal up to a point—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Oh, yes, quite. I think two months is the figure. It is an estimated sixth of a year's maintenance cost—about one-sixth.

Mr. Bryden: Could the hon. Minister indicate what the department has in mind with regard to advertising and promotion? I see that the figure here, which admittedly cannot be very precise, for the two months or whatever it is prior to March 31, 1967, is \$50,000. Now have you worked out in any detail your plans in respect to the promotion of this service? As I indicated when the bill was before the House last year, this seems to me to be critical. If you can persuade the public to leave their cars at home or to leave

them at the stations along the way it can make a great difference, but that probably will take a fair amount of persuasion.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, there is no question about the advisability of whatever promotional exercises are appropriate to develop the patronage that we are interested in. This whole exercise—or project, if we may call it that—was designed largely to take vehicles off our expressways and I can assure the hon. member that there will be a programme of promotion. It is in the study stage now. I think it is not too far from becoming reality. The whole matter of the concept is all under close examination and study between representatives of the department and representatives of Canadian National Railways. We are working closely with a department of Canadian National Railways called the visual design branch or department, whatever it is.

I can say we have pursued this to quite considerable length but it is not quite completed yet. Certainly there is every recognition of the extent to which we have to sell the service. We quite appreciate that fact and I am sure the hon. member, when he sees what we come up with promotionally, will be impressed. I hope he will, we spent some time at it and a little more time will round it out satisfactorily, I believe.

Mr. Thompson: Is the hon. Minister maintaining an existing terminal at Burlington or is he going to have to build one?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: At Burlington?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, or is the hon. Minister going to have to build one?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, we will use the same terminal facilities that are there now.

Mr. Thompson: There is no need to buy extra land for parking or anything like this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not at Burlington. We have land bought—

Mr. Bryden: What are the hon. Minister's plans with regard to parking? I assume that all along the line existing railway stations will be used, but the question could arise as to whether or not the parking facilities available at the stations will be adequate. I hope they will be. I hope a lot of people, instead of driving from somewhere in Trafalgar township down to downtown Toronto, will drive to the Oakville station and get on the train there. But if they are to do that, they will want to park their cars somewhere.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we are right back again into vote 811. I might say that this is all capital construction; the whole thing. It is certainly a valid question, but it is valid under vote 811, I would point out to the hon. member.

Vote 806 agreed to.

Hon. Mr. Spooner: Mr. Chairman, it being almost 10.30, and as we have come to the end of the vote, I move that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report it has come to

certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will continue with these estimates and from 5 o'clock to 6 o'clock we will deal with private members' business. As I said on Friday, following this department, we will deal with The Department of Tourism and Information, Lands and Forests, and Labour, in that order.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.25 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Final report, standing committee on private bills, Mr. Reuter	1257
Statement re application for proposed heavyweight boxing championship match, Mr. Rowntree	1257
Statement re Hydro exhibits at World Fair, Montreal, Mr. Simonett	1258
Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1261
On notice of motions No. 8 and No. 12, Mr. Sopha, Mr. Knox	1278
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. MacDonald, agreed to	1291
Recess, 6 o'clock	1291
Appendix A	1292

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to have visitors to the Legislature and today we welcome, in the west gallery, students from Irwin memorial public school, Dwight. And I understood later, in the east gallery, Our Lady of Lourdes separate school, Toronto.

Presenting petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. A. E. Reuter (Waterloo South), from the standing committee on private bills, presented the committee's seventh and final report which was read as follows and adopted.

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. Pr10, An Act respecting the board of trustees of the continuation school of the township of Pelee.

Bill No. Pr37, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Your committee begs to report the following bills with certain amendments:

Bill No. Pr3, An Act respecting the board of education of the township of Toronto.

Bill No. Pr7, An Act respecting the Tilbury public school board.

Bill No. Pr25, An Act respecting the city of Hamilton.

Bill No. Pr32, An Act respecting the city of Ottawa.

Your committee would recommend that the fees and the penalties and the actual cost of printing be remitted on Bill No. Pr28, An Act respecting the estate of William A. Dickieson.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a statement with respect to a matter we discussed which was raised in the House yesterday and which has currently been before my department.

As you know, an application has been made by Mr. Frank Tunney, promoter, to the On-

tario athletic commission for authorization to stage, in Toronto, the heavyweight boxing championship of the world between Cassius Clay and Ernie Terrell on March 29 of 1965.

Before dealing with this specific application, I would like to establish a few facts. First of all, it should be emphasized that the sport of boxing is legal in this province and has been for many years. Rules and regulations have been established by the provincial government to ensure the protection of the public, the safety of the participants and to control the staging and promotion of boxing exhibitions. The selection and appointment of the referee, medical officer, judges, announcer and all other officials comes directly under the control of and supervision of the Ontario athletic commission. In addition, a security deposit is required from the promoter to guarantee the purses of the boxers, the payment of the officials and of the commission tax.

The licences of the promoter and of the boxers and managers are also under the control of the commission, as well as other requirements for the fight—Weigh-ins, medicals, contract approvals and so on. All these requirements are set out in The Ontario Athletics Control Act and regulations.

It is clear then that the issue here does not revolve around the legality of boxing in the province of Ontario. That is entirely another matter.

I would like to deal, for a moment, with the attempts that were made to stage this fight in other centres in North America and to which some reference has been made both in this House and in the press.

Following an inquiry by the Ontario athletics commissioner to the Illinois state athletics commission, we were informed that the reason for their refusal to sanction this bout was that, and I quote: "The promoters licence was not complete."

In the case of Mr. Tunney, who proposes to promote the fight here in Toronto, we find that his licence is in order.

I have been informed by the New York state athletic commission that no formal application has been made to that state to hold this particular fight. I understand that the reason for this is that Mr. Ernie Terrell's

standing has not yet been cleared by the New York state athletic commission. I should point out that while New York state is not a member of the world boxing association, the province of Ontario is and Mr. Terrell's standing has never been questioned by the world boxing association.

Now, with respect to the approaches that were made in the city of Montreal, I am informed that the Montreal athletic commission, which incidentally is a municipal body—there being no provincial commission in Quebec, I am informed that the Montreal athletic commission approved the holding of this fight in Montreal, but the promoters there were unable to secure the Montreal Forum.

Mention has been made of Main Bouts Incorporated and I want to emphasize that the Ontario athletic commission has no direct dealing with this organization, since all of their arrangements with respect to the franchising of closed-circuit television are with the promoter of the fight. It is the promoter who must in turn comply with all provincial regulations.

I was notified of receipt of the application on Monday morning, March 7. Since that time we have been engaged in a review of the application and matters surrounding it. I am now satisfied that the application meets all of the requirements of The Athletics Control Act and regulations and the commissioner has no other choice but to authorize the staging of this bout.

Now I want to emphasize, Mr. Speaker, that this decision in no way condones or supports the previous actions, affiliations or public statements made by either of the major participants in this fight. This decision is based entirely on the fact that a proper application for authorization has been submitted. This application is in order and complies with all of the regulations of the province, which permit and control professional boxing. It is on this basis alone the sanction has been granted.

Mr. Speaker, any other action, regardless of how attractive it might be to anyone, would be a clear case of unsupportable discrimination against the promoters and participants themselves.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Mr. Speaker, may I advise you that the major electrical utilities of Ontario and Quebec have undertaken to co-operate in producing exhibits for the 1967 world's exhibition. Ontario Hydro and Hydro Quebec will share equally in contributing a total of \$1.5 million toward the

cost of installing displays in the Resources for Man section of the Man, the Producer, pavilion.

Details of the hydro exhibit are being developed by Expo '67 officials in co-operation with the two provincial hydro utilities.

I am pleased to note this joint effort between Ontario and Quebec in emphasizing Canada's stature as a nation on its 100th birthday.

In addition, Ontario Hydro plans to participate in the Ontario government pavilion at the world exhibition.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I have a question before the orders of the day for the hon. Minister of Labour, notice of which has been given.

Would the hon. Minister comment on a suggestion by Mr. Jack Donaldson, manager of the motor transport industrial relations bureau, that the teamsters' negotiating committee is not going to allow the membership of the union to vote on the industry's final offer, which lapses on Sunday?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my department is actively engaged in efforts to mediate this dispute, I think that the hon. leader of the Opposition will appreciate that it is most inappropriate for me to comment on public statements alleged to have been made by representatives of either side.

Mr. L. A. Braithwaite (Etobicoke): Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the hon. Minister of Labour, notice of which has been given in the usual manner.

Has the hon. Minister any information regarding the willingness of the publishers to negotiate a settlement with the ITU?

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I am aware of the position of the publishers. My information was secured in the course of acting on a request by the Ontario federation of labour. The information I received was conveyed to the federation of labour and I assume—in fact, I have been told personally—that it has also been relayed to the international typographical union.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett).

In light of President Johnson's statement that tire standards will be established in the United States, will the hon. Minister assure the House that similar standards will be set up in Ontario?

Hon. I. Haskett (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, The Department of Transport does not contemplate setting specification standards for automobile tires at this time.

We have, however, been actively studying the situation with regard to tire performance for about two years in concert with the members of the American association of motor vehicle administrators, which is an association which includes in its membership all state and provincial motor vehicle departments.

Some time ago a task force was appointed from the association's membership to review tire standards for new tires on passenger cars and stationwagons. The information submitted to the task force indicated that the rubber manufacturers association, the society of automotive engineers, and the automobile manufacturers association had been studying new tire performance and requirements. Federal specifications for tire purchases were also available to the task force.

It is the considered opinion of the task force that the standards and regulations for new tires should primarily cover performance requirements rather than construction requirements. It is the committee's thinking that under no circumstances should we concern ourselves with a phase of this work that might interfere with the necessary research and advancements going on in tire technology.

Standards and specifications that reflect the thinking of the task force on this subject after reviewing the material from the above-mentioned sources, include definitions for breaking energy, cross section, official measuring rim, ply rating and standard rims. The proposed standards also include tests for strength, endurance and high-speed performance:

Breaking energy is the energy in inch pounds that is required to force a cylindrical steel plunger three-quarters of an inch in diameter with a hemispherical end, into the tread as near the centre line as possible at a rate of two inches per minute, avoiding penetration into a tread groove. When determining the breaking energy, the tire shall be mounted on the rim and inflated to the pressure shown in table A. (See Appendix 1, page 1292.)

Cross section is the dimensions in the tire mounted on the official measuring rim after it has been allowed to stand for 24 hours at room temperature, inflated to the pressure as recommended in table A.

The tire shall be calipered at six different points, spaced approximately equal around the circumference. The average of these measurements is to be taken as

the cross section. In the event that the widest part of the tire occurs at a letter or at a side wall design, the height of such configuration shall be deducted from measurements.

The official measuring rim is a standard rim that has been calibrated and found to meet the precise measurements as recommended by the tire and rim association.

The ply rating is the tire strength with its recommended load and does not necessarily represent the number of actual plies in the tire.

The standard rims are those sizes of rims and shapes of flanges as adopted by the tire and rim association.

The strength: The tire shall meet the requirements for minimum breaking energy as shown in table A. No tire shall have a strength below that of a tire of the same size and cross section with four ply rating.

For sizes not listed, the strength requirement shall be not less than that for the nearest smaller size in cross section and the same ply rating.

Five measurements of force and penetration of break shall be made at points equally spaced around the circumference of the tire. In the event the tire fails to break before the plunger is stopped by reaching the rim, the force and penetration shall be taken as this occurs.

The energy to break a tire shall be calculated from the average energy values at break by means of the following formula: $W = F \times P$ over 2; where W equals energy at break in inch pounds, F equals force at break in pounds and P equals penetration at break in inches.

The endurance: Tires shall meet the requirements of laboratory test wheel endurance without evidence of tread, ply, cord or bead operation or broken cords.

Preparation of tire for endurance test: The tire shall be mounted on the rim and inflated to the pressure shown in table A. The average radial deflection of the tire at the load shown in table A shall be determined on a flat surface after the tire has been conditioned at a temperature of 100 degrees Fahrenheit, plus or minus five, for a minimum of three hours and with inflation pressure adjusted to the value specified in table A.

The equipment: The test wheel shall be a flat faced steel wheel, 67.23 inches in

diameter and at least the same width as the cross sectional diameter of the tire to be tested. The tire while being tested shall be located in an air space controlled at a temperature of 100 degrees Fahrenheit plus or minus five.

Procedure: The tire and wheel assembly shall be mounted on the test axle and pressed against the test wheel with the required axle load. Specifications for the test shall be as follows:

The tire endurance test: Speed, 50 miles per hour; pressure from 100 per cent test load; hours, four. Under appendix A, 120 per cent for six hours, under 140 per cent for 24 hours at a test of 1,700 total test miles.

One hundred per cent test load shall be the load necessary to obtain the average radial deflection of the tire against the test wheel, as was determined above in the preparation of the tire for the endurance test. The tire shall meet the requirements of laboratory high speed performance tests without evidence of separation or tread chunking.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): I do not think we have done anything to deserve this!

An hon. member: The hon. member asked a question.

Hon. Mr. Haskett:

Preparation of tire for high speed test: The tire shall be mounted on the rim shown in table A and inflated to 30 pounds per square inch pressure. The average radial deflection of the tire at the load shown in table A shall be determined on a flat surface after the tire has been conditioned at a temperature of 100 degrees Fahrenheit, plus or minus five, for a minimum of three hours and the inflation pressure adjusted to 30 pounds per square inch.

Equipment: The test wheel shall be flat faced steel with the wheel having a diameter, not less than 67.23 inches and not greater than 120 inches, and at least the same width as the cross sectional diameter of the tire to be tested. The tire, while being tested, shall be located in an air space controlled at a temperature of 100 degrees Fahrenheit, plus or minus five.

After two hours break in at 50 miles per hour, tire should be allowed to cool at 100 degrees Fahrenheit temperature. Inflation pressure should then be re-

adjusted to 30 pounds per square inch before continuing the test. After cooling period, resume test at 75 miles per hour, increase speed five miles per hour every one-half hour until the performance level of 85 miles per hour has been achieved.

The proposals are still under study and discussion and when final recommendations are available they will be given careful consideration.

Mr. Young: May I thank the hon. Minister for this very enlightening lesson in algebra; and I would also ask him if he could tell us, in a supplementary question, how soon this study may be completed and how soon we can look for its results in labels on the tires, which means something for the safety of the people of Ontario.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Read it again!

Hon. Mr. Haskett: Mr. Speaker, if I can repeat what I said before, we have been actively considering the situation with regard to tire performance for about two years and I concluded by saying that proposals are still under study and discussion and when final recommendations are available they will be given consideration.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond), in two parts:

1. When was the last inspection of the Ontario Steel Products plants at Chatham, Milton and Oshawa made by the industrial hygiene branch?

2. Did the department find conditions arising from tar smoke a health hazard for workers; if so, what changes will be made to correct the situation?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first part of the hon. member's question is: At the request of The Department of Labour inspections of the Ontario Steel Products plant at Milton were made by industrial hygiene branch staff in May 1964, June 1965, and December 1965. Inspections of this company's plants at Chatham and Oshawa were made on February 16, 1966 and November 25, 1965, respectively by staff of The Department of Labour.

The levels of oil mist in the air at the Milton plant were found by the industrial hygiene staff to be within acceptable limits and presented no hazard to health. Improvements in ventilation for the better control of oil mist were recommended and have since been carried out. Improvements of ventilation

in the spray painting area have been made within the past month.

No request has been received by the industrial hygiene branch within the past five years to assess fume conditions in the Chatham and Oshawa plants of this company.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege, I believe it is personal privilege if not a point of order. This morning's *Globe and Mail* quotes the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) as saying yesterday: "I understand he," that is I, "challenged the secretary of the farm products marketing board to have him thrown out."

Mr. Speaker, just to set the matter straight, I approached the secretary of the farm products marketing board who was screening people going into this meeting. We first exchanged friendly personal greetings. I then said to him: "Are members of the Legislature entitled to attend this meeting?" His reply was that he thought that it was for members of the commodity boards. I said I found it difficult to believe that anything would have happened there that members of the Legislature were not entitled to hear and his reply was that he personally had no objection if I went in, whereupon I went in. That is all. Which shows just how completely wrong the hon. Minister of Agriculture is.

Hon. W. A. Stewart (Minister of Agriculture): Well, Mr. Speaker, since the point has been raised, may I—

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): Out of order, Mr. Speaker!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

The member for York South, I understand, has risen on a point of privilege to correct a statement in the paper. In his opinion, he has now corrected that statement. I think perhaps there should not be any debate back and forth. It is just the same as if any other member had risen and made a statement before the orders of the day.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, surely I have the right to express an opinion on what has been said? Because there is an inference here that I did not tell the truth and I would like to explain my side of the story if I may.

Mr. Speaker: I think perhaps this is not the correct place at the present time, although if the Minister did rise he would have to rise on a point of order, and not on a point of privilege. He may rise on a point of order on what the member has said.

Hon. Mr. Stewart: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on whatever point you suggest in this particular case, as long as I have the right to say something.

I must say that I checked this morning because I may have been wrong in what I said yesterday, and if I was, I am quite willing to withdraw it. I checked this morning to see exactly what did happen, because the *Globe and Mail* picked up the exchange we had here in the House yesterday. So I asked what did happen and now this is what I am told.

The hon. member came to the door of the meeting and asked the secretary of the farm products marketing board if members of the Legislature were being admitted—I think that is what he has just said. I am advised by the secretary—and this is all I know, what the secretary of the board told me, I was not there. He replied: "No, they are not, Mr. MacDonald, this is a closed meeting." Mr. MacDonald said: "Well, I'm going in and if the Minister wants me to leave he will have to ask me to leave." Now this is what I am told happened yesterday and I think we ought to put the record straight as far as the other side of it is concerned. Thank you very much.

Mr. MacDonald: But it is not accurate, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order. House in committee of supply; Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

On vote 807:

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of questions that I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) in respect to this vote. As he is aware, in the great township of North York there is an interchange which is called spaghetti junction. The interchange between Highway 401 and the Spadina expressway.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): In the riding of Downsview.

Mr. Young: In the riding of Downsview, the hon. member pinpoints it that accurately.

Now I understand that interchange has

cost something in the nature of \$10 million? Would the hon. Minister perhaps—about \$10 million!

—And then the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto has added to that by building a leg of the expressway, if you will, down as far south as Lawrence avenue and that would cost another \$2.5 million, something like this, when it is complete. So there is an investment of something in the nature of \$12 million in that interchange.

Mr. Minister, the question I have is: Is it possible, or is there in these estimates a subsidy for Metropolitan Toronto to put this expressway farther south? Now I ask that because it just seems to me to be completely unreasonable that the hon. Minister should have this very expensive interchange at that point and have it not used to its capacity. It was designed to bring traffic from 401 down into the heart of Metropolitan Toronto and also to take traffic north up to Highway 7 at least, and farther north still.

Now it just seems incredible that an investment of \$12 million should be sitting there, that that spaghetti junction should be used to a minimum degree. It is as a matter of fact serving Yorkdale shopping centre, but in my mind it is an extremely expensive bowl of spaghetti to be sitting there on the highway for the simple purpose of serving, at this point, Eatons and Simpsons.

I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us if any plans are underway or if he is bringing real pressure to bear on Metropolitan Toronto to complete this leg of the expressway?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member would agree that the interchange, I will call it an interchange anyway, had to be built at the time, but the agreement that we have with the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto provides for the extension of what will be known as the Spadina expressway. I would suppose it will go down certainly as far as Bloor street. It might even go farther than that.

Now the extent to which we could put anything more than the ordinary pressure that will be on the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto to complete this expressway, under any circumstances, I just would not know. I think the demands of the people will probably provide all of the required pressure to ensure that it will be completed as quickly as possible. We will, of course, subsidize the cost of it, to the extent of 50 per cent, the same as we do any other Metro-

politan Toronto road and any other Metro road. But the extension of it really will be up to Metro. They are committed to it and we have an agreement with them to this extent.

Mr. Young: But it might help if the department met with the metropolitan officials and urged them, in view of the great investment that the province has in this junction, that they should speed up the construction of the Spadina expressway. There is no question that the northwest part of the metropolitan area is in dire need of this expressway. There are other pressures that are being brought to bear on those hon. gentlemen for other kinds of construction, but it just seems that it is logical and reasonable that the department should meet with them, point out the very great investment that is there, that is now useless in a large sense as far as its ultimate use is concerned and that the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto ought to be really pushing forward with this project, and pushing fast.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I have commented in the only manner I can. Metro is aware, as the hon. member is or anybody is, that this expressway is going to be needed for just the purposes you describe, but the extent of the pressure we can put on Metro I think is very limited, notwithstanding the fact that we subsidize these expenditures 50 per cent. Nevertheless, the decision as to how and where to spend their 50 per cent of the money is pretty well in their hands.

We are in constant communication with them. There is a very great awareness of the need for this expressway, but I would not like to be put in the position of saying we are going to pressure a municipality to spend a great deal of money. We stand ready to co-operate with them, of course, at any and all times; and as I say we are in conversation with them at all times on all these matters.

Mr. Young: Is it likely that you could impress them with the fact that the province does not like paying the interest on \$10 million worth of debentures, when they are there for their use as much as anyone else's? It seems to me that the hon. Minister might at least indicate something like that to the authorities in Metropolitan Toronto and I hope he will do this.

An hon. member: There were attempts to stop the new city hall, too.

Mr. Young: Oh yes, they are building a lot of things; but this is a great growing area,

as the hon. Minister knows. We want to get traffic from 401 down to his riding, you see, and bring people from his riding into North York to see what a marvellous place it is up there. So we hope he will help to push this project along.

Hon. A. Crossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): Metro and this government did it all.

Mr. Chairman: Yes. I would ask the member saying that that great county of Welland—there is a postscript on this same point of view—will you yield the floor to the member for Downsview?

Mr. Young: I still have a question I wanted to ask.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I was just saying that perhaps pressuring is a kinder way. The hon. member for Yorkview was talking about pressure. I think really what is needed, if you are familiar with the Metro capital budget, is more money. I know this road has been in the works and it is a very urgent Metropolitan Toronto project. The question is: Is there money available within the limits that Metro has to work? You cannot build too many things at the same time.

The newspapers not too ago were suggesting to some of the Metropolitan Toronto members that perhaps some of us should say—I think they directed their remarks mainly to the government side of the House on that—that some of us should say a bit more in favour of Metro. So listening to that urging, Mr. Chairman, it would be my thought that since there is such a substantial capital investment of the province of Ontario here that it would seem reasonable and logical that additional money was made available to Metro to get on with Spadina road extension.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Have you spoken to the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) about what he has to say about the Spadina expressway?

Mr. Singer: No, I am speaking to people like yourself, who really have great trouble standing up on the floor of this House and defending Metropolitan Toronto.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Singer: That is why you are so concerned.

Hon. Mr. Yaremko: Ask the hon. member for Bracondale what he thinks about the Spadina expressway.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. On vote 807, please.

Mr. Singer: Well, Mr. Chairman, I would think that a very good look should be taken at the whole metropolitan budget, and particularly the urgent need for roads. The hon. Minister is a chairman of this special committee and he must be very familiar by now with all of the great needs for handling traffic, both commuter traffic and roads and subways, in this great metropolitan area. It would seem to me that perhaps additional money could and should be made available now to Metro by way of loans to let them get on with the Spadina road extension and let the heart of the province of Ontario expand by getting on with these road building programmes.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, there is another matter I would like to ask the hon. Minister, following up the statement the other day by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. Newman) regarding the Fort Frances situation. As the hon. Minister is aware the bridge between United States and Canada there is very much in need of replacement.

I understand that some negotiations have been going on for some years and some pressure has been building up there.

The present bridge, I understand, has recently been sold to the Boise Cascade Company and they are now operating it. The problem there seems to be, according to what the hon. Minister said the other day, that local people should negotiate or take some part in this matter. I would have that elaborated on, as I do not quite understand what the hon. Minister meant.

It seems to me that an international bridge ought to be built by the jurisdictions concerned rather than the towns concerned and it looks as if this may be a new principle in bridge building. Does he mean that other bridges have been built by adjacent municipalities and by corporations formed by them? Perhaps the hon. Minister could set me clear on this and then perhaps I could say something further on it.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to comment on that. I think that before I start though I should like to just briefly comment on the remarks of the hon. member for Downsview. I would say to him that I am glad to have these comments. I am glad to them reviewed here but I still say to him as I did to the hon. member for Yorkview that I do not think pressure is the way to accomplish this.

Mr. Singer: I was not suggesting pressure; I was suggesting a loan.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right; I am glad to have these comments in any case, Mr. Chairman.

As I pointed out, we are in very constant communication with these people. On the other hand—and I do not suppose this is too pertinent to the discussion—when attempts are made to get a little extra revenue for the province, there is a strong voice of opposition and criticism. Here we are on the other hand, being asked to spend it in a variety of directions. But nevertheless we are aware of the importance of this situation and we are working constantly with them.

I commented on the other matter raised by the hon. member for Yorkview the other day, and if I did not make myself clear, I shall try to do it briefly now.

He is right; this little bridge over the river between International Falls and Fort Frances may be under lease to or under the ownership of the firm to which he made reference. At one time it was owned by the Ontario Minnesota Paper Company, I believe.

Now I am prepared to admit that the bridge itself is no longer adequate to take care of the traffic at this point. On the other hand the reason that we here have adopted the policy or philosophy of making our views known, in a report prepared by engineers after examining the area, to a local committee—and the state of Minnesota has done the same thing—is that in one particular respect at least a location that has been suggested would cause tremendous property damage and disruption to the town of Fort Frances; so the report that we have submitted recommends consideration for certain alternative locations.

I think it is fair to say that the report from the state of Minnesota is not at the moment on all fours with ours, so we simply feel that the local municipality should have something to say about the location of a bridge of this type, when you consider the approaches that are required and so on, and the extent to which it could damage a fairly substantial proportion of a relatively small community.

This is the basis upon which the thing is under consideration now. The local communities are examining these two reports. The committee as a matter of fact was set up by the local communities for this purpose and after they have had a chance to examine the proposals from both sides of the border I think they may come up with some ideas of their own. I think that at that point both

agencies are prepared to get back and consider it.

To take it a step further, this is a—

Mr. Young: Could I interrupt?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I want to pursue one more point that you made. This is a bridge that crosses an international waterway—an international boundary which in this case is a river. Before a facility of any kind is built, there will likely have to be a bridge authority set up. These bridge authorities are financed, usually, through the sale of some form of bonds or debentures. Part of that, of course, involves much negotiation and legislative requirements at the levels of both federal governments, because once you cross an international boundary in the form of an international bridge, then federal statutes become involved. The state of Minnesota will have to go to Washington, we will have to clarify certain things here with the government at Ottawa; and so the thing is not as cut and dried as it sounds.

I do not know whether this is what the hon. member had in mind or not, but this is where it stands. First of all we want to get some conformity of thought as to where the bridge should go that will suit the people in the community; they are the people who are going to have to live with it, not us.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, once the determination of location is made would the province of Ontario and the state of Minnesota build the bridge?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No; I think it would be the same as any other international bridge. It would be built by a bridge authority.

Mr. Young: And that authority would carry it forever?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, forever is a long time, but it would likely carry it until the bonded indebtedness was retired. The usual basis of financing is to set up an authority that sells bonds or debentures or some form of security to finance the capital construction costs. Tolls are imposed and out of the toll revenue, over a period of time, if it is possible, then the indebtedness is retired. That is usually the way it is done, but I would not think that we would have all the say about that here in Ontario; that is my point.

Mr. Young: Does it revert to the state and the province or is there a continuing authority at that point once the debentures are paid?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The authority could continue to collect tolls for, shall we say, continuing maintenance purposes. It would be a sensible thing to do.

Mr. Young: This is the case in Sarnia?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Unfortunately it is not the case in Sarnia, because one jurisdiction is collecting tolls and the other is not; this is what the ruckus is about in Sarnia.

Mr. Young: Which side is collecting tolls?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are collecting tolls on our side. Here again, you see, is where the United States federal authority gets into it; they will not allow the collection of tolls once the capital costs have been paid.

Mr. Young: And they are subsidizing?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The state of Michigan is now subsidizing; the federal authority will not permit the collection of tolls.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a situation which needs the attention of the hon. Minister, and serious attention, because this matter has been going on for some years.

A year ago this matter was raised in the House and at that time, as I remember, we were told that there were three alternate routes being explored. Now surely it does not take more than a year, or two years as the case may be, to explore these alternate routes?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You would think—

Mr. Young: If there was real urgency in the hon. Minister's mind about this I do not think it would take this long. Certainly it seems to me, in conversations that I have had, that the state of Minnesota has pretty well cleared away its problems and is going to co-operate with the hon. Minister here in doing this job. So unless other factors are present, then this bridge ought to go forward. The Mississippi parkway, I understand, is going to terminate there and now the new highway has gone through from the head of the lakes to Fort Frances, and so it becomes the natural funnel for a whole tourist industry flowing both ways here.

I quite realize that there are tremendous pressures against replacing this bridge—economic pressures, because the Boise Cascade Company is making a very large return on its investment and the shareholders in that bridge must find it a pot of gold, literally. I can understand the kind of pressures that

can be brought to bear against any people who may want to make changes here; but surely, Mr. Chairman, the time has come when this government ought to take the initiative and really push now to make that link with the United States roads a link which will be adequate, a link which will be a public utility in the sense that this one is not, and a link that can handle adequately, at a reasonable price—much more reasonable than the present prices charged—the traffic that will go across that bridge. I hope the hon. Minister will turn his attention to this and get a little more action than has been apparent up to the present time.

Mr. E. P. Morningstar (Welland): Mr. Chairman, the people of the great Welland riding, and particularly those in the city of Welland, are most grateful for the action the hon. Minister's department has taken to ease the traffic congestion which has plagued us in that area for many years.

The proposed tunnel under the canal in the city of Welland is a very important project designed to remove the burden of traffic and I only regret that it is held up until the federal government makes a decision on a new ship canal it is now considering.

Down through the years, your department has been most sympathetic and co-operative in providing solutions to our problems, which makes me wonder what the future holds for us. I must confess I share an anxiety expressed to me by the mayor of Welland, Mr. Allan Pietz, and members of his council, because in the capital programme of your department for the coming year there is no work listed for Highway 406, between Welland and St. Catharines. I would like to inquire from the hon. Minister what is being planned for this highway, or whether any alternatives are being considered at the present time.

I might say, Mr. Chairman, that we are quite concerned over there with the holdup of Highway 406.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, before the announcement by the federal government respecting the relocation of the Welland canal in the vicinity of the city of Welland, it had been the intention of the department, and I am sure the hon. member knows this to be true, to proceed with the construction of this highway with all possible speed because we have been over to Welland and had a number of discussions with the Welland county people and the hon. member for Welland.

But I would point out to you, sir, and to the House, as a matter of fact the study for the city of Welland had been completed which indicated the manner in which Highway 406 would tie in with the existing road network in the city of Welland, and also for future requirements for Highway 406 through Welland in conjunction with the tunnel that was being planned at that time and which had proceeded to a rather advanced stage. But due to the announcement, not too many months ago, of the possible relocation of the canal, which would run from Port Robinson to just north of Port Colborne, we have had to delay the construction of Highway 406, until such time as the transportation study in the city of Welland has been redone, taking into account the new location of the canal.

I point out to you, sir, to the hon. member and to everyone, that the location of the canal in the city of Welland means a very great deal, because it bisects it right down the centre of the city. I would say to the hon. member for Welland that he will appreciate, I am sure, that the terminal point of Highway 406 could be very much affected by the possible change in road systems in Welland, because of the relocation of the canal.

Therefore, sir, we have no alternative but to delay the construction of this highway until these answers are available. We hope they will be available this fall.

However, we realize, Mr. Chairman, that an improved facility between Welland and St. Catharines is necessary. If the location of Highway 406 will have to be changed because of the relocation of the canal, we are studying the possibilities of improving existing Highway 58, from Welland northerly to Turners Corners, at Highway 20 and a connection via county road 14, which would tie in with the section of Highway 406 which can be constructed, irrespective of the canal location. This section of Highway 406 is between Beaver Dam road, otherwise known as county road 23 northerly to St. Davids road. This would handle the traffic situation until such time as the canal would be relocated and Highway 406 could be proceeded with in its final location.

It is our hope to proceed with that section of Highway 406 which I have just described, from the Beaver Dam road northerly, plus a connection from the Thorold tunnel to Highway 406 in the near future. I would hope, Mr. Chairman, that that is largely the information the hon. member for Welland wanted. We do hope to proceed along these lines.

Mr. Morningstar: Thank you very much, Mr. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): May I follow up, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Is it on the same point?

Mr. Thompson: On bridges!

Mr. Chairman: And would the leader of the Opposition be on the same point? All right, proceed.

Mr. Thompson: I just wanted to clarify if I could, through you, sir, the hon. Minister's policy on bridges. I have noticed that the various international bridges seem to have different fees for crossing. I will not bother listing all these fees, but they vary from Cornwall to Messina \$1 to the Whirlpool Rapids bridge, 30 cents. There is a disparity in this situation.

I have, sir, several questions. First, I would assume that the decreasing costs for travelling across an international bridge is because of the debenture having been paid off to an extent or paid off completely. But I have wondered if that is the reason. Second, after the debenture is paid off, the bridge commission is then keeping up the maintenance of the bridge. I assume that is the reason for getting the toll. Apart from that, at that point the bridge commission would be making a profit. To whom does that profit go?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: First of all, the rates of toll are set by each individual authority. I presume they are set in those terms that will take care of operational maintenance costs and provide for orderly debt retirement. I would assume that is the basis upon which they are set. Now to proceed, if we may, to what happens when the bridge is paid off completely.

If it is an international bridge, we could find ourselves in the same position as they are at the Blue Water bridge between Port Huron and Sarnia. It is a matter of record, I think, to say that the federal authorities in the United States will not allow tolls to be collected once the capital debt has been retired. There is not much point in discussing whether that is sensible or not to do. That is the way it is.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): A pretty good policy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It may be, unless it is also sensible to have some type of nominal toll that will take care of maintenance and operational costs, without any other means of acquiring the amount of money required for this purpose. I am not too sure that a nominal toll is sufficient to take care of operational costs and maintenance cost, plus the payment of staff like toll collectors. Painting the bridge from time to time is costly, and has to be done frequently. In many cases, when you start a large bridge and paint it from one end to the other, you might just as well start all over again, because it is required. So costs do accrue to it.

I think the continuing toll, if this helps to illustrate the situation at the Blue Water bridge, is 25 cents, collected on the Ontario side. I am not sure whether it is possible for these authorities to make a profit; this I cannot tell you. I do not know. Certainly once the capital indebtedness is taken care of, and the bondholders have been paid off, there is no more need for piling-up funds for that purpose. But I cannot honestly tell you what would happen if a profit was earned. It might go back to the respective jurisdictions. There is this possibility.

In the case of the Niagara bridge commission, it operates several bridges. Some are older than others, so they get to the point that where the debt is retired on one, they continue the operation and the earnings from that bridge to help retire the capital indebtedness and take care of maintenance and operational costs on the others. That may be a unique situation, because it is the only one I am aware of where there is more than one bridge. But I can tell you there are areas in the province now where additional bridges are being contemplated under existing authorities. That is where there is an authority responsible for the operation and retirement of an existing bridge, and possibly where the capital debt is close to retirement. Some thought is being given that the same authority might well build another bridge and then have the revenue from two bridges to retire the indebtedness. This is a possibility. I think the original bond holders or their trustees would have to be consulted about what is written into the original trust deed or indenture. I would not know, but there is a variety of considerations involved here. I think maybe they are about all the comments I can make here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. I am just thinking of the effect on the province. The hon. Minister of Highways

is building roads right up to the bridge. I am thinking of the need for tourists and an attraction for tourists. I gather that the bridge commissions are independent, that there is no auditor who looks at whether they are now making a profit on the basis of the maintenance after they have paid off the debentures. Does not any public auditor keep watch over this? Is the public auditor in the hon. Minister's department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, each authority has its auditors, Mr. Chairman. I think it should be obvious that the trustees for the bond holders in any circumstances would insist on auditors. And this is done. I speak with some knowledge of how it is done in the Niagara bridge commission, because I am a member of it.

Mr. Thompson: My point is, after it is paid off, how does the public know that and how does the public benefit from this? The bridge obviously is there because you have built a highway and we, the taxpayers, have paid for this highway. We would want to know when we get some benefit from this.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Certainly you get benefits in substantially reduced tolls which would only be involved to take care of operation and maintenance costs. This is a major consideration, I think. They drop down very materially.

Mr. Thompson: My question, Mr. Chairman, is how do you know that happens? I have a list of all these rates to cross a bridge. Frankly, I do not know how long the dollar that you have to charge from Cornwall to Messina is going on or what the contract is. Yet I notice that from Windsor to Detroit you only pay 60 cents.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is very difficult to be specific about this, Mr. Chairman. Some bridges carry much greater volumes of traffic than other bridges do. I think a bridge with a sufficiently high volume of traffic would produce enough money on a lower toll rate to take care of these cost factors and debt retirement. That would be the order of things.

But then I can think of other bridges where the traffic volume is of much less substantial character. If you are going to meet the demands again that I have referred to—debt retirement plus these other cost factors—from the revenue obtained from fewer vehicles, then it appears rather obvious that the rate is going to have to be higher.

The authorities set these rates themselves. We have no control over it; no jurisdiction

at all. I think this may be one of the only answers I can give the hon. leader of the Opposition. Certainly, the bridges at Niagara Falls carry a tremendous number of vehicles and the rates for all types of vehicles there is considerably lower than it would be at the Cornwall-Messina bridge, because of the volume.

I think that must be one of the principal reasons for the disparity, I guess would be the word to say, between these bridge tolls.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, just following up on this, I would feel that because you, as the Minister of Highways, have obviously contributed to a bridge being there, you would not have a bridge that comes over into a pasture land. You have a bridge connected with a highway. The public, in having paid for the highway, have a very real interest in when that bridge is paid off.

It seems to me there should be a reporting to you, or perhaps the Provincial Treasurer, but I think to the Minister, every year on the decreasing amount of debenture. And may I add again that I would assume that the only private bridge to which you have built a highway is at Fort Frances, and I would hope, in view of the fact that the public of Ontario had paid for a road to go to Fort Frances and are proud of the road, that we would not then say to a private company, "Well, you can take the profits from here on in with respect to maintaining the bridge after it is paid off."

In other words, I am saying I think there is very much an obligation for you to be looking at a private company at the end of your road having a bridge and charging a toll. But I also complete what I said before, that rather than us guessing at why some of these rates are lower, and assuming it is because perhaps they have cut down on their debentures or they have more traffic going across them, that we should have the facts; because this is obviously of great concern to the Minister and to the people of Ontario.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to talk about another matter. On Highway 401 at Jane street—I think that is in the riding of my friend, the hon. member for Yorkview—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I have just one more little piece of information for the hon. leader of the Opposition and I am sure this may be of interest to him.

Mr. Chairman: I might say, Mr. Minister, that two or three other members have in-

dicated their interest in bridge construction, but the member for Downsview was next on the list.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, well, I was going to add one more piece of information for the hon. leader of the Opposition. The rates, this is precise information, are set out in the trust deed, and they cannot be changed unless the trustees are in agreement. And of course that makes a very great deal of sense, to me, anyway, I cannot argue with that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, in the widening of Highway 401 and the building of the new entrances and exits, quite a problem was encountered at 401 and Jane street. I do not know whether the hon. Minister is aware of this or not, but there is a rather interesting series of newspaper stories about the five stores that were apparently going to be affected by this construction. I notice Mr. McNab is giving the hon. Minister some comments on this. Mr. McNab's name comes into this story in rather a good light. My complaint is not about the Deputy Minister but the fact that it perhaps took the department a month to get at it.

In any event, there are some five store owners there who, because of the redesign of that entrance and exit, found themselves in a pretty desperate position. And I think anyone who looked at this would recognize immediately that they were in a desperate position. They were about to be put out of business.

These were older people who had invested their life savings in variety stores, cleaning stores, grocery stores, a small restaurant, a laundromat and that sort of thing. And they found themselves in a very, very difficult position. They took their problem to a gentleman named Mr. Blevens, and Mr. Blevens was described in one newspaper story as the senior expressway design engineer of The Department of Highways. Mr. Blevens is quoted in the *Globe and Mail* of November 27 as having delivered himself of this very fascinating statement:

It is a hard fact of life, he said, but it happens all over. What is the difference between being wiped out by a highway and by the construction of a supermarket? A proprietor receives no compensation when a new supermarket takes all his business, he noted.

And then Mr. Blevens goes on to say it is tough, and these poor people are just going to be out of luck. Well, as I say, the complimentary part is just about to come. Mr.

McNab happened to see this in the newspaper. And mind you, while it took a little while, on November 27, the next month, there is another story in the newspaper talking about moving the highway ramp to meet objections.

Highway 400 exit ramp for southbound traffic on Jane street will be built about 200 feet north of the original location, to meet the objections of local store owners, A. T. C. McNab, Deputy Minister said yesterday. The original plans were drawn in August of 1964 and showed two streets—

and it goes on to describe the difficulties of the store owners.

Mr. McNab says it is a minor modification; he had not heard of the owners' complaints until he read about them in the news report about a month ago.

Well, the moral of the story is pretty obvious, Mr. Minister. First of all, I object to the callousness of the senior design engineer. I would think that when he had a problem like this and could realize there was real hardship being visited, or about to be visited, on five store owners, that he should have gone to the highest source in his department and into immediate consultation to see if anything could be done to help them.

Why did not the senior design engineer, immediately prior to making what I think are rather fatuous statements, go to the Deputy Minister and say, "Here is a problem, can we do anything about it?" That is point number one.

Point number two: In the designing of this highway, why should that not have been considered, because as you run one of these legs of a cloverleaf past a bunch of stores, it must be obvious to any design engineer that you can well ruin the stores' business. These poor men can be put out of business, and this was the way it was going to be.

Point number three: In view of this lack of internal communication within the department, how much extra did this change cost the people of Ontario?

The hon. Minister was talking a little earlier about our saying, "Spend more money, but do not raise the taxes." Well, here is something where obviously more money was spent because there were two sets of designs—at a certain stage along there would have been a retreat and it must have cost more money.

Mr. Chairman, I find some substantial concern about the fact that senior officials of the department take it upon themselves to embark on public discourses which are very cal-

lous, without thoroughly investigating within the department what can and should be done.

I am glad the Deputy Minister stepped in. I am sorry he did not get in earlier and I am sorry that these people had to go through a month or six weeks of very severe mental stress and strain. They had to hire a lawyer, they had to fight their battle. Eventually they did win, it appears, through the intervention of the Deputy Minister. This is all to the good.

The point is, there should be a better system of building roads and not of worrying people.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, without any other knowledge of this matter, I will certainly take it as it has been read into the record by the hon. member. I would simply say that it would be my idea that anybody who represents The Department of Highways should conduct themselves in a manner that is quite satisfactory to the public. I will have to concur with that.

I think that it is probably quite fair to say that the hon. member is as gratified as we all are that the Deputy Minister was able to provide a satisfactory solution and I can tell him that in the practical sense it did not cost us anything. We simply shifted a parking lot on to some property that we owned from another area that we owned, so that, in reality, the expenditure of funds had taken place for this complex in any case. We just shifted this and made it possible to protect these people. So really, the solution, when we got down to it, turned out to be quite simple but quite effective as far as the people were concerned, and I share the hon. member's concern that people who deal with the public do not deal with them in the manner that we hope they should.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Chairman, there is a radio programme every Sunday morning—I believe it is—and the commentator is speaking for the weekly newspapers of Ontario and he always says that he is speaking to that "great part of Ontario that lies outside the cities."

Now some hon. members today have spoken for that great part of Ontario that lies in and around the cities and, of course, they have a case from their point of view. But I do not want the hon. Minister to forget the statement of the one who speaks for the newspapers, that he is talking and he should be acting for that great area that lies outside the golden horseshoe.

When one looks at the hon. Minister's schedule for construction during the coming

year, I am thinking particularly of the Stratford area and the Owen Sound area—now if hon. members will study those two maps very carefully, they will have to come to the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that indications of new construction are more scarce than watering places in the Sahara desert, which is an indication, I would say, that my hon. friend is not giving—in my judgment—sufficient attention to those great areas that lie out and beyond and there are two reasons. In the first place, they are not being adequately served for present-day needs and there is no inclination, it seems to me, on the part of the hon. Minister to look ahead to what will be required for the expansion of those areas in the next decade or so. I think all hon. members will agree that one of the great tributaries toward industrial expansion in this province is the availability of good roads. The railway trains are growing less and less important and roads are becoming more and more important, and unless an area is connected with a good highway, it can have little or no hope of drawing unto itself industrial capacity.

I am thinking at the moment, to give a practical example, of No. 10 highway. Now for years between Port Credit and Brampton there was the two-lane highway with a terrific amount of traffic, as everyone knows. Now, lately, you have moved to the place where four lanes are being provided for at least part of that area. That is quite true, but now when you move up Highway 10, up above Orangeville, you find a sign there that says, "Rough roads for 10, 15 20 miles"—I am not sure of the mileage, but quite a long stretch of miles. It is a crooked road and it is quite inadequate for the present-day industrial loads that are required if you have an industrial capacity at the other end of the line.

And Owen Sound and those places that lie south of Owen Sound, in my considered judgment, cannot hope to build up their industrial capacities unless there is an artery that leads from that town or from that city to the markets of this province and I believe—and this is all I am going to say on this; I have said it before and I will say it again—I believe that one of the greatest contributing factors that we can have in this province toward a decentralization of industry, if you will, is to build good roads so that industry can get to the place where they manufacture, to the place where the markets are; and with all this talk about getting more roads around Toronto—well, that is all right. I do not go as far as some do in saying that they should not have roads. I think they should; I think their

need is great, but what I want the hon. Minister to keep in his mind is that not only are the needs of Toronto great, but the needs of the rest of the province are also great and I would say that the needs of the rest of the province should not be subject to the needs of any other parts of the province but they should be dealt with as a province and not as a geographic unit.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, it simply is not possible for me to do anything but concur with the hon. member for Grey South.

I suggest to him that I am not likely to forget that coming from the part of the province that I live in. However, I would like to come back, once more, to three situations that are now *fait accompli* and make one more reference to the continuance of a study programme. He may well say that we study forever and we do not do anything. In all frankness, in this particular day and age, I hope when I stress the fact that it is as important to know where the road should go and why it should go there as it is to know how to build it, I hope that the hon. member would say that that is a pretty sensible way to pursue it.

I have mentioned to the House that we have studied three areas of the province and have several more areas under study and I would like the hon. member to listen once more because I have indicated to him that one study that is just about to get under way will have a very great bearing on the area that he is concerned about and this one that I make reference to is the Kitchener-Waterloo area, and we have another study that will get under way shortly. It is called the Owen Sound area transportation study—more appropriately, I think, it should be called the Upper Lake Huron-Georgian Bay study. These two studies will tell us what we were told in London, what we were told in the Niagara peninsula, and what we were told in Ottawa, and we certainly hope to move in the direction of the implementation of the recommendations of these studies as quickly as we possibly can.

I would like to give the hon. member an example of what will emanate from the London area transportation study. This study revealed, without very much doubt, that a completely new controlled access corridor between London and Sarnia is needed, and it is not hard to accept it when you hear these study reports presented. This will be given very high priority, but even of more interest to the hon. member, it showed

that Highway 4—we both live on Highway 4 rather some distance apart—but it pointed out that at least to the northern boundary of the London area study, Highway 4 was certainly in the category of an arterial road. Now these studies border each other; they overlap each other and when the rest of them, that I made reference to, are completed, we will know the story completely about No. 4 and we will know about Highway 10.

This may take a little time, Mr. Chairman, but I think it is a better way to do it than to just crash in with new construction here and new construction there. We are going to do it on a planned basis; certainly we are not forgetting these areas of the province or these studies would not be under way.

But we are going to do more than just study them, Mr. Chairman, I can assure the hon. member that we are going to accept the recommendations of the study and on a staged, planned basis we are going to build the kind of roads he talks about. There is no question about it, I agree with him entirely.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Brant.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the hon. Minister something about the staged, planned basis of construction that he has just referred to. The arterial corridor, a new phrase but a descriptive one, called Highway 403, that is presently being extended around the city of Brantford and heading west toward Woodstock is scheduled to cross the Grand river in the long stretch between Galt and Brantford where there is at present no adequate crossing. The hon. Minister is aware of the fact that No. 5 highway crosses the Grand river at Paris at a high level bridge which, in my view, was not designed to stand the tremendous stress of traffic that it has received in the years up until the opening of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway. This bridge, in my opinion, is in a serious state of disrepair. Frighteningly so, as far as the people in the Paris area are concerned, who must cross it regularly.

I want to bring to your attention, Mr. Chairman, the fact that in the past few years there has been every indication that The Department of Highways is aware of the increasing difficulty. The bridge has been narrowed down, there have been special speed limit signs put up calling for a maximum speed of 15 miles an hour crossing this fairly long and very high bridge. There was a time, a year ago, when watchmen were

posted on this bridge and they were supposed to ensure that the speed of 15 mph was not exceeded. Naturally this was a difficult thing to do, because there still is a heavy volume of traffic and many very heavy transports using it.

My own experience, I cross the bridge very often, is that nobody gets down to the speed limit of 15 mph. When I inquired about this I was told by the department that actually it was the responsibility of the police to see that the speed limit was not exceeded. I would not for a moment, Mr. Chairman, stand here and say that The Department of Highways is playing fast and loose with the safety of the people who are using this road, for I am sure this is one thing that must be of prime importance to the engineers and, of course, to the hon. Minister. The fact remains the bridge is inadequate. When you cross it you feel as if it were made of toothpicks and scotch tape. We are very much concerned as to the assurances that the hon. Minister might give us in the House as to its safety and what programme there is that will ensure that it is kept up to standards.

There is even one rumour going around that there is a Bailey bridge kept quite handy in case it does fall in, and he might refer to that.

Now just in this connection, the relief that is expected for this bridge is the crossing of the river a few miles down by the new double bridge where Highway 403 will cross the river. Try as we might we cannot get any definite indication from the department when this bridge will in fact be built. There are a lot of statements that have been made through various agencies associated with the hon. Minister that it will begin within two years. It would be a great help if, once the plan is made to build these large and important new highways, something more specific than has been available so far could be given to the people in the area as far as the timing is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, rather than stop at this point and let the hon. Minister comment further, as I hope he will do, on bridge crossings of the Grand river, it appears to me that between Caledonia and Galt the crossings are completely inadequate. I feel sure that in the five to ten years that lie immediately ahead this will be remedied.

There are a number of plans for these river crossings and one of the plans that I hope the hon. Minister is considering most carefully is the request that was put before him by a delegation from the Six Nations

reserve so that the two parts of this reserve that are divided by the Grand river would be joined by a suitable bridge. I know the hon. Minister will say that the responsibility for this lies with the federal government, and yet in Ontario his department is the main agency that must make the plans and execute the construction of these important, and of course, expensive projects.

I was present with the delegation in his office and I must say to you, sir, that we were royally received and the representations of the Six Nations council were listened to attentively. The hon. Minister sent out a group of people who were going to examine the warrants for such a bridge and, if I understand this correctly, they have a system whereby they would examine just what the need is.

But in this case I want to say to you, sir, that the regular warrants simply cannot apply if these in fact refer to the proposed usage by numbers of cars and so on, because a special community within our province is divided by the river. The one section of the reserve that is cut off from the main town and the main population is lost to the use of the Indians through rentals to the white population simply because they do not have ready access to it. If they are going to consider any farming of the small part of the reserve that is removed from them by the river, they have to trundle their equipment many miles around through Brantford or Caledonia in order to get across. The alternative is to cross on the ice in the winter time; which of course, is being done, but this is not useful in the harvest and regular farming season.

So in this whole area the crossings of the Grand river are of great and growing importance. I hope that the hon. Minister will be able to give us some definite indication of what the plans are for the rebuilding of the crossing of Highway 5 at Paris, the new crossing on 403 and the possibility of doing something for the very pressing needs of the people on the Indian reserve.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think I can.

The hon. member will recall we have said on a number of occasions that we would attempt to repair the bridge. I think you will be pleased to learn that upon investigation we find that it is going to cost too much to repair it. Our estimates of the cost of repair approximate \$800,000, and our estimates of the cost of a new bridge run around \$1,250,000, so it is simply not economical to repair it.

Mr. Nixon: Is this the bridge at Paris?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This is the bridge at Paris. Certainly we will rebuild the bridge, it is a matter of simple economy, I think. With the kind of money I have made reference to here now we can have a new bridge rather than a patched up or repaired one; this is the sensible thing to do. This is our present plan. I would like to be more specific about when, presumably we can now commence the design of a new facility rather than plan for the reconstruction of the old one.

As far as the bridge over Highway 403 is concerned, this is definitely planned for construction in 1967. I can assure the hon. member of that now and make the statement here that it will be on our 1967 construction programme.

Now we come to the bridge of the Six Nations reserve. I am going to have to discuss this with the people that we assigned to do the investigation work while you were there with the representatives of the Six Nations reserve. If you will permit me to find out what they have accomplished, I will certainly pass it along to you, but I cannot do it at the moment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister a question, if I may, on matters that will take us even further into the hinterlands than either the first two previous speakers.

I am sorry if I have not been able to quite understand the application of some of the changes in the budget this year as it affects the unorganized townships. I realize we have passed this particular item and I will make my question very short.

The hon. Minister yesterday made a remark to the effect that certainly some of these roads should never have been built in the places they were. I can certainly agree with that, but in the meantime people live on those roads and people have to get to school on those roads. The hon. Minister will immediately say that there is an arrangement through the statute labour board and local roads boards to take care of these matters.

In some of the townships, as he knows, and I know very well, this will never work and this will never build those roads. In several places in Algoma, and there are dozens of this kind of township there with

an assessment in the area of \$1,000 a mile, we just never will get these roads. It must be a problem that I know the hon. Minister has looked at. I am wondering if there is some way, through the increase in the budget this year, in the estimates this year, that he has taken this into consideration in a way that will be a little bit easier to get some relief to these people.

Now for instance, we do have some of these roads, and I will have to say that part of one of them is a King's highway, where school children had to go by boat over a section of road—by bus to a point, by boat to a point, by bus from there to a school—through several parts of the seasons last year. This means that this road is finished. Under any circumstances, neither statute labour board or roads board will ever rebuild these roads. Could I have a comment on this, please?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes Mr. Chairman, I think I would almost be inclined to ask the hon. member, either now or at some future occasion, to be specific about these situations. I am quite prepared to review them on an individual basis with the hon. member at any time. But to say across the board just what is to be done about that type of road is a little difficult. If you have specific situations in specific townships that you are concerned about, I should be very happy to look into what can or should be done. If you would care to indicate the section of King's highway that was under water, there is another situation we would be happy to discuss with you. But I would have to have something of a more specific nature, I would say to the hon. member.

Mr. Farquhar: Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I have brought the matter of the road under water to the hon. Minister's attention. I have certainly brought to his attention a great many times the specific roads that I am talking about in Algoma, the King's highway north of Bruce Mines, and I cannot remember the number of the particular highway at the moment. This is the area that I am speaking about particularly, this whole area up there, a depressed area and an area that is not going to be able to do what needs to be done for those roads under either statute labour or local roads boards arrangements.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Niagara Falls.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment on the bridges

at Niagara Falls; they were mentioned here several times earlier in the day. They were talking about prices in crossings and how much they charge on individual bridges. The Peace bridge, I know, does not come under the commission that the hon. Minister sits on.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not trying to choke this off, Mr. Chairman, but discussion on matters related to international bridges under the capital construction vote of The Department of Highways is very much out of order, I would suggest.

Mr. Bukator: It is funny that it should be out of order at this particular time.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There is no mention in here. These bridges are not even the property of The Department of Highways. We have nothing to do with them.

Mr. Bukator: This is what I was coming to. I was trying to make a point and give this House some information that they apparently do not know about. You were all floundering around here, talking about the prices of bridges, and I thought, Mr. Chairman, my comment would be in order. It is a remarkable thing that others can get the stage, but I have to be stymied at this stage.

Mr. Chairman: I suggest that the member for Niagara Falls—

Mr. Bukator: I would suggest that the Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: —should not be stymied, that other members have been permitted to speak on it and I will rule him in order.

Mr. Bukator: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was going to say that at the Peace bridge you can get a book of tickets. This is relevant to our bridges as the hon. Minister is a member of that board. You can get a book of tickets at Fort Erie. You can cross the bridge with one ticket, which costs you 25 cents at least if cashed, whether there be one in the car or five. There is no difference in charges for the number of passengers in the car. This is a 25 cent charge. If you buy a book of tickets, it is a little less than 20 cents, whether it be one or five. This is very cheap and there is nothing to compare to it, I do not believe, in any international bridge in the country.

In the meantime, I would like to mention also the private bill that was presented here some years ago—three years ago, to be exact.

They give grants in lieu of taxes, Mr. Minister, to the tune of \$64,000 a year to the town of Fort Erie, because their bridge is practically paid for. This is the point I want to make. And so, because they have the money, they are giving a lower rate to cross and they are also paying to the municipality a portion of the money towards taxes, a grant in lieu of. Now to get to the Rainbow bridge. The Rainbow bridge has a similar arrangement, only you can buy a book of tickets, I believe, for \$2.50. The local residents buy a book of tickets and have three months in which they can use those tickets. The authorities put a date on it, they stamp it the day you buy it, and if you go across that bridge just once, as I have done on many occasions, and not go back across that bridge again, it costs \$2.50 to cross the bridge once.

I would think that this concession could be given to the residents in an international area such as that is. This request has never been made of the department before, or of the bridge commission on which you sit. I believe this should be considered in favour of the people of that area to allow the purchaser to use the tickets until they are all used, regardless of date.

The point I was trying to make also, since you have taken over the Whirlpool bridge, is that when it was a private bridge it paid to that city some \$38,000 a year in taxes. For five years after the bridge commission took over the Whirlpool bridge—it was bought from a private company—a grant was paid in lieu of taxes to the tune of \$38,000. There was no statute that the bridge commission should pay this, or The Department of Highways should pay it, the parks commission contributed the \$38,000 for five consecutive years. When that agreement ran out, the grant was cut off. I think it has been so for the past two years.

The reason I draw this to your attention is that since the hon. Minister is on the bridge commission, and since this grant has been cut off, as I mentioned in the House last year, I think this should be given consideration. Why should the government take over from private enterprise and then deprive that municipality of its just dues? I make this point very briefly and I will quit at this point with the particular request to give the people of that area the opportunity to use their tickets until they are used up.

This is no different than they do at the south end in the Peace bridge area. I do not think this would hurt the commission financially at all. The tickets are there; it would entice me to go back after the third month,

rather than because you charge per passenger and for car. If there are three in the car, I think it is something like 60 or 70 cents each way. So I think if I make two trips I can use up my \$2.50. I buy the tickets and I find I leave them in my glove compartment, and I am in Toronto rather than home. I have lost that amount of money for those tickets. I believe that your commission should look at this very seriously, and possibly make this concession to the people of that area.

The question I was going to ask you when I got to my feet, pertaining to construction about the bridges, is as follows.

In your estimates, you indicate that you are going to spend some money in the traffic circle at the Rainbow bridge. My question is are you also going to do some work under the bridge where the stores are? I understand that the leases of the people who are there will expire this fall. Is the purpose of not renewing those leases—and I have only heard this, I have not spoken to any of the tenants there—for the purpose of widening that road?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: There are a number of items here. Probably the disparity between the tolls on the Rainbow bridge and the bridges under the jurisdiction of the Niagara bridge commission versus the Peace bridge at Fort Erie would be the debentures or bonds issued by the Niagara bridge commission, secured by three bridges. There are three bridges to maintain, three bridges to operate. So this may account for the disparity in the rates of toll. Again, the tolls are part of the agreement with the debenture holders. I pointed that out before, when we were discussing this matter. These bridges must be self-supporting, that is the story. However, these are matters I will be happy to take up at a subsequent meeting with the bridge commission. I cannot speak for the commission here today; it is not possible.

The matter of the redevelopment of the bridge plaza area has nothing particularly to do with road widening or anything. It is simply what I have said; it is a contemplated complete redevelopment of the bridge plaza area. I would hope the hon. member would agree with me that this is overdue. The bridge plaza area is not quite in keeping with the general character of Niagara Falls, Ontario. So we are in the process of contemplating, as a matter of fact we hope to present our ideas and concepts for, the redevelopment to an early meeting of the bridge commission, probably within the next few days. So we are contemplating something that will completely face-lift the whole bridge

plaza area that the hon. member is very familiar with.

Mr. Bukator: This is the point I was trying to get at. I might say to you, Mr. Chairman, that on occasions in the past when they considered a complex of that type or even re-vamping and reconstructing roads, the hon. Minister has been good enough to invite me to sit in. After your preliminary meetings with the bridge commission, I hope the hon. Minister intends to extend that courtesy to me; I would like to know what is going on, since the hon. Minister said we are in the process of bringing plans about.

Mr. Chairman: I should explain to the member for Niagara Falls that as far as the collection of bridge tolls is concerned, it comes under section 4 of vote 801. I did not want him to think that I had allowed other members to speak and I would not allow him, although technically it was out of order.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Chairman, we are on 807, I believe?

Mr. Chairman: Correct!

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: While I sit here I listen in amazement and consternation to the criticisms and the talk about roads in Ontario which leads me to believe that the majority of the hon. members of the Opposition never travel over roads in this province.

I would like to say something about the road situation prior to 1943, when my friends the Liberals were in power. This will make you laugh, and rightly so.

The Liberal Opposition before 1943 had a great habit up in my area a little west of Port Arthur to build a road there. It was called "The road to Duluth." And every year our member would make an announcement that this road would be paved, and the same contractor got the job every year. He would go out—my hon. friend who is smiling over there would know about this—he would go out and lay about two inches of blacktop for five miles on the road to Duluth. That was the road paving in Lakehead. By spring it would be broken up and the same contractor would get the same job again and he lived off that for 10 or 15 years.

That was the great Liberal Party contribution to highways in the Lakehead area. Now the NDP has come into the picture. They were all Liberals before, but they got tired and formed a new party of their own. I just want to compliment you—

Mr. Chairman: Do you think this properly comes under vote 807?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Yes, this is construction, I am talking about now. In my area I will tell you about some of the roads we have. The trans-Canada highway—and any of you who wish to travel over a beautiful road, travel east from Port Arthur to Sault Ste. Marie and on down. You will see curves there and cuts that cost a million and a half or more dollars a mile. You will see the finest road of any place in the world, both east and west from the city of Port Arthur down to Toronto and farther east. We are very proud of our Department of Highways up there. We have a lovely road to Duluth, which is kept in fine shape.

Last year, many of the hon. members in the Opposition travelled up to Atikokan and Fort Frances to see that marvellous Noden causeway opened; a beautiful road, the like of which you will never see in any other part of the world.

Highway 17 west to Winnipeg; and then on the northern route we have Highway 11, another beautiful road. In my area again we see, starting next year, Mr. Chairman, the ring road which is going to be a marvellous thing for our two cities and that whole area up there.

Mr. Chairman, I think The Department of Highways has done marvellous work, and I hate to hear somebody get up and talk about some little bridge or some toll that is two cents too high or some petty criticism of that kind, when we should be talking about big things in the biggest province in Canada; a province that has been made the greatest in Canada simply by the work of departments such as our Department of Highways today.

Now, let us say something about the personnel.

Mr. Chairman: Before the Minister starts this, the member for Ottawa East wants to know if he will answer a question.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would be very glad to.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask of the hon. Minister. Has he ever travelled in eastern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Who, me? I lived there for years.

Mr. Racine: Apparently he must not have, because according to one of the hon. members opposite, in the last federal election, speaking in the great county of Renfrew South, he referred to Highway 17 as being a "goat trail."

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Does Highway 17 run through there?

Mr. Chairman: Is this a question?

Mr. Racine: I want an answer from the hon. Minister.

An hon. member: Is this a goat trail?

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I have been from coast to coast and I think the hon. member has alternate routes there, does he not? He is talking about the Ottawa Valley road. Do not forget that there are two roads, one of them that is a lot better than the one the hon. member was speaking of. So that he is well served. He has no kick there because he has two routes to use.

However, I wanted to mention another thing in connection with construction, and that is new roads that we have going into our mining areas in my area and farther west. This is construction still, Mr. Chairman.

The road into Red Lake, which is 100 and some miles long, is a road that you would be proud of in the city of Toronto—all paved with the exception of 10 miles; that is all there is to finish. And that road is one that is taking you 110 miles north of Highway 17 to serve the great mines in the Red Lake district, and the new one that is going to be built now at Bruce Lake.

This department is doing a tremendous amount of work that hon. Opposition gentlemen do not see, and one reason they can criticize so badly is because the people in the eastern part of the province do not get up there to disprove Opposition statements here. I for one will not stand here and hear this department criticized, and its personnel criticized, because for my money and for the moneys of the people of Ontario, they are doing a great construction job.

I might mention two of our civil servants who are sitting in front of the hon. Minister. I would hate to tell you how many years they have been with the department, what knowledge they have of roadbuilding when some of you have been in this House for about two years and have never seen a road built—a lot of you. I think criticism of that kind is unfair and the hon. members seem to pick out the tiny little things that they have to criticize and forget to look at the overall picture that is evolving in this province of one of the finest road systems in this world.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say another thing, I will just mention it, and that is winter

travel in this province as you know is just about as tough as any place in the world.

Mr. Chairman: Under new construction, vote 807.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Well, this is concerning snowplowing.

But I think the hon. members over there have noticed what happens after a heavy snowstorm? Every vehicle in The Department of Highways is out, day or night, cleaning those roads to make travel safe for the population of this province.

Gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, I have nothing but praise for The Department of Highways; and all I can say to the hon. Minister is to congratulate his staff and tell them to carry on with the good work because the people of this province are well satisfied with what they are doing.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Chairman: Of course I shall have to rule the last statement out of order!

Some hon. members: hear, hear!

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, may I say just one word with respect to what the hon. Minister of Mines has just said?

Mr. Chairman: If your colleague will yield the floor.

Mr. Bryden: I do not think that I will have any trouble with him, sir.

I must say, and I think I speak for all hon. members of the House when I say, that I am tickled to death to see the hon. Minister of Mines back in such good form again, soaring all over the rafters. I think this is one of the best efforts I have heard him make and he has made a great many good ones in the House.

It is not very long ago, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. Minister used to get up under the estimates of department after department and make the same laudatory speech about the entire department from the Minister down to the lowliest office boy. I take it that he has now concluded that The Department of Highways is the only department worthy of such praise and I am inclined to agree with him.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You mean you are excluding The Department of Mines?

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to get back down to

earth and look at some of the problems that we have in the highways situation.

I would like to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister a problem that we have in the Hamilton area concerning the construction of the overhead signs. As you know we now have two main highways running in or around Hamilton, which are the new 403 and the Queen Elizabeth Way.

The 403 starts about eight to ten miles outside of Hamilton with a great big sign, "Hamilton—You go by 403." Now if you take the other way over the skyway bridge, which was always the main way into the east end of Hamilton and still is the main way, you will discover a big sign saying "Niagara Falls" and nothing about Hamilton at all. Most of the tourists and people going to Hamilton would prefer to know that there are two ways to go to Hamilton.

The business people in the east end of Hamilton are really losing out because a stranger going into Hamilton will go in on 403 which actually goes right through the west end of Hamilton. If they want to go to the east end they have to go completely through the city, about an hour's drive. I wonder if it would not be possible to erect a sign there that would indicate that one could go to Hamilton through the Queen Elizabeth Way, too?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we will certainly examine this. What the hon. member says seems sensible and we will have a look into it.

Mr. Chairman: I suppose, Mr. Minister, that for the satisfaction of the member, this would properly come under vote 803. We discussed signs at that time, but I did not want to cut the member off.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister regarding a problem that has been a vexing one in my riding for some time. As the hon. Minister knows this government has spent more money on highways in Yorkview than perhaps in any other single riding during the past year or so. In that process they have probably not only built a top quality highway through that riding, but have also created some very great problems for people living adjacent to the road.

A couple of years ago some agreement was reached and a 50-foot line was established from the edge of the pavement within which people's property would be purchased. I wonder if the hon. Minister could tell us how many settlements have now been made on the basis of the agreement at that time?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would have to say to the hon. member that while we were involved with the original considerations that were followed in terms of the purchase of these homes, he will recall that The Ontario Housing Act was the vehicle that was used for the purchase. Now The Ontario Housing Act is administered by the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall). I do not have this precise information; I could get it but I think the hon. Minister of Economics and Development, who has conducted the actual operation, could give the hon. member this information in due course.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, my problem is that if I wait for those estimates to get the information then I cannot come back to the hon. Minister of Highways in the House because his estimates will have been completed.

The problem is a very simple one: If those transactions have in fact been completed, there are other transactions that should be completed following that. In other words, there are properties lying along the highway which have flankage along the highway bringing the houses within a very few feet of the edge of the highway right of way. Now these are the people who are very seriously affected.

In the case of some of the other homes that are being bought, the back of the lot might be 100 feet or 150 feet in some cases from the houses. These are being taken in and are being purchased. But many of the houses with flankage and therefore lying very close to the highway are being ignored. They are just outside the 50-foot line.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if there has been any further consideration given toward these people? Is there any thought on the part of the hon. Minister that there might be an extension of that 50-foot line in certain specific cases where hardship is being suffered by people whose flankage lies along the highway?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say that there certainly has not been by The Department of Highways, Mr. Chairman. We certainly had something to do with the original rules, but since that time the implementation of those rules and the purchase of these properties has been exclusively the prerogative of the hon. Minister who administers The Ontario Housing Act.

It is possible that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development — he is not here, but I am confident that if the hon. member

requests this information of him it will be given him. I could probably obtain it from the hon. Minister but then so can the hon. member. On the other hand, I can say with some degree of assurance that there has been no departure from the original terms of reference. I think the hon. member will find that when he gets confirmation from the hon. Minister.

Mr. Young: I will ask the hon. Minister of Economics and Development about this when the time comes but the problem, I am afraid, is going to be that he cannot act without some assurance from the hon. Minister of Highways that money will be forthcoming or that the techniques will be worked out so that he can act. The people on Lorne Bruce drive and Culford road and other places are wondering just what is going to happen and I do not want to be caught in this problem of the hon. Minister here saying that it is the—

Mr. Chairman: I would remind the member for Yorkview that the hour is five o'clock.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs) moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Clerk of the House: Notice of motion No. 8, by Mr. F. R. Oliver,
Resolved,

That, the Ontario water resources commission be instructed to report upon the feasibility of piping water from the Great Lakes to drought areas in western Ontario.

Notice of motion No. 12, by Mr. E. W. Sopha,

Resolved,

That, in the opinion of this House, it is deplorable that the citizens of many organized municipalities have not got adequate and certain supplies of fresh and potable water, nor have the citizens of many municipalities adequate sewage disposal facilities, and, in the opinion of this House, adequate water and sewage services are a minimum requirement for the

protection of health, enjoyment of a reasonable standard of living and the attraction and development of industrial growth. This House is further of the opinion that the government has lacked direction and purpose in providing for many thousands of our citizens their minimum requirements of fresh water and reasonable facilities of sewage disposal.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): I move, seconded by Mr. Nixon, resolution No. 12 standing in my name which has just been read.

Mr. Speaker, it is trite but basic to say that in relation to everything else that exists, water along with air and sunlight is a fundamental essential to the emergence and continuation of human life in the form in which we know it on this planet. Accordingly, if problems exist, as they do, and indeed exist in very gross and anxious form, in relation to the supply of fresh water to inhabitants of this part of the planet over which this Legislature has jurisdiction, then perhaps it is not an exaggeration to say that there is no problem with which this governing body ought to be more anxiously concerned than that of water.

Since man began in his gregarious fashion to assemble together in fairly compact units of population, whether they be cities, towns or townships as we know them, there has been always extant the problem of making available to these various units of population density, adequate supplies of fresh water. Such water supplies represent one aspect and important as it is, only one part of total water services for another aspect which is an outgrowth of the fact that man, on birth, immediately becomes a waste-producing animal. These wastes, organically and industrially, he produces in large quantities. He can do three things with his wastes and all of them involve contamination. He can burn them and he pollutes the air. He can bury them and he pollutes the ground or he can put them in watercourses and he pollutes the watercourses.

Uncritical judgment treats the problem of the provision of fresh water supplies as occupying one compartment of human activity and the problem of disposal of wastes in watercourses as being a different problem. In truth the conservation of available water supplies and their freedom from pollution are two subjects which, in fact, are one.

At the outset to give the appropriate context which later remarks deserve, and in

dealing with matters inherent in these two resolutions, Mr. Speaker, I charge upon this Legislature the responsibility of being trustees in the truest sense in which these words can be used, for the people of this province of our water resources. For greater certainly I say that each and every member of this House holds in trust for those outside this House, the supplies of fresh water with which we are providentially endowed.

This vital trust is coupled, inescapably, with the responsibility to so order events as well and as reasonably as they can be ordered by intelligent minds, to the end that no citizen of this province regardless of his financial or other status is denied the basic standard of living which is a reflection of having available to him, adequate supplies of fresh water and reasonably efficient sewage disposal facilities.

If that is the norm which our people are entitled to reach, then I will show illustratively that, with many municipalities involving large groups of people, the standards fall sadly and shockingly short of it. In other words I am saying that it is so intimate a responsibility to each and every member of this House, whether he supports the government or rests in Opposition, that the responsibility cannot be sloughed off by saying that the Legislature before us has set up an independent commission to carry out our responsibility. I reject that excuse and I shall take the time of the House to examine to what degree of efficiency that independent commission, the Ontario water resources commission, has carried out its functions.

The bill which was the genesis of the Ontario water resources commission, passed this Legislature ten years ago. It is absolutely clear that during the days when the Premier of the province used to introduce important pieces of legislation as expressions of policy for the government which he headed, that the hon. Mr. Frost was pre-occupied with the problem of pollution. He said so when he said:

It is quite apparent that what I said on the introduction of this bill, as to its importance and its implications, was by no means an overstatement. This is an immensely important and far-reaching matter. It means that the problems of water contamination and pollution in this province have to be faced. Every municipality must become conscious of this and must take steps to eliminate it. It removes the difficulties of securing money, from a credit standpoint, and will provide

ways and means for the retirement of costs involved on a long-term basis. Municipalities are, of course, empowered to proceed on their own.

Yet the committee known as the water resources supply committee, out of which the OWRC grew, had ten terms of reference which bear recital if only to provide a gauge, a measuring stick, to determine to what extent the OWRC has fulfilled the reasons for its creation. They were asked to consider and deal with the following:

1. The present and prospective need for an integrated system of water supply in Ontario with particular reference to south-western Ontario.

2. The best method of providing adequate quantities of suitable water to municipalities, industries, agriculture and other consumers.

3. The extent of pollution in the lakes, rivers and streams, and the best means of controlling it.

4. The effects of the construction of an integrated water supply system or systems to municipalities on local water tables and on the availability of water resources for agriculture, including irrigation and other purposes.

5. What legislation may be necessary to ensure satisfactory control of the water resources as well as the legislation which may be required to provide for transmission of water from source to municipality or user.

6. The estimated cost of an adequate system or systems and the best means for financing such system or systems on a self-liquidating basis.

7. The co-ordination of action by municipalities and the provincial government in the financing, administration and control of the water system or systems.

8. The best administrative organization for maintaining continuity of operation and expansion, and for providing efficient management and effective safeguards to ensure the purity and adequacy of water supplies.

9. The urgency of each portion of the water system or systems so that a schedule of priority of completion may be provided.

10. The best means of ensuring the province's continued control over water resources, particularly with reference to provisions of the international boundary water treaties and other relevant statutes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make at this time this fundamental point. The provision of adequate supplies of fresh water and the

creation of adequate sewage disposal facilities are economic matters which exist outside of the normal operation of the laws of supply and demand, that is to say, that the problem operates separate and apart from the ordinary working of our economic system. If the citizen needs water for his daily living then no private enterprise, apart from very isolated instances, is going to supply it to him. On the one hand the capital cost is often gigantic, on the other hand it is unprofitable.

Only society acting co-operatively through government can satisfy the demands for and the human needs of fresh water. Therefore we arrive at this simple question: Is the OWRC fulfilling its purposes and tasks in providing for our people in organized centres of population adequate supplies of fresh water and sewage facilities? I for one, for my own part, am ready to say categorically that it is not, and I say it emphatically. In truth it is open to one who has no need in politics to put on a blindfold to reality to say that the Ontario water resources commission, in the ten years since its inception, has grown like a dinosaur, and like the dinosaur its brain is too small for its body and again, like the dinosaur, if it cannot respond to the environment in which it operates, it must disappear. To illustrate with reference to the area I know best, look at the Sudbury basin. Picture the Sudbury basin, metaphorically as being represented by a saucer, the rim being composed of precambrian rocks and the centre composed of agricultural soil. The city of Sudbury is situated on the southeastern portion of the rim. The central portion of the saucer, lower in elevation than the rim, is comprised of a number of municipalities, and not all of the municipalities, it should be said, are plagued with water problems. Those that make up the principality of the International Nickel Company, that is, Copper Cliff, Levack, Lively and Creighton, have no problems. Mother Inco has decreed and has provided the funds to grant to the inhabitants of those communities quite satisfactory sewage and water services.

No one, but no one, in any way wants to detract or derogate from what they have achieved. But one is entitled to say, and I do say it, that particularly in regard to water service, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. If the aforementioned municipalities have had directly conferred on them by a paternalistic industrial giant, which feeds on the entire area or region, those services to which normal living entitles the inhabitants, then why should not the inhabitants of Capreol, Hanmer, Blezard, Rayside, Balfour and Dowling townships and

indeed the most important municipal unit of all by virtue of its size, the city of Sudbury, also enjoy the same normal services?

I digress from this theme for a moment. A half century ago surveyors came along and laid out six-mile square townships which eventually became units of municipal government. The boundaries are fictional, unobservable lines, arbitrarily set. These boundaries I say have no relevance, absolutely no relevance, to the intelligent solution of the problem of providing fresh water and sewage facilities to the inhabitants of the municipalities in the second group I have named.

Of course the problem is regional. Watersheds have no concern for man-made boundaries except as man used them to be boundaries. In this geographic and political complex as I have described, early this year the Ontario water resources commission arrived in its full majesty. The commission had summoned political representatives of all the municipalities to discuss water and sewage problems. Those with problems came to the public meeting. Those without water problems stayed away. I attended and I can fairly report that those who came, came in a state of bewilderment, not knowing what they were to meet. They came not in any spirit of co-operation to solve a common problem; on the contrary, they came as representatives of political units which had a problem, a very anxious problem, a problem that transcended artificial political boundaries and of the practical engineering solution to their problem they had but little preparation.

The commission listened to them and at the end the commission suggested that each of them go back and pass a resolution asking for a study by the commission.

Well, very few of them have passed that resolution and their failure to pass it, I say objectively, speaks loudly of the suspicion with which they treat the commission. They know that a study is going to cost them money, they don't know how much money but they know that if it leads to a project then that project is going to cost them money and they don't know how much money nor any of the other important implications.

You see, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you out of my own experience that the Ontario water resources commission is not known for its generosity. It doesn't give anything away. Anything it gives it expects to get paid for and with interest.

Now to return to the meeting. At the end of it the commission issued an edict to the city of Sudbury, an edict worthy in every

way of comparison to an imperialistic czarist ukase. This was directed to the city of Sudbury and the city of Sudbury was ordered to build a sewage treatment plant within five years which would cost millions of dollars. I can tell you here and now that the council of the city of Sudbury, together with the technical and engineering experts which staff the administration, are, taken together, a very responsible group of people.

They know that the citizens of the city are already overburdened with debentured debt and the natural query is "where do we get the money?" It is all right for the OWRC to issue its orders but who, it may be asked legitimately, is going to pay the cost of carrying out the order? Sewage disposal facilities and a sewage treatment plant are very anxious problems to the council. They are only a part of the problem.

Adequate supplies of fresh water for a population past the 80,000 mark and growing, is quite another problem and a problem of considerable magnitude. It is safe to say that the political heads of the city are very conscious of water. They must go to sleep thinking about it for they know that the last administration was defeated at the polls because of water. The housewife turned on her tap and out of it came a stinking, putrid, unpalatable, unpotable solution, unfit for humans.

This last autumn, sir, fathers, mothers and children sought ground water where and when they could get it. They journeyed to faucets provided in the eastern part of the city. They lined up outside the beneficent business in the north end which provided a tap which emitted ground water. The brewery which is a good citizen in the community, provided large quantities of filtered water. This they did for weeks on end, ungrudgingly and without complaint as typifies the phlegmatic people that occupy that city—but came the first Monday of December, they went to the polls and they turned out the administration because the administration refused to recognize that good decent people in the modern world don't have to drink a solution which literally contains millions of the dead bodies of organisms. Algae is nature's way of setting up a process which tends toward the purification of water, but nature's process is too unpalatable for human consumption.

Sudbury gets its water from the Ramsay watershed and Lake Ramsay is landlocked with no large increments flowing into it. My point is, and I wish to emphasize and re-emphasize it, that there comes a time in human affairs when we have had too many

studies, when the time for further study is past, when the time for action is required.

The OWRC ought to have arrived at the point long ago where it must take the lead in assisting the people of Sudbury and their political representatives to determine whether Lake Ramsay is to continue to be the reservoir from which water supplies for the city of Sudbury will be drawn, or whether some alternative source is to be used. If Lake Ramsay, which apparently has supplies sufficient to meet the demands for a further ten years, is to be the source of our water, then action must be taken to bring large additional amounts of water into the lake.

I am no engineer. I don't profess to have technical competence to advise on such matters, but those who are skilled in these arts point out that among the solutions to the problem of the supply of potable water to the citizens of Sudbury are these:

- (1) The bringing of water from the Wahnapiatae river, five to eight miles to the east. The distance depending respectively on whether Lake Ramsay is or is not used as a reservoir.

- (2) The bringing of large amounts of water directly to the city of Sudbury from Lake Wahnapiatae, 18 miles distant, with or without the use of Lake Ramsay as a reservoir.

- (3) The bringing of water from Lake Wahnapiatae using an intermediate Sudbury basin reservoir such as Whitson lake.

This latter system, while no doubt more costly, would be a regional rather than a city plan and would have the beneficial effect of providing water for the Sudbury basin. However, and this is very important, since in the present circumstances this cost would be a burden for Sudbury city taxpayers, they are quite naturally and properly opposed to the co-operative plan.

My point is simply this, since in the long run the government controls the taxing power, the spending power and the jurisdictional limits of the city of Sudbury, as well as the other Sudbury basin communities, surely this government must take the lead in providing the best service for all without placing the great bulk of the burden on the long-suffering people of Sudbury. The long-term solution to the water problem demands that in doing so, the government is bound to intelligently seek for, and obtain, the advice of those technically qualified to advise on the engineering problems and the cost thereof.

It is not sufficient that the government

carry out its political and indeed moral responsibility simply by holding puerile, disturbing and troublemaking meetings which tend to set one community against the other, such as the one I have described, and in issuing orders to a struggling city already overburdened with debt. And I want to say this in the clearest possible terms so that no man will misunderstand me, and I hope the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Spooner) listens to these few brief sentences. I want to say this in the clearest possible terms, so that I will not be misunderstood.

Water and sewage services being a minimum requirement for the protection of health and the enjoyment of a reasonable standard of living, the industry carried on in the Sudbury basin must bear its full measure of financial responsibility for the cost of the provision of adequate water and sewage facilities in regard to water services. I see no difference between the government coming along as it did and saying to this industry: you must be responsible for financial assistance to the indigent; you must be responsible for financial assistance to the aged—no difference between them and in saying to this industry, in the clearest possible terms, you must be responsible for paying a fair share of the cost of sewage and water facilities for the inhabitants of this entire large dormitory municipality which includes not only the city itself but the whole basin.

In addition to corporation taxes and all other forms of general taxes, this government has collected, in the last fifteen years, in mines' profits taxes from the mining industry in Ontario, the sum of \$141,464,158, and it is safe to say that more than half of this was collected from the mines in the Sudbury basin. The people of Sudbury, through their elected representatives, have said to the government, have pleaded with the government, have abjured the government, have cajoled the government, to return more of this special tax which, when all is said and done, is produced through the sweat of the workers in Sudbury to meet the needs of the basin. This government, in 23 years, has turned a deaf ear upon their pleas. The only solution that the people get is a visit from the first citizen every once in a while, who tells them what great people they are and what a great future they have.

Summoning up considerable temerity, and being entirely conscious of my own limitations of knowledge in respect to the important and complex problem of water, I turn now to a consideration of the problems of the

southern part of the province. One can graphically portray the geographic, topographic and geologic character of southern Ontario by pointing to, by way of contrast, the characteristics of a large area of the United States, and the demographic implications of geography. In southern Ontario we have no large river basin such as the Mississippi which has provided facilities of transportation and supplies of water to support large, highly industrialized urban centres. On the contrary, our rivers on what I may call Ontario island are small water-courses with many even smaller tributaries. This means that the riparian inhabitants of the Great Lakes have access to unlimited quantities of fresh water and waste water disposal facilities, and that is not so for deposits of population even moderate distances from the shoreline of the lakes. Therefore, massive industrial expansion in such places as Brantford, Chatham, Stratford, St. Thomas, London, Galt and Guelph, to name a few, will be a direct correlation of the availability of large supplies of fresh water.

Put another way, this means that the economic growth of communities such as these will depend on the building of the engineering projects to bring fresh water to these communities, as well as the erection of facilities to dispose of human and industrial wastes. Both problems are at least of equal magnitude. Strange it is to recall that only a few years ago the Hon. Leslie Frost stood in this House and talked down to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) when that member suggested that the government get on expeditiously with the building of pipelines to supply fresh water to the hinterland of Ontario island. Therefore, we might say to the government that if it is the intention of the government that the golden horseshoe alone shall enjoy unhindered economic development in this province because it has reasonable access to large quantities of fresh water, and the development of industry in other centres removed from the shoreline shall be inhibited because of the limitations of water services for which the government itself is directly responsible, then the government should say so and the people of this province will understand, in comprehensible terms, the nature of the economic restrictions on growth which can be expected in the development of the southern part of the province.

Another way of looking at the same thing is to reflect that in 1966 the problem of controlled flooding from the heavy runoff which, after all, occurs during only 20 per cent or

less of the year, is fast becoming far less serious and of much lesser magnitude than the problem of dealing with "low-flow" periods with the increased concentration of pollutants.

We have either provided defences against flooding or we will know the steps to take to control it. We have only begun to think about the control of the damage caused during the periods when our relatively small watersheds are not carrying adequate quantities of water to foster the growth of vegetation, to provide irrigation for agriculture or, perhaps most important of all, to safely dilute and assimilate the irreducible amount of wastes that they are expected to dispose of. One hears such problems in the anxieties expressed by hon. members such as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), who is deeply concerned about the state of that watercourse, the Grand, in his riding. Or harken to the words of the writer of a bulletin of the Grand river conservation commission, when he said: "Studies made of the Grand river and its tributaries show that additional reservoirs are needed to provide flood protection against storms like Hurricane Hazel, which caused great damage in the Don and Humber river valleys in 1954, over which it was centred. Such flood protection reservoirs would also provide stored water for increasing low river flows in dry weather, and help a situation which is becoming increasingly difficult."

There are many members of the House, including the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Pittock), who are far more qualified than I am to inform us about the vexing problems with which the people of their areas are very intimately concerned in relation to the preservation of these valuable watercourses. I wish to draw the attention of the House to one aspect of it. If I am wrong, let somebody get up and show me how I am wrong. I will reject as unworthy of attention any remarks of a general nature which merely say that I am wrong and do not clothe that statement with hard facts. Let me approach it this way. Water is a multi-purpose, multi-use commodity. It can destroy wealth as well as create it and wealth and welfare lie in the control of water, not merely in its possession. The control of water calls for the ability to store it safely in times of flood or high flow so as to enjoy its use during the natural low-flow periods. Therefore, safe storage areas and the means to effect water storage and distribution over the low-flow periods are required on a universal scale in order to abate the effect of the irreducible amounts of pol-

lutants in watercourses during such low-flow periods.

To illustrate, if the city of London, or any other city, is going to get large amounts of fresh water through a big pipeline, then the amounts required for human and industrial use must be supplemented by large and dependable quantities of stream flow which will dilute and assimilate the resulting wastes in the Thames river, or any other Ontario river. No sewage treatment plant, no facilities for treating industrial waste can ever achieve 100 per cent efficiency. Put another way, this merely means that in putting even so-called fully treated human and industrial waste into a watercourse, there is unavoidably going in with it a certain percentage of the unassimilated wastes of large numbers of people and industrial processes. Thus the adequacy of river flows at all times is a vital and necessary part of total water services.

Frankly, what bothers me is that having the knowledge that the three major bodies concerned with water and wastes now being under the rubric of one department—that is to say, Hydro, conservation authorities and the OWRC—I wonder, very anxiously, as I am sure a good many other people do, whether there is a nexus between them. Within the ministry of the Energy and Resources Management department, is there a dialogue going on among these three groups so that there will be a policy evolved in respect to the overall composite control of water?

The only intelligent approach, sir, which fits this day and age is to be concerned with the total and comprehensive picture of what we ought to be doing with our water. There is plenty of evidence that Ontario Hydro is exclusively concerned with falling water for power generation only, and does not want to be bothered with the consideration of any other implications of the commodity.

For example, one would like to know whether any consideration is being given in reference to the planned Blue Mountain pump-storage development, and whether it would be possible to combine the use of the water that will be brought 900 feet up to the plateau to other useful purposes such as pollution abatement, in addition to simply letting it fall back again into Lake Huron to generate power. For example, and I do not profess to be an expert and many men have been condemned for less vision which eventually becomes reality: Is any really serious consideration being given to the use of a part of that hydro power facility for the possible

development of an artificially augmented reservoir in the Luther Marsh which, in turn, could be used to supply fairly large quantities of badly needed water during the damaging low-flow periods to the watersheds which are relatively close, and which radiate from this marsh, that is to say, the Conestogo, the Grand, the Saugeen and, a little farther away, the Thames, and others as well to the south and east?

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I do not want to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but clearly from the text, a copy of which I have, he is not more than two-thirds of the way through. He is on page 17, and he has 28 pages in all. That half-hour, which we have agreed on as being the maximum for the introduction, is up.

Mr. Speaker: It is not up. We started a little late; it was about seven or eight minutes past the hour when the debate started, so I was allowing the member to go another five or seven minutes.

Mr. MacDonald: If he is going to do the last 11 pages in seven minutes, I look forward to watching this.

Mr. Sopha: I will not delay to get into an argument with the hon. member. I will leave out an appropriate portion, but let me point out the point of order. There is no rule in this House that restricts me to 30 minutes; let that be understood.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have an agreement—

Mr. Sopha: No, the hon. member has not read it.

Mr. MacDonald: We have an agreement in which the introduction is to be a half-hour. If we are not going to abide by it, then the gentlemen's agreement is out of the window. And if this is, once again, our problem with the Liberals, then we will have to review the agreement—

Mr. Speaker: May I inform the member that I will endeavour to keep the members within the agreement? For their information, in case the member speaking did not get a copy of this from the Whip of his party, there will be no formal time. Item 2 of this agreement was that there would be no formal time limits, but the Whips will encourage the mover to speak not longer than 30 minutes, and other debaters to speak not more than 15 minutes.

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Chairman, am I to assume from your statement that the hon. member will be given the opportunity of reading the last ten pages of his address? I cannot see how you can cut it down to seven minutes.

Mr. Speaker: I am going to allow the member to proceed and judge in five or seven minutes whether he will be nearly finished or not.

Mr. Sopha: This time out will not count, I trust. I thank the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs. Now to continue at the point where I was so rudely interrupted.

Mr. Speaker: The member will please proceed.

Mr. Sopha: To revert to what I said earlier, it seems to me to be as simple as this: Some government is either going to construct very costly pipelines to the hinterland of Ontario island, with its multiplicity of small water-courses, to foster industrial growth as well as to support large deposits of population, or it is going to construct more permanent reservoirs in co-operation with conservation commissions, which might well be less costly in the long run because they serve a greater number of users thus reducing per capita costs. I have not yet seen, and would be happy to have it drawn to my attention, any expression of long-term policy on the part of the OWRC in respect of future developments in this way. On that score I want to say two things. 1. There is evidence provided by talking to people, principally engineers, who deal constantly with the Ontario water resources commission, that the dinosaur has truly a small and highly inflexible brain. There is a feeling abroad in the engineering community that the OWRC does not truly and reasonably seek the advice of competent people. On the contrary, the dinosaur makes up its mind about the nature of the solution to problems and then only invites and encourages advice which conforms to its preconceived ideas. If the OWRC says that this attitude is wrong, there are quite a few municipal engineers whose minds it should disabuse of the notion. There is plenty of evidence, and some of that evidence is of such recent currency as last week when the association of municipal engineers met, that the OWRC is extremely unpopular. It is viewed as an almost classic case of empire building, concerned more with its size, power and influence than with dealing with the very pressing problems in regard to water which face our people. I really think, and I charge

upon it, that the commission views itself as the owner of the biggest water distribution system in the world. To create that water distribution system it is apparent that independent engineering consultants' conclusions must be tailor-made to meet the preconceived conclusions of the staff of the commission itself—that is, to crystallize the dinosaur's predispositions and predilections. To illustrate, for I do not wish to have to seek anybody's forgiveness for failing to buttress my arguments with specific illustrations, one can ascertain no evidence that the OWRC, in issuing the czarist ukase to Sudbury to build a sewage treatment plant, considered that the securing of the financial means to do so is the only part of the larger economic problem of financing municipal government and services in Sudbury and in a community that lacks even a modern industrial assessment.

There is no other solution than to provide Sudbury with the money, possibly in the form of a grant instead of the industrial assessment which our cumbersome and antiquated legislation now denies them, while the very industrious people of Sudbury want no charity from anyone. They have borne such a burden in inequity that not another straw can be added. One hears that when Sudbury had a member on the commission, that the commission came very close to securing \$12 million from the government to build sewage treatment plants in Sudbury and in four or five other centres which lack them. Perhaps we had a chance when Mr. Desmaris was on the commission. It appears to have evaporated.

2. On the subject of planning as it relates to the carrying out of its functions by the commission, one wonders with some amazement and a considerable degree of shock whether the omnivorous wandering dinosaur is able to distinguish between what is long-term planning and that which is short-term needs. Let me refer to certain remarks made recently by the general manager of the OWRC, and I am quoting from the *Globe and Mail* of January 27, 1966:

David Caverly told the annual convention of the alumnae association of the Niagara parks commission school of horticulture:

We are taking a cautious approach. We are at present planning a study in co-operation with The Department of Northern Affairs on the quantity, and the quality, of water resources in the Arctic region.

The study starts this year and may take from 10 to 15 years. It will give the first

exact information on the water resources of the area. Except for limited studies of some northern rivers by Ontario Hydro, little is known.

A lot of people have been making assertions about diverting this water, but until the study is completed we just don't know the situation, he said. We will want to know how much there is and what the quality will be, for it might have too much mineralization to be of use.

Maybe we will find out that it might be better to leave the water where it is and bring people in to develop the country there. The Russians are making big developments in their Arctic regions. Perhaps we should, too.

There is a considerable body of respectable opinion in this province, in this country and on this continent that believes we have great need for a new, more intelligent, more comprehensive, more co-operative and at the same time fully protective approach to Great Lakes management than we now have. In particular this opinion emphasizes the vital urgency of wise action in Canada in the face of the rapidly growing pressures developing in the United States.

I personally believe that the greatest single threat to our national sovereignty, and in particular our position as downstream interests on the St. Lawrence system, lies in the negative posture which is our current policy in regard to adding new water to the Great Lakes from our north for co-operative use.

For example, a fully protective plan for recycling northern rivers after they have completed their flow in Canada was proposed several years ago. Only after strongest resistance by this government and the federal government, have we even reached the stage where we are now taking an inventory of our northern rivers.

Insofar as I know, no consideration has yet been given to full and adequate engineering studies of this fully protective Canadian developed concept which, it should be noted, could not possibly, from a technical point of view alone, ever be carried out by Canada in our own specific interests. Its development indicates great promise for this province and yet no adequate studies are under way. Surely something can be done to expose the hidden riches indicated in this concept.

Attention was drawn last week to Public Law 89-298 of the United States Congress which authorizes the transfer of water from Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence river watershed to other watersheds in the north-eastern United States.

Everyone knows that Chicago wishes to draw off further large amounts of water for sewage treatment from Lake Michigan, and other large urban centres on the United States Great Lakes shoreline will have increasing demands for supplies of water.

With all respect to Mr. Caverly, the problem simply can't wait for 10 to 15 years to find a solution followed by many years of construction. On the contrary, the economic and engineering aspects of protective replenishment for fully co-operative use and trade with the United States, must be dealt with now—today.

At the risk of oversimplifying, I say this, on this 8th of March, AD 1966, and I say it to this House, that if people on the North American continent get thirsty enough they will come and take our water somehow and in some way.

Economic strife with the United States could cripple us more than it would cripple them and it would be so foolish and unnecessary; whereas a display of leadership on our part could place our province in the lead in this regard.

I have no desire to, and I don't like to use the floor of this House to disagree with a civil servant. He must needs answer through the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) and I do say to that hon. member that if Mr. Caverly, in his leisurely approach to this urgent problem, is expressing the views of the Ontario water resources commission, then the analogy of that commission to a dinosaur is truly an apt one.

I say again in the clearest possible terms that neither Mr. Caverly nor Mr. Vance nor the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin are the trustees of water exclusively, in the truest sense of the word.

We are all trustees for this and future generations in this matter, and at this hour it is not sufficient for hon. members of this House to yawn while reflecting that they have placed their responsibility for our water resources in the hands of an independent commission. Either the trustees that sit here will carry out their responsibilities or they will suffer the consequences of the wrath of the people of this province.

The people of our ridings have sent us here as members of a vital democracy, not merely as the rubber stamps for an empire-building technocratic commission. And today, the searchlight of public opinion is pointed directly at this crucial resource with which this commission and this government deals.

I wish there was more evidence that the

OWRC is acting in accordance with the realities of present problems.

I have heard that the commission already knew the problems and all that was needed was some action directed toward their solution.

The problem is simply this: Sudbury is not getting a sewage disposal plant, not because it does not want it but because it simply does not have the money.

Lake Ramsay needs increments of fresh water. The people of Capreol, Hanmer, and Rayside townships have not got the common use of sewage disposal facilities, and all the meetings in the world are not going to change that unless and until engineering specifications are prepared and positive steps are taken to provide the facilities without crushing the water user under a financial burden impossible to bear.

In the words of my resolution, such facilities are a minimum requirement to good living. The people of these communities have a moral claim upon the wealth of this province and that claim is being asserted here and now in no uncertain terms. It is incumbent on the dinosaur to get his bulky frame moving, or the inexorable laws of evolution will displace him from our future.

What must be decided first, and will never be decided at a public meeting where people are assembled who do not even assert that they have the qualifications to decide, is the question of whence supplies of water are going to come, and how that water is going to be handled and charged for.

Put in specific terms, will the valley municipalities forming a part of a geographic, geologic and demographic unit, be supplied from Lake Wahnipitae or elsewhere with Whitson lake being used as a reservoir and Whitson creek being employed as a water-course to supply the western side, or is there some alternative plan that is more feasible from an economic and engineering point of view?

As matters stand, already overburdened, the city of Sudbury has no alternative but to solve its own problem and in the end where will this piecemeal policy lead us?

Impatience with the OWRC in the Sudbury basin knows almost no bounds. In my view, in the words of the little girl who got less than her little brother at Christmas, "it ain't fair" that people should work to create wealth, can look at their neighbour in the next-door municipality in the principality of Inco and see that they have adequate services while they have none.

Simple justice, ordinary equity, demands that these workers, these good, law-abiding people, trying to do the best they can for themselves and their families, be treated with equal fairness.

Many useful developments, when based on the consideration of only one aspect of water use, present economic difficulties impossible to overcome. Taking several uses together, however, and sharing the burden of cost between them often makes all of them feasible realities. It is particularly in this comprehensive approach in which this government has failed utterly and dismally, and we see no evidence except the evidence of aggrandizement and empire-building that they as yet even understand the meaning of the responsibility which is in their hands.

Unless there is a total concept of water and all that this implies, we are in jeopardy of failing to meet the basic requirements of our people. And we are in double jeopardy of wasting and throwing away invaluable assets. This House is the trustee of our water resources. The hard reality of the approach we have made to date, and the glaring deficiencies arising out of the failure to provide for our people, invites support for this resolution.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Speaker, I rise with pleasure to take part in the debate on resolution No. 8, which stands in the name of the hon. member for Grey South. This resolution reads as follows:

That the Ontario water resources commission be instructed to report upon the feasibility of piping water from the Great Lakes to drought areas in western Ontario.

While I agree that this resolution deals with the most important aspect of water supply, I am indeed surprised that such a resolution should appear on the order paper of this Legislature. I am surprised for two reasons.

First, because the Ontario water resources commission has already reported in great detail on the feasibility of piping water from the Great Lakes to drought areas in western Ontario, as well as to drought areas in other parts of the province of Ontario. And second, not only has the commission reported, it has acted.

However, despite the apparent reluctance of the hon. member for Grey South to read these reports, all of which are readily available, or to take cognizance of the tremendous accomplishments of this government through the operations of the Ontario water resources commission, I should be pleased to accept the opportunity to review these operations and accomplishments in detail.

This is a proud record and one which it is a pleasure to discuss.

The provision of adequate safe water supplies for individuals, municipalities and industries alike, and the protection of the water resources of the province against pollution, remain the principal objective of the commission. Considerable progress has been made in this regard over the years. Under section 16 of The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, the commission has power to control and regulate the collection, production, treatment, storage, transmission, distribution, and use of water for public purposes, and to make orders with respect thereto. Since the commission was formed in 1957, a tremendous construction programme has been undertaken throughout the province in the field of water supply and pollution control. Under the Act, all plans for the establishment of any waterworks or sewage works, as well as extension of and changes in existing works, must be submitted to the commission. No such work may proceed until the commission's approval has been given.

Hon. members will be interested to know that as of December 31, 1965, the number of certificates issued by the commission since 1957, with respect to such works, totalled 15,095, at an estimated value of over \$1 billion.

As hon. members are aware, provision was made in the Act for the commission to finance, support, construct and operate waterworks and sewage works on behalf of municipalities. A number of the projects referred to above have been undertaken on this basis. A municipality may, of course, undertake a project entirely on its own, although the plans for such a project must have approval of the commission.

To date, some 340 projects, serving 204 municipalities, have been developed by the commission at a cost of \$133,500,000. Of these, 251 are in actual operation, while the remainder are in various stages of development. Under this arrangement, the facility remains the property of the commission until such time as the debt on the project has been retired by the municipality.

By the year 1964, due to the acceleration which had occurred throughout the province in the construction of water and sewage works under agreement with the commission, most of the municipalities which could use this type of financing had been covered.

Notwithstanding this, there were still a number of municipalities which could not go forward, either on the basis of their own

arrangements, or under commission financing, because of their inability to undertake further capital debt. It was for this reason that the authority of the commission was extended in 1964 to allow construction of provincially owned water projects, with the municipality signing a service contract for the supply of its water needs.

In August of 1965, this new provincial financing arrangement extended to include sewage works as well, both on an area and an individual municipality basis. This will mean that sewage will be accepted and treated at provincially owned plants with a charge levied on the basis of volume.

Some of the advantages of this new programme will be immediately apparent; no capital debt as such will have to be undertaken by the municipality. This will be recovered over the years through the water and sewage rates based on usage.

Another major benefit arising from this programme is that the province may construct oversized works, depending on the anticipated growth of a municipality. The cost of oversizing will be carried by the province until the added capacity is utilized. Through the development of such projects on an area basis, the benefit to any individual municipality will be greater, since the cost of the works will be amortized over a longer number of years.

Furthermore, it will mean that earlier problems experienced with respect to compromises in the degree of necessary treatment and type of construction will be eliminated. The certainty that this system of financing will give a new stimulus to the construction of water supply and pollution control works in the province, is evident from the fact that almost 100 applications have already been received from municipalities desirous of entering into this arrangement. The programme is now well under way and construction on the first of the provincially owned sewage projects is expected to start in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, having established the general framework and stated the policies of the commission, I shall now deal specifically with the fresh water pipeline programmes completed, under construction, and in various stages of planning.

I shall restrict my remarks largely to south-western Ontario, although it should be clearly recognized that the Ontario water resources commission programme concerns the whole of this province and is in no sense confined to western Ontario alone.

In 1956, the towns Leamington and Essex, four townships, Mersea, Gosfield North, Gosfield South and Maidstone and the H. J. Heinz Company, all in Essex county, signed an agreement with the Ontario water resources commission to construct a pipeline and treatment plant, work began in 1958 and the pipeline was completed in 1959 at a total cost of \$3,860,000.

This project was financed by the Ontario water resources commission. The seven participants are paying for the facility over a 30-year period. The commission is operating the system, and provision has been made in the agreement for the commission to continue to operate the system after it is paid for, if this is the wish of the participating municipalities.

In 1963, this pipeline, the union water system, provided 1.3 billion gallons of fresh water, and in 1965 this total increased to almost 1.6 billion gallons. A proposal is now receiving serious consideration which involves the Ontario water resources commission taking over the existing system and undertaking a major expansion. If this proposal is finalized the commission will assume permanent ownership of the present system and all future expansions to the system.

The proposed expansion indicates that the union water system would be extended under a stage programme, involving the immediate construction of enlarged treatment facilities and additional maintenance to extend the area of service and reinforce the existing system. The projected cost of taking over and extending this system is \$6.5 million.

In 1957, the town of Dunnville approached the Ontario water resources commission and asked them to construct a pipeline and treatment plant for that town.

In 1958, two major industries, the Sherbrooke Metallurgical Company Limited and the Electric Reduction Company of Canada Limited, indicated they would enter into a joint agreement with Dunnville and the commission. Construction of the system began in 1959 and was completed a year later, at the cost of \$2,586,000. This agreement carried the same provisions as the union Essex county scheme. The town of Dunnville and the industries paid for the facility over a period of years.

In 1963, this system supplied 3.7 billion gallons of water and is continuing to operate at about that rate.

About this time, the staff of the commission undertook to produce, based on their own knowledge, a comprehensive, although preliminary, chart of the total probable water

pipeline requirements throughout this province. It was not practicable at that early date to arrange detailed consulting engineering studies on which to base these plans. The result of that study indicated the total probable requirement of 19 new pipelines, 11 of which were likely to be required in southwestern Ontario.

Sufficient commentary on the quality of those early and empirical proposals and on the quality of the commission's staff concerned, is the fact that of those 11 proposals, nine are now either under construction or in some state of active negotiation with the municipalities concerned.

On May 21, 1964, the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Roberts), announced the offer to construct a water pipeline between Lake Huron and the outskirts of the city of London. This pipeline would be designed to provide an assured source of water to the city of London and to any municipality in the vicinity of the line which might require water. The financing of the construction would be borne by the provincial government through the Ontario water resources commission, thus allowing construction to proceed with no delay. Water from the pipeline would be supplied at the boundaries of London and the boundaries of any other municipality lying between Lake Huron and London which might require pipeline service. Each municipality would make its own arrangements for distribution to the ultimate consumer. The capital cost of the pipeline to the municipal boundaries and to the pumping stations required to force water to the end of the line would be financed entirely with provincial funds; municipalities would be supplied with water at a price sufficient to meet the amortized construction and operating expenses.

On September 4, 1964, the hon. Prime Minister turned the first sod on this Lake Huron water supply system. Some of his remarks at that time were as follows:

The construction of the Lake Huron water supply system is not a new undertaking for the Ontario water resources commission. It does, however, represent a significant departure in concept. For the first time, the Ontario water resources commission will build and maintain a water pipeline and will sell water at cost to municipalities in the same way as Hydro sells electricity to municipal public utility commissions. In earlier projects, participating municipalities have contracted under agreement whereby they would own the facilities after 30 years. The Lake Huron water supply system will remain the

property of the commission. This pipeline and its method of financing and operation will be a first in Canada.

There is every reason to expect that the Lake Huron water supply system will go into full operation early in 1967 at a final total cost of more than \$18 million.

On November 26, 1965, the hon. Prime Minister made the following announcement concerning the Lake Erie-St. Thomas pipeline:

The purpose of this pipeline is to meet the water supply requirements of the city of St. Thomas and the townships of Yarmouth and Southwold, and other municipalities which may be in a position to utilize water from this installation. For a number of years it has been anticipated that if the demands for water in the city of St. Thomas area would require such action, in the opinion of the Ontario water resources commission, in addition to residential and other requirements, the construction of an assembly plant in this area recently announced by the Ford Motor Company will also create a demand for water beyond the capability of existing local sources of supply. The commission has been holding discussions over a long period of time with representatives of the area municipalities and the Ford Motor Company, who have endorsed the proposal for the construction of a pipeline to serve the area.

The commission plans include the installation of an intake approximately two miles east of the village of Port Stanley and the construction of a filtration plant at this location to deliver water by pipeline to the St. Thomas area. The cost of this project is estimated to be \$11 million and will be based on meeting initial short-term requirements of ten million gallons per day with provision for oversizing to accommodate anticipated developments.

Water from this system will be sold at cost under similar terms to the arrangements of the commission relating to the Lake Huron water supply system, which involves a supply of water from Lake Huron to the city of London and interested municipalities along the route of this line.

This project has progressed as scheduled, and tenders for the initial stages of construction will be called almost immediately.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, to further elaborate this government's plans for an assured supply of water to the cities, farms and industries of western Ontario, I am able to

submit progress reports on the following pipeline projects.

The county of Lambton: As a result of a hearing held in the city of Sarnia in November, 1964, the commission retained the firm of M. M. Dillon and Co. Ltd., to prepare a report on the water supply requirements on the western portion of the county of Lambton. On January 21, 1966, a proposal was presented to the municipalities. The total cost of the waterworks facilities that are included in this proposal is approximately \$13 million. The municipalities involved include the city of Sarnia, the village of Point Edward, the townships of Sarnia, Moore, Sombra, Plympton and Enniskillen. Some consideration has been given to the existing Petrolia water supply system, and further improvements which may be necessary in approximately 1973 at an approximate cost of \$2.5 million.

At the present time, interest in further development of the programme has been indicated by the townships of Moore and Sarnia, the village of Point Edward and the city of Sarnia.

The county of Peel: In August, 1965, a tentative proposal was submitted to municipalities in the southern portion of the county of Peel. The municipalities concerned with this proposal are the town of Brampton, the town of Streetsville, the town of Port Credit, the township of—I am afraid I cannot pronounce this very well—Chinguacousy, the township of Toronto. As a result of that proposal, a committee consisting of representatives of each of the municipalities and the commission have met regularly on this proposed water and sewage works scheme.

On January 7, a proposal, including suggested rates, was presented to the committee and subsequently, on February 17, the proposal was outlined in detail to the heads of the municipalities concerned. In addition, a meeting with the municipal representatives was held on February 25 and commission representatives have reviewed the proposal with the individual councils. A further meeting is proposed for today. The cost of this project is presently estimated to be about \$72.5 million.

Lake Huron water supply system secondary facilities: In conjunction with the construction of the Lake Huron water supply system, proposals have been submitted to the town of Parkhill, the villages of Grand Bend, and Ailsa Craig, the townships of London, Bosanquet, Stephen and McGillivray.

As a result of these proposals we have been authorized to retain consulting engineers to

prepare functional designs on the system to serve the towns of Parkhill and the village of Ailsa Craig.

Further, the village of Grand Bend has definitely indicated its interest in receiving water from this source. The estimated costs of the secondary supply facilities are:

The village of Grand Bend, including townships of Bosanquet and Stephen—\$541,620; the town of Parkhill, including the township of McGillivray—\$405,000; the township of London, Ilderton—\$150,400; the township of London, Arva—\$110,200; the village of Ailsa Craig, including the township of McGillivray—\$234,000.

County of Kent—from December 14, 1965, meetings were held with the municipalities in the northern and southern areas of the county of Kent relating to the proposed water supply programme for the area.

Two proposals were presented. First, a proposal to serve the city of Chatham, the town of Blenheim, the villages of Erie Beach and Erieau and the townships of Harwich and Raleigh, utilizing Lake Erie as a source of supply. Second, a proposal to serve the towns of Wallaceburg and Dresden and the townships of Chatham and Camden.

In the southern area, all but the village of Erie Beach have responded favourably to this proposal, with the exception of the city of Chatham, which has advised that their consulting engineers are in the process of preparing a report to the city on the future development of the municipal water system. This report is due in approximately one month, when the city has indicated it will then meet with the commission to review this proposal.

In the northern area, Wallaceburg has indicated it is not interested in the proposal, and the remaining municipalities have not replied. The cost of the two proposals: first one—\$5,470,000, and the second one—\$2,667,000.

The lower Grand Valley area: In the fall of 1964, the commission held a meeting in the city of Brantford to receive presentations from municipalities in the area regarding the need for improved water supply. Subsequently, in March, 1965, the commission appointed James F. McLaren Ltd., to prepare a report on the regional water supply requirements of the lower Grand Valley, including the city of Brantford, town of Caledonia, the villages of Jarvis, Hagersville, and Cayuga and the township of Brantford.

The final report by the consulting engineers has now been submitted and is under review by the various divisions of the commission.

Subsequently, a proposal will be prepared and a meeting arranged with the municipalities involved.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that it must now be abundantly clear to the hon. member for Grey South, that not only has this government and the Ontario water resources commission reported on the feasibility of piping water to the drought areas of this province, but has in fact made substantial and remarkable progress towards fulfilling its purpose and obligations.

Our future policies are clear. The rapid expansion which continues to characterize the development of this great province necessitates the planning and carrying out of a vigorous programme for the future, both in the field of water supply and water pollution abatement.

To ensure an adequate supply of water to meet the needs of this province, we propose to continue studying the sources of supply and the feasibility of additional pipeline construction. The rapid growth of many of Ontario's towns and cities demands an increased supply of potable water for municipal uses.

Tremendous quantities of water are re-

quired also to meet the needs of industry. Farm crops which depended in the past to a large measure upon precipitation, now draw huge quantities of water through irrigation systems in various parts of the province.

The necessity of regional water needs studies has already been established and there is every indication that this type of activity, already under way, will engage the attention of this government and of the Ontario water resources commission in an increasing way in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to draw to the attention of the members that as both these resolutions will be debated again jointly on Thursday, there will be ample time, I hope, for all the members who wish to speak to the resolutions to speak at that time. I would ask the member for York South to adjourn the debate.

Mr. MacDonald moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.

APPENDIX 1
(See page 1259)

TABLE "A"

<i>Tire Size (Nominal) Inches</i>	<i>Plu Rating</i>	<i>Measuring Rim (T & RA) Inches</i>	<i>Tire Load Lbs.</i>	<i>Inflation Lbs./Sq. In.</i>	<i>Cross Section (Minimum) Inches</i>	<i>Breaking Energy (Minimum) Inches-Lbs.</i>
6.00-13	4	4J	730	24	5.70	1000
6.50-13	4	4½J	840	24	6.25	1000
7.00-13	4	5J	920	24	6.70	1100
6.00-14	4	4J	800	24	5.75	1000
6.50-14	4	4½K	890	24	6.25	1000
7.00-14	4	5K	980	24	6.70	1100
7.50-14	4	5½K	1090	24	7.20	1200
8.00-14	4	6K	1180	24	7.70	1300
8.50-14	4	6K	1270	24	7.85	1300
9.00-14	4	6½K	1360	24	8.25	1300
9.50-14	4	6½K	1470	24	8.55	1300
6.00-15	4	4J	900	26	5.75	1000
6.50-15	4	4½K	1000	26	6.25	1000
6.70-15	4	4½K	1120	26	6.55	1100
7.10-15	4	5K	1210	26	6.95	1100
7.60-15	4	5½K	1320	26	7.45	1200
8.00-15	4	6L	1400	26	7.85	1300
8.20-15	4	6L	1420	24	8.00	1300
8.90-15	6	6½L	1790	28	8.80	1500
6.15-14	4	4J	730	24	5.70	1000
6.45-14	4	4½J	840	24	6.25	1000
6.95-14	4	5J	920	24	6.65	1000
7.35-14	4	5J	1020	24	6.95	1100
7.75-14	4	5½JK	1120	24	7.35	1200
8.25-14	4	6JK	1210	24	7.80	1300
8.55-14	4	6JK	1320	24	8.10	1300
8.85-14	4	6½JK	1390	24	8.50	1300
6.35-15	4	4½J	800	24	5.95	1000
6.85-15	4	5J	900	24	6.45	1000
7.35-15	4	5½JK	1035	24	7.05	1000
7.75-15	4	5½JK	1100	24	7.15	1100
8.15-15	4	6JK	1180	24	7.65	1100
8.45-15	4	6JK	1280	24	7.85	1200
8.85-15	4	6½JK	1370	24	8.25	1300
9.15-15	4	6½JK	1470	24	8.50	1300
9.00-15	4	6JK	1420	24	8.00	1300



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Tuesday, March 8, 1966

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1295
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	1322

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order. House in committee of supply: Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

On vote 807:

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, at five of the clock I was bringing to the attention of the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), a problem of certain constituents of mine. He knows the area and the location and has had this brought to his attention several times by several hon. members of this House.

I am speaking particularly of people whose property flanks on to the highway. Many people who owned property along the highway and the back of whose lots abutted the highway, were bought out by The Department of Highways or by The Department of Economics and Development. But often, property which came closer to the highway, and flanked on it, was not touched because it was just beyond the 50-foot line.

I also bring to his attention the people on Lorne Bruce drive, where a street allowance comes between their front line and the line of the highway. They, in effect, are much closer than many of the other people who have been bought out. Yet, because of the freak of the way the line is drawn, these people are still there and they are worried about their situation. I hope that the hon. Minister has this in mind, that some relief may be accorded to these people in due course and I would hope that as the other settlements are finally made, a reassessment of the total situation will occur at that time.

I will raise this at the proper time with the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) when his estimates are up, but depending on the answers we receive from him, we may ask other questions of the hon. Minister at the appropriate moment.

Mr. E. G. Freeman (Fort William): Mr. Chairman, earlier today we heard the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrope) extolling the virtues of this government and also speaking about—

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Just what department was that?

Mr. Freeman: —The Department of Highways, but I am sure that he will extol the good features of the other departments too, but just to set the record straight I thought that it would probably be just as well if, at this time—and it may be, mind you, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. Minister of Mines has not had an opportunity to see all of the outlying roads around his constituency and it could be possible that he has seen few, if any, of the roads in the Fort William area which adjoins his riding.

For the matter of the record, I should like to bring to the attention of the House, through you, Mr. Chairman, certain problems that were discussed here not too long ago and the hon. Minister of Highways is well aware of these things and I know that he has every sympathy for the people in the Thunder Bay area and in the Kenora, Rainy River, Sioux Lookout and Dryden areas—those vast areas of northwestern Ontario—

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): But you cannot drive a car on sympathy.

Mr. Freeman: Not very well; it takes other things. I should like to call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to some of the things that people are worried about in northwestern Ontario. May I quickly go over a resolution which was recently submitted to the Cabinet:

Whereas excellent progress has been made on Highway 17, primarily in the English river to Ignace area and The Ontario Department of Highways is to be commended for its efforts—

Now I think this is very fine and I am sure the hon. Minister deserves these words of commendation. We believe it to be extremely important that the unfinished sections of Highway 17, including the area

around Kenora, be completed as promptly as possible, and you should see it, it is horrible, just plain horrible.

Any unfinished portions of Highway 17, still act as a definite detriment to tourists and truckers, thereby creating a loss of revenue and adverse publicity to the area.

Highway 17 between the Lakehead and the Ontario-Manitoba border is the only Canadian connecting highway between eastern and western Canada, and it is essential that this highway be brought to standard as promptly as possible. This is a federally subsidized highway and it is urged that The Ontario Department of Highways do all possible to complete the Ontario section of Highway 17, between the Lakehead and the Manitoba border at the earliest possible date, Mr. Chairman.

Now I am sure the hon. Minister knows full well the length of time that is going to be consumed in the construction of this major portion of the trans-Canada highway and how many interruptions there will be along the way, each and every year. As the year comes, there are stretches of highway under construction, and they are not only a threat to the happiness of the tourists and the residents of the area, but are a very real threat to the motor vehicles they are driving.

A thing that has always, Mr. Chairman, confused the people in our part of the country, and perhaps down in this part of Ontario, too, the same conditions exist, but we wonder what the explanation is as to the cause of the tremendous delays in the construction of highways. They go on for such a long period of time. They can work in the winter there, too. And the fact that the hon. Minister of Mines mentioned particularly in today's talk, that one portion of the highway between Fort William and Pigeon river, commonly referred to years ago as the Scott highway, has been, I must say this to the hurt of my friends on my right: Since the days their government was in power, it has been rebuilt practically every year. Now it is in fairly good condition, but I intend, as a matter of fact, to drive over it as soon as the weather breaks in our part of the country, and see just how much deterioration has come about during the last fall and winter period.

But to go on briefly again, Mr. Chairman, with regard to the highway situation, particularly with development of access roads—

Mr. Chairman: May I ask if this work is in connection with maintenance or new construction?

Mr. Freeman: Yes, this has to do with those very features—rebuilding the trans-Canada northern route, Long Lac to Nipigon. I am sure that comes under the heading, maintenance, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Before us now, under vote 807, is new construction.

Mr. Freeman: All new construction?

Mr. Chairman: Yes, under 807. I am not trying to restrict the—

Mr. Freeman: This has been set up for, I think, a programme of new construction on Highway 17.

Mr. Chairman: We would like to hear it.

Mr. Freeman: If it is not new construction, I am sure that is what the people in that area feel is imperative. It ought to be done.

Mr. MacDonald: They have been led to believe that it was new construction.

Mr. Freeman: They were told it was going to be new construction, put it that way. As for the rebuilding of the trans-Canada northern route, Long Lac to Nipigon, I do not know, Mr. Chairman, whether in your experience you have had the opportunity to travel over this beautiful highway. It is a beautiful location and a beautiful area, but the highway itself needs rebuilding. This section of road, officially called by The Ontario Department of Highways the trans-Canada highway northern route, and thus named on their official maps up to and including 1965, has never been brought up to trans-Canada highway standards. The planning department of The Department of Highways has indicated that contracts would be let to rebuild Highway 11 between Highway 17 and Long Lac, but it cannot stand rebuilding; it is a new construction job, to a very great extent, with widening, curves, and all this sort of thing.

The present pulpwood and mining industries are major contributors to the economy of the district and require roads designed to allow greater truck loads. This route is heavily travelled. The increased tourist traffic in northwestern Ontario is creating a demand for better highway conditions. This resolution has been presented previously, and no action has been taken in the past 14 years to have any major improvements made. That does not speak too well for reconstruction of highways or repair of highways or maintenance of highways, or whatever heading you care to put it under.

The Ontario Minister of Highways has promised consistently over the past years that action would be taken in the near future. The government has been urged, and the Minister of Highways has been urged, to name an early starting date for a rebuilding programme, to be completed within the shortest possible period of time. When I mention these things, Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention also to the fact that in new construction, maintenance work and any other development work—this is particularly true of development roads, which come under the heading, in many cases, of access roads, development roads and new construction—these problems have been brought before the government by people who, I am sure, support in very large measure this government or the official Opposition. I would think that this would be an excellent time for this government and the official Opposition to get shoulder to shoulder on this thing and see if something cannot be done for the people in northwestern Ontario.

I could go on for quite some time, but I know that there are many things to be taken up during the estimates of this department, but I would like at this time to remind you, Mr. Chairman, and through you, the hon. Minister of Highways and the hon. members of this government, that we in northwestern Ontario are not going to be satisfied with the highway construction work that has been carried out over the past years and we feel now that we are entitled to major consideration when the problem of new highways, reconstruction and maintenance is brought to the attention of this government.

We hope it will not be necessary to press consistently for these things, that the government in its wisdom and magnanimous spirit at all times, as exemplified by the hon. Minister of Highways himself, will carry out the promises that he has made to northwestern Ontario and give us something to carry on with up there, to take care of the tourist traffic and the resources that we have in our part of the country and the resources which are contributing so greatly to the well-being of the southern part of the province and the balance of Ontario.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Well, of course, the interest of the hon. member is quite a natural one—it is the part of the province that he represents. I simply say to him that none of these things are being ignored to the extent that he would have the House believe.

Certainly with respect to the trans-Canada

highway there are some sections which are under construction now. The number of miles of any part of the trans-Canada highway that can be considered substandard is quite small; the number of miles is very minimal. I would say as a matter of information to the House that the entire route of the official trans-Canada highway in the province is 1,458 miles. It is the longest mileage of trans-Canada highway in any province in Canada.

To December 31, 1965, 1,212 miles had been paved to trans-Canada standards and some 1,300 miles had been graded; 246 miles are paved and considered satisfactory although they may be somewhat below trans-Canada standards. But of this **246 miles** that may be somewhat substandard, a good portion of that mileage is under construction at the moment. I am quite aware of the fact that there are a few sections of trans-Canada left that are not as adequate as we would like them to be, but I would point out to the hon. member that in that part of Ontario—and he made reference to some commitments—I can honestly say to you, sir, I can say to him and I can say to the House, and I have said to the representatives who come down from that great part of the province of Ontario, that there has not been one commitment made to anybody in the north that has not been kept.

Mr. MacDonald: It took 30 years to fulfil that, though.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would suggest to the hon. member for York South through you, Mr. Chairman, that this government has not been around that long and neither has this Minister. I repeat, not one commitment has been made that has not been kept and I am frank to tell you, sir, that people up there know it.

An hon. member: That is a lot of garbage.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not a lot of garbage. We will tick some of them off. If the hon. member pursues that line there will be nothing but garbage from him. He would not know really. I might point out to him that he is never around here—

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the Minister to speak to the chair, please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I want to put something on the record, if I may.

Mr. Chairman: Through the chair, if you will, Mr. Minister.

Mr. MacNaughton: We have, Mr. Chairman, accelerated the construction programme on Highway 105 in keeping with a commitment to have it finished by July 1, 1967, and it will be done. We have committed ourselves to build a road in the Sioux Lookout area; 28 miles of it are under construction. We have committed ourselves to make a start on 71, southerly; the second contract will be under way this year and the commitment was made about a year ago.

We have committed ourselves to complete Highway 11 between Atikokan and Fort Frances and every hon. member in this House knows that that is finished. The paving will be completed by the end of this construction season.

Mr. Freeman: We hope!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You have my word for it and I have not made one commitment yet that has not been kept.

I could recite a lot of things like this. I am here to tell you that the people know it; they recognize it and they tell me that. The programme is not too bad; it is not quite as bad as the hon. member would have the House believe.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister; I have looked over the highway construction programme and I do not see any paving slated for any Indian reservation in the province of Ontario. Would the hon. Minister tell me if there is any paving slated for any Indian reservation in Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, you will not find this in the capital construction vote: They are, as I pointed out to the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon), municipal roads by and large. They do not appear in here.

Mr. Spence: A supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. Is there any paving slated for any Indian reservation in the province?

Mr. Chairman: The Minister has suggested that they provide grants to the municipalities and the municipalities pay for them.

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Chairman, I can answer that question; there are five miles going through a reserve in my riding.

Mr. Spence: I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have a reservation in my riding. These people pay licence fees and gasoline tax, but there is no paving slated there. I would like

the hon. Minister to give us some paving in Moraviantown Indian reservation in the county of Kent.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. member if he has reference to a King's highway?

Mr. Spence: No, an Indian highway.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister about the status of the Cariboo Falls-Warner Lake road in northwestern Ontario?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think that would be an appropriate question for the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Gibson), but I see he has left—oh, here he is back again—he should hear about this—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order. The Minister of Highways has the floor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member, the Warner Lake-Cariboo Falls road has no status at the moment at all. This matter was considered by the mining and access roads committee—actually it does not come again in this vote, because the proposition was for a three-way cost-shared road. It takes three parties to share the cost of the road that was proposed—the provincial government, the federal government and the company. The company were not interested in it—

Mr. Bryden: So they determine policy.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: They would not use it; they did not want it.

As I said, it takes three to qualify in terms of this federal-provincial cost-sharing plan and the third party was not interested, so really the road has no status at all at the moment.

Mr. Newman: I would like to pursue this. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the evening the hon. Minister said that every commitment ever made by this government has been kept. On Thursday, June 7, 1962 in the Kenora *Daily Miner and News*, is the following:

In a telegram sent to His Worship, Mayor C. A. Bergman of Kenora, The Department of Highways advises that work on Warner Lake road will be starting next Monday, June 11, and a work camp will be set up by June 15. Best regards.

It is signed by John P. Robarts, Prime Minister of Ontario.

Mr. E. W. Sopha (Sudbury): What year is that?

Mr. Newman: 1962.

Mr. Sopha: That was the day of the nomination.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have no knowledge of those dates and I simply repeat what I said, and I say it categorically, the road has no status. This was the question you asked me.

Mr. Bryden: You should tell the hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: At that point there was no awareness that the third party to the agreement was not going to go along with it. Mr. Chairman, we do not set all the rules on these cost-shared roads. The federal authority has something to say about them.

Mr. Newman: Well, Mr. Chairman, if you do not set all the rules, then surely the hon. Prime Minister must set the rules. After all, he is the one who said they were going to start working on Monday, June 11. He was even specific as to the date on which this was going to start. You are not going to go back on the hon. Prime Minister's word, surely you are going to follow through then.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have said all I have to say.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Could I, through you, Mr. Chairman, ask a short trenchant, pungent question of the hon. Minister? The question is, when will the Sudbury-Timmins road be completed?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I will probably pursue this in the same manner that I did last year. It will not be quite as satisfactory as the hon. member would wish, but nevertheless, let me say for a moment to the House where we stand at the moment.

Work on the new alignment commences at Benny on Highway 144. It is now 144 instead of as formerly Highway 544. We have given a little status to the road there, I should point out.

Total mileage is 133 miles. We hope to make access available to Gogama this fall.

Mr. Sopha: Half way.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is about half way. We hope to do some work northerly from Benny. I cannot project the date of completion at this time, other than to say it will be a succession of contracts, clearing and grading, until it is finished. But I cannot tell you the exact year. I do not propose to stick my neck out to that extent, because these things have a happy way of coming back to haunt you, I would say to the hon. member. We want to finish it as quickly as it is possible to do so.

Mr. Sopha: I have two things that I wish to say, both of which can be brief. I have my historical experience; I wish the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs would not go away, because I am going to say something about him in a minute—

Hon. J. W. Spooner (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Something nice, I hope.

Mr. Sopha:—and I do not want to say it to his desk. I had an experience with the Killarney road that revealed the technique in regard to that one before; you get the council to pass a resolution and send it to the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Highways, asking the department to get on with the job of completion. It worked miracles. After that resolution was passed, which I must say I drafted for the council, I remained anonymous. Only the most compelling reason could make me reveal my—

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Sopha: They started from both ends, then they completed from the Burwash end to the Killarney end. They had the foolish notion, when they started that road, that they would provide employment to the village of Killarney by constructing five miles a year.

Mr. Chairman: Through the chair, please.

Mr. Sopha: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister apparently does not quite appreciate the intensity of feeling in the Sudbury basin for the completion of this road and the linking-up of the two great metropolitan centres in northern Ontario.

To that end I can reveal that a couple of weeks ago a band of hearty voyageurs started out by snowmobile from the Sudbury end to travel through to Timmins along the Hydro line, and along the route of this road in anticipation of seeing the country that the road will go through.

Apart from that, and the romance of such a journey, it is a matter of deep economic interest to the people of Sudbury, because, as I related last night, and as I have said before at the risk of boring hon. members, here we have Sudbury, which has been balanced on an east-west axis up to Highway 17, North Bay to Sault Ste. Marie and beyond, with most of its contacts and its economic and social intercourse with southern Ontario, rather than with the northern part of the province. Sudbury is entitled to expect that its area of influence economically will extend into the hinterland above it.

Perhaps the most compelling reason that excites such organizations in our community as the chamber of commerce—and I see tonight one of the representatives of that worthy body from my constituency in the gallery, so he will be able to report that I said things on behalf of the body—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 807, please.

Mr. Sopha: I like the gentleman very much, but I must report he does not vote for me.

All right, that completes the first item I wanted to say in reference to it.

Number two is that one really wonders about the interest of the hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, who represents the riding at the other end of this road, Timmins, and how eager he is on behalf of the townfolk of Timmins to see this road completed. One would like to know the nature of the representations that he makes to the Cabinet to get on with the job of getting it finished. A man, it is true, of considerable influence in the Cabinet.

After all, he is on the Treasury board, he occupies one of the most important portfolios in the government, a worthy son of the north, a man who has been in the House for a good number of years, and yet what is the extent of his influence with his Cabinet colleagues? One begins to wonder what it is, that he cannot on behalf of this important part of the province, persuade the hon. Minister of Highways, the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan), and the hon. Prime Minister, to name perhaps the two most senior and important people in the government—

An hon. member: And the hon. Minister of Health.

Mr. Sopha: Oh no. The hon. Minister of Health is a lightweight in matters of this kind. I am talking about the important people in the government.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please, we cannot hear the member for Sudbury.

Mr. Sopha: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The only thing I am interested in, sir, is that you hear me. If you hear me, then I am content that my message is getting across.

We are at a point where, in so many areas of our activities and our interests, we do not appear to have a voice in the Cabinet to speak out for us, a voice that will put forward what we consider to be our just rights.

An hon. member: What about the hon. Minister of Mines?

Mr. MacDonald: If he does not speak up in the Cabinet, it is the only place he does not speak up.

Mr. Sopha: Yes, indeed. But the hon. Minister of Mines seldom bothers himself with serious matters—

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): The hon. member will be sorry.

Mr. Sopha: Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, I have a cold and I cannot hear what the hon. Minister is saying.

I mention these things on behalf of the people I represent in that important area. One wonders, for example, what influence toward getting the road finished the hon. member for Nickel Belt (Mr. Demers) is exerting. Much of this road, three-quarters perhaps, goes through his riding, and one is entitled to ask on the floor of the House whether he is interested in getting it finished as speedily as possible. The people in Sudbury, the basin in that intervening hinterland between the two centres, are not very keen about dates such as 1969 or 1970 or beyond that.

I believe I calculated last year that at the rate of progress the hon. Minister is presently making, 1972 is the earliest time that the road will be finished. It is not right, and as I said this afternoon, "it ain't fair," it "just ain't fair," to speak in the vernacular. It is not fair when one goes down here to the lake-shore—and no one wants to derogate from what they get at \$14 million a mile down there. But all haste and speed goes on in the construction of the great concrete highway down there to get it finished, to carry that great amount of vehicular traffic in this metropolitan, megalopolitan complex. To ask for similar treatment in our area, to ask for haste in getting a road finished to open up the great hinterland is perfectly reasonable,

equitable, fair and just. And to delay it, I say to the hon. Minister, "It ain't fair."

Mr. T. L. Wells (Scarborough North): Mr. Chairman, I cannot let this occasion go by on vote 807 without remarking that this vote on capital construction costs marks the beginning of the widening of the Macdonald-Cartier freeway through the great riding of Scarborough North.

With the indulgence of this House, Mr. Chairman, and your indulgence, I particularly want to say this tonight because there are 50 of the good constituents of Scarborough North sitting in the gallery. They are not only good constituents, but good Conservatives.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I know the member wants to speak on vote 807.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Wells: Mr. Chairman, after all the various remarks of our friends down here on these highways estimates, I would like to compliment the hon. Minister and his staff on the helpfulness and courtesy which they have shown in the planning of this road.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Wells: They have demonstrated to this local member a great degree of courtesy, and have kept me informed as this highway progressed into this area in Scarborough.

I would like to make one comment to the hon. Minister. I would like to know particularly if in the construction of the highway they follow exactly to the inch the plans and surveys that are drawn up? I say this because as has already been mentioned there is this provision whereby homes within 50 feet of the highway, or the pavement of the new road, are offered the opportunity to have their homes bought by the Ontario housing corporation. There are five homes along the north side of the highway which are 18 inches over the 50-foot limit and which will not receive offers.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I am going to ask the members to direct their questions through the chair.

Mr. Wells: The only thing I would like to ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, is that if these gentlemen, after the highway is constructed in a couple of years, get out with

a tape measure and find that they are one inch within the 50-foot limit, will the department still honour its obligation to make them an offer on their homes?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If this situation develops we will not only rely on tape measures, we will send a surveyor out there if it takes any survey equipment to establish measurements. If they comply, of course, the terms of reference will be honoured, I think I can assure the hon. member of that.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin.

Mr. S. Farquhar (Algoma-Manitoulin): Mr. Chairman, earlier today the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville referred to Highway 17 between the Soo and Sudbury. Of course, I recognize, after some perusal of the capital construction accounts here, that some ten miles east of Espanola is scheduled for new construction. This represents some ten out of 200 miles of very congested highway, and a combination of expanded trucking to and from Sault Ste. Marie and expanded tourist traffic involving cars with trailers and boats. The many consecutive miles of solid lines on the highway because of crooks and hills is certainly a cause of extreme worry to me.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if we can expect an accelerated rate of new construction over this section in forthcoming years, and if this new construction involves another lane? The main reason for the request, of course, is related to the high accident rate—I might even say, slaughter rate—that in turn is directly related to the need for a truck or heavy-traffic or slow-moving lane.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member that this section of Highway 17 is programmed for reconstruction. I do not think I can assure him that we can rebuild at once the entire section that he makes reference to. I simply would not be telling the truth if I told him that. But we have a continuing programme on it; there is some evidence that there is going to be some work done this year. There will be a succession of contracts on the highway because, as I say, the whole reconstruction of this thing is programmed.

That can be said about many roads. It can be said about Highway 11 in the area the hon. member for Fort William spoke about. There is a programme of work allotted to these sections of our highways.

I have to leave it to the reasonable character of the hon. members who mention these

things, to consider whether we really think we can build every road in the province at once. It has to be staged and programmed.

Mr. Freeman: So we wait for the programme to evolve.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, that is the point, and we do. I recall last year somebody said we did things slowly but surely—I think it was the hon. member for Woodbine. Maybe it is slowly, but we do it surely, there can be no doubt about that.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would like to raise the matter that I suppose has been before this House every year for the past 15 years. We have not obtained too much action on it so far, as far as this department is concerned. I am talking about the matter of fair wages on government contracts.

Mr. Chairman: I think that I should point out at this time to the member for Woodbine that he will recall we had ruled out discussion on salaries and on wages for those that were under arbitration and fair wage contracts. We accept as being in order at this time, those with contractors doing business with the government outside of—

Mr. Bryden: That is correct, sir. Actually these people are not directly employees in the government at all; they are employed by people who have contracts with the government.

It is an old established policy in Canada, except for this jurisdiction, that a condition laid down in the letting of contracts is that fair and reasonable wages shall be paid and that fair and reasonable hours shall be worked within the terms of the contract. After much pressing over the years, the government finally capitulated on this matter as far as most departments were concerned, and on January 14, 1965, it passed an order-in-council providing that as far as the Ontario water resources commission, the Ontario housing corporation were concerned, and also, as far as all government departments were concerned other than The Department of Highways, a fair wage policy would be put into effect. I believe the policy has been quite successful.

The procedure, which I will just mention to refresh the memories of the hon. members who have not paid particular attention to this matter, is that when a government department wishes to let a contract, it notifies The

Department of Labour, and The Department of Labour draws up a schedule of wages and hours applicable to that contract. The principle followed is that the wages shall be the prevailing wages in the community, or if there are not prevailing wages for the categories concerned, then they shall be fair and reasonable rates.

The policy that The Department of Labour has followed quite sensibly has been to adopt the fair wage schedules of the federal Department of Labour. The federal Department of Labour has been in this business for about 60 years and has a lot of experience. Most people accept its schedules as fair and reasonable.

The only trouble is that we have never been able, up until now, to persuade the government that this policy should apply to the largest contracting department of the government by far, The Department of Highways. I have been after whoever happened to be the Minister of Highways at the time for as long as I have been here. I remember that Mr. Edwards, who used to be a member for one of the Hamilton seats, I think Wentworth, also used to get after the Minister of Highways, whoever he happened to be at the time. We bashed away at it. We finally talked the Minister of Public Works into getting into line. We never did get anywhere with the Minister of Highways until last year.

I started in with my customary speech, and the hon. Minister of Highways—the genial gentleman opposite who is still the Minister of Highways—shot me down in full flight. He advised me that the whole matter had been settled. I had hardly got about more than three sentences of my speech out and he stopped me cold.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, I think the House should consider this statement in the light of the hon. Minister's earlier statement of this evening that he always keeps his promises and that his commitments are always honoured. He said:

I would say that in a matter of about two or three weeks a fair wage schedule which would embrace the operations of The Department of Highways will be implemented—four weeks—or somewhere in that vicinity.

Admittedly the hon. Minister worked himself up from two weeks to four weeks in a matter of two sentences, but still I think the implication was that it was going to be done soon.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt whatever that the hon. Minister honestly meant what he said at that time. This was a fair state-

ment of what he believed to be true at the time. The only trouble is that he apparently misjudged the situation totally—I do not know why.

I have no doubt that the roadbuilders association has been giving him a lot of trouble because one thing they hate is fair wages; they like starvation wages—they prefer that type—anyway.

Whatever his troubles, this statement was made on Monday, May 3, 1965, with an outside limit of four weeks. We have now reached the year of our Lord 1966, and precisely March 8—a little more than ten months later—and there is still no fair wage schedule in The Department of Highways in the province of Ontario.

I should say in fairness that I talked to the hon. Minister about this a few days ago and he led me to believe that there would be a fair wage schedule for highways contracts in this province very soon. Of course, as he knows—and as all hon. members of the House know—I am a very naive young man who accepts implicitly everything that Ministers tell me, except, as is usually the case, when there is overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

I am not going to say that I am now accepting the statement of the hon. Minister. I will say, though, that I think he could appreciate my situation when I say that I am taking his statement with a grain of salt; I am taking a wait-and-see attitude this year. Last year I accepted his statement *in toto*. This year, I am taking a wait-and-see attitude. Perhaps in the few days since I talked to him on the telephone, there have been some new developments. If so, I would be very grateful to hear about them, but I do think that it is time that in this budget of \$224 million—nearly \$225 million—something can be done to ensure that the men who work in building the highways and the structures connected with them receive fair and reasonable wages, in line with those set in union contracts for the various trades in which they are working.

I would like to hear from the hon. Minister exactly what the status of this case is, at the moment.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I must confess to the hon. member and to the House that I was optimistic a year ago. But I can assure him now, and my assurance stems from the fact that there have been a series of meetings as recently as yesterday and again today, with the Deputy Minister and certain officials of The Department of

Highways and certain officials of The Department of Labour. I can assure the hon. member that a fair wage clause will become part of our contract document for contracts in the next construction season.

Now, to explain why that has not happened—and I confess I do this with some embarrassment. When we moved into this field we discovered that we would have a mixture of contracts—the hon. member made reference to the fact, of course, that I made this statement on May 3. Our estimates were rather late coming before the Legislature last year, so if we add four weeks to that, it would have been in June. Now whether this is a valid explanation or not, I do not know. I felt then it was. If we had a number of contracts all over the province with a fair wage schedule in some of them and not in the others of men working side by side, I think we would have had a bit of chaos.

Notwithstanding that, we have hammered at this thing—and I say hammered and pounded. Part of our contract document will be a fair wage schedule on contracts in the 1966 construction season.

I regret as much as the hon. member does, that we were not able to implement it earlier and I apologize for the extent to which I may have misled the House at that time. But I can give the assurance that this will be the case after April 1—that will be the first of next month.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Four weeks then.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think I am safe with four weeks, this year—I think I am.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, following up on this matter, may I ask the hon. Minister two questions with regard to the proposed schedules, which I hope—as he does—will be included in all contracts for the coming year?

First, will these schedules make any provision with relation to hours of work?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes.

Mr. Bryden: May I ask what provision?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: As precisely as I can remember, I think it will relate to 44 hours per week for construction involving the so-called “building” trades—this is on interchanges and forming where carpenters and that type of tradesmen are employed; on straight construction work it will be 55 hours.

Mr. Bryden: On the paving of the highways?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, grading, paving and that type of work. I would point out to the hon. member, and I hope that he will go along with this, that because of the seasonal character of the work, if we are going to get anywhere with the type of programme that hon. members of the House would like us to, we have to take advantage of the days and the weather that permits us to do the work. I think, from the information that reaches me, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that this would appear to be acceptable.

This was in the course of discussion and consideration as recently as this morning.

I would like to comment on one other thing here, if I may, and again this probably is not a good valid excuse—if that is the way to put it—for the delay that has taken place. But the hon. member will be aware of the fact that while the federal fair wage schedule has been applicable throughout the construction industry, it simply stems from the fact that the counterpart of what the federal government does in terms of the construction industry was not available here. The federal government, as such, has no road building department, no road building authority whatsoever and this occasioned part of the delay because we had to work something out that had never existed before. I must say that I was not as completely aware of some of these problems a year ago—or last May when we talked about them—as I am today. But this is the basis of hours—44 and 55.

Mr. Bryden: I will say, Mr. Chairman, that appears to me to be a reasonable start. Let us see how it works. I think the hon. Minister is right in making a distinction between structures—or whatever you want to call them, the work on the right of way—whether it is grading or paving.

There is one other matter I would like to ask him about in this connection, and that is the classifications that are being worked out governing this kind of work. The reason I am asking is that last year when this matter was under consideration, the Ontario road-builders association submitted a brief to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree), setting forth, shall we say, a very truncated system of classifications. They provided for labourers, truck drivers and certain licensed mechanics, and then they had all the rest of the people in two broad categories—engineering constructor, class 1; engineering constructor, class 2. I do not know if they had in mind people playing with meccano sets or something like that when they talked about

engineering constructors, but it is obviously a phony type of classification. There are a great many different kinds of tradesmen, especially on structures, and I think they should be properly classified according to their trades, and they should receive the prevailing rates for their trades.

What type of schedule? I do not want to go into it in complete detail, but what type of schedule is in mind? Would it be one that would recognize the different types of trades in the industry?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, as far as I am aware, Mr. Chairman, and again these are some of the points that we have been hammering out. I understand that the categories are broad. They will cover, for instance, the type of trades that are involved in structures; all the trade categories that are involved in structures will be defined in the schedule.

But again I point out, this was an area where there was nothing to go by previously. These things had to be worked out. There were elements of trades in the construction of the roads themselves, but there was no reference material available at federal government level. The federal fair wage scale did not help us too much there. These had to be developed. But the categories are broad, and I am quite confident the hon. member will be satisfied with them. As a matter of fact, I say to the House that when we talked to him on the phone, I promised to make a schedule available to him, once it becomes available to me. And this of course, either myself or the hon. Minister of Labour I think will be happy to do.

Mr. Bryden: Perhaps one of the hon. Ministers concerned would table it so that all the hon. members can see it. These are public, are they not? In fact they have to be posted around about where the people are working.

One final point, Mr. Chairman, relates to order-in-council 166 of 1965. Is it the intention that this order-in-council will be amended, or some complementary order-in-council will be passed, governing this type of work?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think we will probably do this as a matter of policy. I do not think an order-in-council is required. This will be a contractual requirement on the part of The Department of Highways. The schedule will be inserted in our contract documents, and upon execution of the documents the contractor will engage

himself to see that this schedule is lived up to.

Mr. Bryden: Well, I would just point out to the hon. Minister in that connection, Mr. Chairman, that all the operations to which order-in-council 166 applies are also contractual operations, but this order-in-council, without going into all the detail of it, in substance authorizes the Minister of Labour to draw up schedules of wages and hours of work in respect of contracts let by the Ontario housing corporation, the Ontario water resources commission and all departments of the government of Ontario, except The Department of Highways. It would seem to me that if the hon. Minister or The Department of Labour is now going to draw up schedules with respect to The Department of Highways, it would be desirable to amend this order-in-council, because as it now stands The Department of Highways is specifically excluded from the policy set forth in it.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Mr. Chairman, might I ask the hon. member for Woodbine a question? Am I right in assuming that you said that all road contractors preferred to pay their men starvation wages?

Mr. Bryden: If I said that, I was exaggerating. A great many of them prefer—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I want his statement for the record.

Mr. Bryden: I will tell the hon. Minister of Mines, since he seems to be interested, some of the things that have happened quite recently in this province. As a matter of fact, I could give him quotations from many eminent authorities, including Catholic bishops and so on, who said such things, or things along that line. I will say to the hon. Minister that there have been some contractors in this province who have been paying recognized wages, working their people 40 and 44-hour weeks. They have been at a tremendous disadvantage because there have been others who have been paying starvation wages. But I will say, in relation to this, that the idea of the Ontario road-builders association as to what constitutes adequate wages, as submitted to the government less than a year ago, is, in my opinion, getting pretty close to starvation wages. It is really on the basis of the submission of their association, rather than of the practices of individual members, that I made my statement. The submission of their association was a complete disgrace, in my opinion. I judge from the hon. Minister that

that is by no means the determining factor in the schedules that are being drawn up, and I am happy to know that.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Would you give us the names of the ones that are paying starvation wages?

Mr. Bryden: I will give you the name of the association that made a submission that asked for what I would consider close to—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: We know that. Give us the names of the companies.

Mr. Bryden: I really do not know if I should bother going into this detail, but here is a case in point that was brought to the attention of the government less than a year ago; I will quote it. It is from a brief submitted to the government by the Ontario provincial council of the united brotherhood of carpenters and joiners of America. I am quoting now:

A case in point was found with two overpass projects constructed side by side on Highway 401 over the period 1964-1965. We shall refer to these overpasses for the benefit of explanation as project number one and project number two. Project number two was let to a contractor who operates rather big in the industry from the standpoint of dollar value of contracts, but from the standpoint of treatment of his employees, he operates on an appreciably lower scale.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): What is his name?

Mr. Bryden: To continue:

The successful bidder on this overpass located at Rodney intersection and Highway 401 is a member of a select group known as the millionaire club—work in excess of \$1 million each year. He had 16 prime contracts for public, heavy and highway construction work over the period from June 1, 1964 to December 31, 1964. Total cost of his contracts was \$2,347,900.

In looking into the smaller side of the operation, we find that two classifications of carpenters—they referred to themselves as carpenters but they performed all types of work in jack-of-all-trades fashion—were employed on that project and they were referred to as constructor number one and constructor number two. Constructor number one was being paid an hourly rate of \$1.85, while constructor number two was being paid \$1.70 an hour. They had

never heard of the provincial institute of trades for training apprentices and they worked ten and a half hours every day for six days per week, summer and fall, five days, winter and spring. The constructors received no overtime premium. Project number two, a few short miles distant at the intersection, is being constructed by a reputable contractor who was performing his work—

this is a few miles away—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Tell us the name of that contractor?

Mr. Bryden:

—was performing his work with qualified journeymen carpenters who worked normal hours and were paid a normal hourly rate of \$3.27.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: What is the name of that contractor?

Mr. Bryden: I think the description of them is quite adequate for the hon. Minister to be able to identify them.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is what we want to know; I am interested in that. That is a blanket statement and I do not think it is fair to road contractors.

Mr. Bryden: I would suggest to the hon. Minister of Mines that he simmer down before he gets shot down completely in flames. He does not know what he is talking about. We have been hammering at this government on this matter—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: I would say until you tell me the names, that is a lie.

Mr. Bryden: I do not care whether you say that is a lie or not, because you do not know the difference between truth and falsehood.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: You have no right to make those statements which are far from the truth.

Mr. S. Lewis: With friends like you, the hon. Minister of Highways—

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: That is all right; carry on.

Mr. Bryden: The hon. Minister of Highways and I were getting along fine. I was just on the point of commending him, if I

may belatedly, for implementing a policy for which we over here have been agitating for some years. I will look forward to seeing the schedules that he and the hon. Minister of Labour are working out. I do not wish to thresh over old straws; as a matter of fact, I am sorry I got diverted into dealing with some old straws. But as long as we are going to have reasonably satisfactory schedules for the forthcoming construction season, I am satisfied. I will say to the hon. Minister that I am satisfied with his statement with regard to hours of work. From as much as he has told me up until now, I think I will probably also be satisfied with the wage arrangements that will be made in the schedules. Not having seen them, I will not say definitely, but I have no doubt the hon. Minister is now moving in the right direction. I am sure that over the years we will develop a good policy on this matter.

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: Half-truths will not go with me.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Downsview.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, on this fair wage pattern that was being discussed, the hon. Minister was saying that there is substantial difficulty in getting a federal pattern because there is no federal department. But is there not a history of fair wage provisions in the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto, and in the city of Toronto? And a fair wage officer? Roads contracts and highway contracts over many years have been let along these lines. Is not the advice of the fair wage officer, both for Metro and for the city, of substantial assistance to the hon. Minister in this regard?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, of course it is, Mr. Chairman. I simply made that reference which previously had been made to the fact that the federal government had had fair wage schedules for a long period of time, and that some departments of the government of the province of Ontario had virtually adopted them. But I went on to further point out that that did not characterize The Department of Highways, as far as the federal authority is concerned.

Of course, we know these other fair wage schedules exist in Metro and so on, and of course that is as far as the Metro area is concerned. Their schedule is probably not applicable elsewhere. This is a matter of fact; I do not think there is any doubt about this. But we are aware of it and I am sure these things have been taken into consideration.

I was simply commenting on the fact that we did not have the help and direction that was available from the federal authorities, because—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I know there is a history of fair wages, fair wage officers and fair wage schedules opinions going back at least 12 years in this area. I would have hoped the hon. Minister could get on with his job a little more quickly. However, we will have it soon and we will wait and see what it produces.

Mr. Chairman, there is another point I wanted to discuss. There is available a board called the highways appeal board which is set up under the Minister in order to accommodate contractors who protest about interpretations of contracts. I am advised—and I am not too sure of my facts on this, so if I am wrong I hope the hon. Minister will correct me—that in order for a contractor who is concerned about the interpretations of his contract to be heard by this board, he must post a deposit of some \$500 to be heard. Then, as the hearing goes on, if it lasts a day, two days or three days, he is assessed at the rate of \$100 a day for the time that hearing takes up. If he has not run out of his \$500 at the end of the hearing he gets back whatever overpayment there is. I would like to know the basis on which the hon. Minister sets up this procedure of the paying in of a deposit, because when I have to go to court against my hon. friend and take him into the county court I do not have to put up this kind of security for costs. It would seem to me that there should be a system evolved of paying costs similar to our courts system.

I would like to hear the hon. Minister briefly review this whole question of assessing a substantial deposit against a contractor and just how it works.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, the deposit and the fees, whatever they may be, are a matter of agreement between the appropriate representatives of the roadbuilding industry and the department. This is not an imposed thing, they agree to it. The claims committee the hon. member refers to is an adjudicating body, and this board of course takes over if the claims branch or claims section of the department, headed by the claims engineer, cannot properly effect a settlement. Then they have the right of appeal to this claims board. That is quite correct.

But everything in connection with whatever the deposit and fees are has been developed by a process of agreement with the

industry, through their representatives. It has not been imposed on them. They do not seem to complain about it too much.

I might add, while we are on this subject, Mr. Chairman, the claims board is at present only adjudicating claims that arose from contracts entered into prior to the proclamation of *The Proceedings Against the Crown Act*. So now anybody with a claim can proceed against the Crown unless the contract was entered into prior to the proclamation of the Act, and these are still being adjudicated. There are not too many left.

Mr. Singer: Well, is there not still a system going on whereby you have a private arbitration, with recourse still being available to the courts?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Not at the moment, although I can assure the hon. member that an alternative process of arbitration is being considered. But this claims board was set up when you could not proceed against the Crown except by fiat, and this was a tribunal set up in order to deal with these claims. Now, with the introduction of the proclamation of *The Proceedings Against the Crown Act*, which goes back, I believe, to 1963, it makes it possible for a contractor who fails to negotiate a proper claim settlement with the claims engineer, to proceed through the courts.

Mr. Singer: Yes, while it is possible, there still is, as I understand it, some sort of committee or board or something within the department to appeal to, and it is these people who have to get the costs, whether or not there is a civil claim available. Am I not correct in this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, we have always had a claims procedure, this is true, yes. A section of the department headed by a claims engineer and two assistants. All claims are processed there in the first instance, and the great majority of them are settled in that manner. This claims board exists to deal with claims when settlement cannot be reached in the first instance with the claims engineer. As I say, this was a method of adjudicating claims when there was no straightforward provision for taking your claim to the courts.

Mr. Singer: But does not that board still exist?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It still exists, but it is only existing to adjudicate claims that arose prior to the proclamation of *The Proceedings Against the Crown Act*.

Mr. Singer: What happens to a contractor who says, "I am not happy with the opinion of the engineer"? Has he not recourse to a board at the present time without going to court?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He would proceed in the manner that I have just described. He would take his claim to the claims engineer or a member of the claims engineer's staff. First of all, he would file notice of his intention to claim, and when that is properly documented, he proceeds to go through the procedures with the claims engineer. That would be on contracts entered into after the proclamation of The Proceedings Against the Crown Act. He has access to the Deputy Minister in pursuance of his claim. If he cannot effect a satisfactory settlement there, he goes to court.

Mr. Singer: Does he have to pay any costs then when he goes before the Deputy Minister and his cohorts?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, none.

Mr. Singer: All right. Now, let us go back to the people who had a claim that arose before 1963. Why should they have to pay \$500 or anything to get an adjudication?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would suppose it could be best characterized as an informal arbitration. I am not a lawyer, I do not know exactly the terms, but this is what takes place. It is a process of arbitration. I would say to the hon. member that it costs money to go before a board of arbitration, of course it does.

Mr. Singer: It costs money to set up courts.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Exactly. And it costs money to operate a claims board. So notwithstanding the fact that these fees are assessed, they are a matter of agreement by appropriate representatives in the industry and the department.

Mr. Singer: It is a pretty unilateral sort of an agreement.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no.

Mr. Singer: What you are able to say to the industry is, "You can't take us to court because we won't give you a fiat. Now, we will do something for you, but you are going to have to pay for it. Now do you agree to that or not?"

What choice do they have? If they wanted any type of adjudication they had to pay a

fee of \$500. I was not aware, as I am now, when I started off on this that this necessity for a deposit has gone, and the rights as to costs are determined by the courts. But I still think this \$500 is a pretty unilateral type of decision and is unfair. How many claims would there be now existing that arose before January 1, 1963?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I could get that information for the hon. member. There would not be too many.

Mr. Singer: I would think that a number of contractors feel that they are somewhat aggrieved are being perhaps unnecessarily penalized by the necessity of having to put up this kind of a deposit.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member may be right. That has never been said to me by a contractor who has wanted an arbitration before this claims committee. It does not cost them anything to proceed through the claims engineer and his staff. I am sure the Deputy Minister does not charge them anything. This then is the counterpart of a formal board of arbitration and the hon. member knows very well this costs money, he knows very well it does. So again I say, it is by a process of mutual agreement—it is a bilateral thing, not unilateral—this has been done. I say that the great saving to them is that they can be heard without the services of a counsel. I think the \$500 could be very cheap because they do not have to be represented by counsel. The hearings are quite informal, and a lot of them have been settled in this manner. Now I recall this question was asked of me a year ago, I think by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, and I may have misinterpreted his remarks then, because I think I said there was no great continuing amount of fees. There certainly is this \$500 deposit. They get it back if it is not all used.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister says no complaints have come to him. I suspect he has divined by now that the industry is not completely happy with the payment of the \$500 fee, or else the matter would not be coming forward at this time. The complaints have come to me and to my colleagues about this, and this is why the matter is being raised, and without belabouring this point unduly, since the contractor who felt he was aggrieved, has little or no remedy, other than the gratuitous offering of a board of arbitration. What other choice did the industry have then to say, all right we will take it on your terms, it is better than nothing?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would hope the hon. member will agree with me that while that may be so, it is history now. We went along with, and very much supported, the introduction and eventual proclamation of the proceedings against the Crown, because we feel that is what the courts are for.

Mr. Singer: It took a long time to get around to that.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It did not take us a long time to get around to it. It was—

Mr. Singer: Well, your predecessor.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let us say that has been done, and if the former procedure looks to be a little unsatisfactory to the hon. member, let us say we have moved to correct this, three years ago.

Mr. Singer: But you are still taking the \$500.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We are. These were the contractual arrangements at that time. This is right.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: What does a sub-contractor do who claims he has not received his full remuneration from the prime contractor? Does he have any recourse to the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we certainly do everything we can to protect sub-contractors and suppliers if they file their claims with the department.

Mr. Newman: Does he have to leave a deposit with the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, no.

Mr. Newman: He does not?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No. The only people who go through the procedure that has been discussed here over the last few minutes are the prime contractors. They are the only people. We do make very ample provision for payment of sub-contractors' accounts. We hold back a percentage of the amount that is owing to a prime contractor until he can satisfy us that his accounts have been paid.

Mr. Newman: Yes, but, Mr. Minister, you may not know that the sub-contractor has not received full remuneration. The prime

contractor says he has paid, but the sub-contractor says he has not been paid for his work. What does the sub-contractor do in that case?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: He comes to us. That occasion seldom arises, I can assure the hon. member, for another reason. One of the really important considerations with respect to payment of prime contractors' accounts to sub-contractors is the fact that if they are not paid they are subjected to a very severe prequalification penalty. Their rating is reduced. I can assure the hon. member that this is a procedure that any road-builder does not want to become involved in. If his prequalification rating is reduced, then of course, the amount of work he can have in hand or bid on is substantially reduced.

I can assure you that this consideration is the best protection for creditors of prime contractors that we have. The cases where they are not paid, I would say, Mr. Chairman, through you to the hon. member, are isolated indeed.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Minister, I happen to have heard from a fellow who claimed he was not being paid by a prime contractor. I think he did bring the case up with the department, but had a lot of difficulty getting satisfaction.

But I can see where the fact that the contractor may have a claim levied, or held against him, may lower his standing when it comes to prequalification, and as a result, he may not want to lose the prequalification level that he does have with the department.

I have noticed in your annual report, on page 32, that there have been some changes in procedures on capital contracts. What are these changes that have taken place, on pre-qualifying of contracts?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will have to get that information for the hon. member. We make changes in our prequalification rating procedures from time to time. There is not any doubt about that, I would say, Mr. Chairman. The specific changes the hon. member makes reference to, I will have to look up myself.

But we have a prequalification committee in the department. The Ontario roadbuilders association has a prequalification committee and from time to time our committee and theirs meet. They meet with the appropriate officials of the department and matters relating to prequalification are dealt with from time to time, so these changes do take place.

Mr. Chairman, I know exactly what the hon. member has reference to. Prior to these changes, prequalification only applied to construction contracts. Prequalification applies now to almost every type of work done by the department, including maintenance contracts. In fact, I think all contracts with a value down to \$10,000 require to be prequalified. These are the changes that the hon. member has reference to. It is just an extending of the prequalification procedures.

Mr. Newman: Very good, Mr. Minister.

Continuing with that, why has the department not insisted on prequalification of contractors in all of their works? I notice only 78.3 per cent of the 326 capital projects for the last year required prequalification—on the same page, Mr. Minister.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I see that here. This was a rather broad move in a new direction. We were moving to encompass a much broader range of contracts and types of contracts than previously. I think it is fair to suggest to the hon. member that we hoped to get a little experience in the period of time since this was introduced.

There are some types of contracts that are very difficult to prequalify. As a matter of fact, there are some types of contracts that it is very difficult to get contracts for—bridge painting, for instance. It is very difficult to get people to undertake to paint our bridges by contract.

We have left some of these small amounts, because to formalize them to that extent, would make it difficult for us to get some of our small jobs done. I think that is as good an explanation as I can give.

Mr. Newman: That is understandable, Mr. Minister, but you are working toward a 100 per cent prequalification, if possible?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is certainly under consideration.

Mr. Newman: May I then ask the hon. Minister if the department has ever considered—I am not recommending this—the use of a median bid in contract bidding?

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Not any government contract.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Chairman, we stick strictly to the policy of the low bid and with these modest exceptions, the bidder must be prequalified.

Mr. Newman: Has the department carried out any research on the effect of a

median bid in the department? I have reports here that many instances have come to light where maintenance costs of low-bid materials have far exceeded the cost of higher bid materials, which require less care.

Then, for the illumination of the hon. members, the idea of the median bid was to eliminate the distorting effect of excessively high or low bids. All quotations 15 per cent above or below the predetermined estimate are rejected, the average is taken on the remaining bids and the bidder closest to and below this average is declared to be successful tender. Is this what the hon. Minister also had in mind when I mentioned median bid; is this the same policy that may have been researched by the department?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, this is what we understood it to be. I would say we have proved to our satisfaction that this procedure is not necessary. Those are materials contracts the hon. member is referring to; they are not construction contracts, they are materials contracts. We do not have to adopt a policy of that kind because all the materials that are used on our jobs are pretested by the department. We know that the quality is satisfactory before the contract is awarded.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister. In the tender price, does the hon. Minister have an estimate for the coming year as to what his tender index will be on road contracts?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. Reference was made to this before, Mr. Chairman. We use the best current up-to-date information we can get from the Dominion bureau of statistics. It proves to be somewhat more satisfactory, because trying to project these cost indices over a protracted period of time just has not worked. We have had to do this on a very frequent basis so we work closely. The financial comptroller's office is in touch with the Dominion bureau of statistics and we get these updated costs as frequently as they are required. We think we are even probably ahead of the game to some extent in this manner.

Mr. Newman: Well, does the hon. Minister foresee an increase in expenses as a result of the increase in wages that has been prevalent throughout? How far higher will his tender index price go above 151, as it was in 1964-65?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wish I had a crystal ball, Mr. Chairman, I—

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister must be able to forecast the thing, can he not, Mr. Chairman?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If I were to produce for the hon. member the graph of the various indices for granular material, steel, structures, paving materials and so on, he would find that over a period of years the graph has gone up and down fairly frequently.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister has the graph right in the book here; all I am asking him is to tell me what he anticipates his index price will be for the coming year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We would anticipate that it will be not less than it is now; that would be good sound practice. We probably projected some increase, but to tell the hon. member exactly what that will be, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister bases his costs on his index price.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, but I tell the hon. member those index prices can change. We protect ourselves in our estimates, of course. If the cost indices do decline, I assure the hon. member we will have a little more money to build roads with. If they go up, we will have a little less than we have budgeted for, but this is an impossible thing to determine. I will say, though, that the costs have steadily risen over the past few years and it is obvious that the wage increases that are contemplated are going to add very materially to the cost of our contracts.

Mr. Newman: Then may I ask if the hon. Minister would explain the price of concrete in structures in the 1963-64 construction year? It was \$31.85 a cubic yard. Why has it gone up to \$37.74, an increase of 20 per cent over the past construction year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I think the hon. member put his finger on it not too long ago, when he said that heavy labour content is the thing that puts these costs up. The actual material content does not vary that much, but the cost of labour has and there is a tremendous amount of labour in the type of material the hon. member makes reference to. This is where the great amount of cost accrues.

Mr. Newman: That is exactly why, Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister should be able to anticipate a tender index price. He has

to work on some type of figures when he decides what his contract is going to be.

Mr. Chairman, if I may ask, on the volume of claims and investigations, I notice that the number of accidents involved with the department has risen substantially over the past construction season. Can the hon. Minister explain the reason for the great increase in the number of claims?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I do not mind trying to answer these questions, but the question has no relationship to vote 807.

Mr. Newman: Why would it not have any relationship to vote 807? Under capital construction?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Really, this is capital construction. I have some difficulty relating the matter of claims to motorists to construction of highways. There may be a vague one that escapes me—

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, these involve government vehicles, the department's vehicles, page 42.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We have very few vehicles on construction. These vehicles are the property of the contractors. We use our vehicles for maintenance purposes.

Mr. Newman: All right then, Mr. Chairman, will the hon. Minister turn to the book at page 42 and explain why—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: It is not appropriate, Mr. Chairman, to discuss this matter under this vote. I have no objection to discussing it, but let us keep in order.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, when I attempted to bring up some of these points under vote 801 I was told to wait until 807. This is why I waited—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: This was not one of them.

Mr. Newman: Should I have spoken on vote 801, Mr. Chairman? I will save them for next year then, that is all. But tell me where I should bring them up so I can straighten it out this year and not worry about it next year.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will let the hon. member know. At the moment, I would have to go back. I am not trying to restrict the debate, but we are making an attempt to keep in order. We have broken these estimates down into 11 votes instead of three; we have allocated the sections that used to

be strung out under each of the three votes; we have provided—albeit the hon. member says we did it accidentally; this was not true—hon. members with the estimates book for some time. He has had the capital construction programme, as well, in advance of the estimates as I could make it available, and I tabled the annual report several weeks ago. I simply say, Mr. Chairman, we have allowed a great deal of latitude, but let us try to keep in order. This is out of order on this vote—

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, I will accept the ruling of the chair as to this being out of order, but I had asked the previous Chairman under which vote I could discuss this. He had mentioned under 807; I wrote the figures 807 on each one of these questions that I had to ask. But it is all right, I will ask them under 807 next year.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): Mr. Chairman, there is a great disadvantage in being the only Liberal in all of eastern Ontario. I had a lot of questions to ask about The Department of Highways. I was hoping some of the hon. members on the other side who represent this great area of the province—certainly not through any fault of mine; I cannot really understand why our people should have voted that way, but 11 out of 12 are Tories—I thought at least two or three of them would say a few words, or ask a few questions about eastern Ontario.

Mr. MacDonald: They have all made their announcements.

An hon. member: None of them are here; they are all away.

Mr. Racine: I quite understand that the hon. member for Renfrew South (Mr. Yaka-buski) did make an announcement that the hon. member for Sudbury quoted yesterday in the House. I notice he was here this afternoon; he did not say anything about it.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to have to make that kind of remark, but I would like to join the speeches of the hon. member for Sudbury, the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), the hon. member for Fort William and others, who have complained about the highway conditions in their areas. I say that the conditions in eastern Ontario are identical to the other areas that have been mentioned before. I would have thought that those hon. members on the other side of the House should have asked some questions at some point or other on these estimates. I suppose, Mr. Chairman,

that they are quite satisfied with the conditions. I am not satisfied, and I do not think the people of eastern Ontario should be satisfied.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Does the hon. member mean there are no good highways in Ontario anywhere?

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I am referring to eastern Ontario.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): Is the hon. member referring to Kingston, too?

Mr. Racine: I am talking about eastern Ontario. I am not talking about—

An hon. member: Be more specific when you talk about eastern Ontario. What are you talking about?

Hon. Mr. Wardrope: The hon. member is talking to a lot of members.

Mr. Racine: That is right. I would be glad to see them come up and say something, even if they only said that everything that is being done by the government is good. I would be glad if they got up anyway. I know in all those areas, in all those constituencies, there is something wrong. I would refer to the speech made by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence) some years ago when he referred to the trip he had made with the hon. Prime Minister during the election campaign of 1963 through the country of Russell. He referred to the roads in the county of Russell as being the worst in Ontario. I am not inventing that; you can go to *Hansard* and read these remarks by the hon. member for Russell.

When the hon. Minister of Mines was making his wonderful speech about northern Ontario this afternoon, I referred to a speech that was made by a Tory candidate during the last federal election in the county of Renfrew South when he talked about highways. Of course, we know that the highways are not the responsibility of the federal government, but still this member thought he would win some votes by referring to the goat trail—he was referring to Highway 17—and particularly to that part of Highway 17 between Pembroke and Ottawa. Some parts of it are pretty good, but they have been at it for years and years and years.

I do not think that eastern Ontario should be satisfied with that and I think in the reports of the economic council, it was mentioned that eastern Ontario is an area which suffers from poverty. There are pockets of poverty in eastern Ontario, and I think the

hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Villeneuve) has read those reports and he will agree with me that this happens.

I think this economic council has said that in order to bring prosperity to that part of the province there should be highways. I think this is fundamental. I am not against highways for Toronto, Hamilton, Windsor or Niagara Falls. I am in favour of them, but I say that we should think of the other parts of Ontario. I think possibly one of the reasons why eastern Ontario at this time is underdeveloped is because of the fact that the highways in that area have been neglected.

Mr. Chairman, I have tried to make my point to show you the necessity of doing something in that area.

Mr. Chairman, may I quote an article from the *Windsor Star*, dated October 5, 1965, which says that:

Ontario plans a 67-mile, \$40-million freeway between the city of Ottawa and Pointe Fortune, about 30 miles northwest of Montreal, within 20 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat that "within 20 years." That is a long time, when you consider that in the province of Quebec the continuation of the trans-Canada highway, now almost completed, will be completed to the borders of Ontario possibly within the next 12 months. We will get this freeway in 20 years from now. I would like to continue this quotation:

The four-lane freeway has priority in the \$100-million plan for eastern Ontario, a gathering of about 160 community representatives from the region was told. Another freeway would be built by 1985 between Ottawa and Brockville to channel Toronto traffic from the Macdonald-Cartier freeway to the capital.

I am not a mathematician, but it seems to me that this is 19 years hence—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would like to save the hon. member some embarrassment because what he is quoting here is absolutely incorrect. If the hon. member had been at the meeting that was in his own capital city, to which we invited everybody, I think he would know that that article is incorrect.

If the hon. member would like to pursue the reading of the article, fine, but I can point out to him that it is completely inaccurate.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, perhaps I could ask the hon. Minister, through you, when he

expects a good highway. I do not think we should have a freeway, but when does he expect a good highway to run from the Macdonald-Cartier freeway to the capital city? Is this not a fair question, Mr. Chairman? I think this is something that should be done and now. I say that this highway should be built now, and we should have this highway go from the Macdonald-Cartier freeway to the capital city for 1967.

I know that the hon. Minister will probably tell me that it cannot be done, and I say that it is bad planning. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. members for Stormont (Mr. Guindon), Glengarry, and Prescott (Mr. Cecile) have said that there was going to be a good highway from the Macdonald-Cartier freeway to Ottawa shortly, but I say that good planning would have given us that highway to the capital city for the Centennial year.

Mr. Chairman, I have been waiting to get into this debate for a long time because I feel that this is bad for this province. We should have a superhighway leading from the Macdonald-Cartier, coming in from Montreal where a lot of people will be travelling to and from in 1967; we should have a highway that should lead to the capital, because the people coming in from the western part of the province driving toward Montreal might be induced to take a left turn and go down to the capital, and I think this is what we need.

May I ask, Mr. Chairman, if it is not too much, when we can expect that kind of a highway to go through the capital city?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, to get back to the earlier comments of the hon. member when he was reading from the *Windsor Star*, making reference, of course, to a highway from Ottawa to Pointe Fortune in 20 years, let me suggest to the hon. member that if he had attended the presentation of the area transportation study in Ottawa, I think last October 8 or 12—and he was quite at liberty to attend it; as a matter of fact, I would be surprised if he did not get an invitation—

Mr. Racine: May I just say a word, Mr. Chairman? At that date, I was taken up with the committee on aging.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Very well, that is satisfactory. If the hon. member had been there, he would have witnessed the traffic and transportation study engineers from the department disclose a projection of the highway needs in the eastern or Ottawa study

area over a 20-year period. He would also have seen a graphic presentation and an oral presentation of the extent to which these 20-year projections were to be staged.

In the first priority stage was the road that he made reference to, from Ottawa to Montreal. I certainly am not going to say that this road will be built in 1967, because it will not be and cannot be, but I will go back to emphasize the extent to which we are covering the province with these studies, to determine where these roads should be most effectively built to develop these areas and deal with the transportation problems there.

The projections go right through to 1985. I am convinced that the hon. member would have been impressed if he had seen the manner in which these projections were developed.

Stage 1 of the projected 20-year period calls for an expressway, and it does call for an expressway from Pointe Fortune to Ottawa. It may very well be that two lanes will be built in the early stages because the projections indicate that this is all the traffic demands, but I can assure the hon. member that sufficient right of way will be acquired to add another two lanes and make it a fully controlled access highway in due course.

Coupled with that, we propose to build in the same priority stage, a road which will go northerly from just west of Cornwall, I believe approximately to the community of Casselman. There it will connect with the east-west freeway that I have spoken about, from Ottawa to Montreal, again in the first stage. It may very well be that in advance of the actual reconstruction of a road just west of Cornwall to Casselman, we may assume some existing county roads into the King's highway system. We may do this very shortly, and then of course subsequently reconstruct them to the extent that is necessary to effect this connection.

The hon. member made reference to a road that would probably take off, if you like, from Highway 401, the Macdonald-Cartier freeway, just east of Brockville. This has been planned, because actually the projections in the study indicate a very, very respectable volume of the vehicular traffic moving from Toronto easterly as going directly to Ottawa. They do not want to go down any further before they turn north to Ottawa, and so they use Highway 16. At the same time, we hope and propose to improve Highway 16 during this priority stage.

Mr. Chairman, I am not attempting to tell the hon. member that we will build these

highways in 1967 or any precise year, but the projections are divided into three stages. The first would be in a five- to seven-year period. Planning of the eventual freeway from Ottawa to the Quebec border is now in the planning stages. We will be on with some functional planning very shortly. In due course we will get on with property acquisition. It takes a fair amount of time, from the time we decide to build a road of these dimensions, or these characteristics or proportions, before it becomes an accomplished fact.

I want to assure you, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. members of the House, that implementation of the priority stages of the recommendations in the Ottawa area transportation study plan, are well advanced and under way.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, now that the hon. member for Ottawa East has asked for some comments from members from eastern Ontario, I think that I can consider myself as a member from eastern Ontario, representing the riding of Kingston and the Islands. I think he should have been a little bit more specific in saying what part of eastern Ontario he was talking about, because as far as Kingston is concerned, I have heard nothing but kind words and comments on the highway system, particularly as it goes from Kingston through to Toronto. I would like to assure the House here, that the people of Kingston are very appreciative of this highway, that enables us to go from Kingston to Toronto in not more than 2½ or 2¾ hours.

Mr. Bryden: What about those who want to go to Ottawa?

Mr. Apps: In addition to that, I would like to point out that there are about five different routes you can take from Toronto to Ottawa. You can go up Highway 35, to Peterborough, through to Ottawa on No. 7. You can go up from Belleville, through Tweed to 7 to go to Ottawa. You can go to Kingston, up 15, through Smiths Falls to Ottawa. You can go from Prescott to Ottawa and from Morrisburgh to Ottawa. The problem is not in getting to Ottawa, it is when you get into Ottawa that you have problems in driving.

I hesitate to get up in connection with The Department of Highways, because as far as I am concerned, I can say nothing but good things about the department, and every time you say that, of course, the hon. members on the opposing side get up and say, ha ha, you are looking for something more when you do that.

Well, that may be true. Maybe I am look-

ing for something more. I would like to see them improve the highway between Kingston and Ottawa a little bit more, because they did not do a very good job. However, that is beside the point. Of all the departments in this government, I do not know of any that give you more co-operation and help than The Department of Highways.

I have sat here all afternoon and all evening, listening to the Opposition try to pick up little things here and there. They criticize The Department of Highways and it really means very little, because I think they all realize that The Department of Highways is doing an exceptionally fine job. I, for one, representing Kingston and the Islands, would like to congratulate them on the way they are looking after our problems. They are doing an exceptionally good job.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I wonder could I ask the hon. member for Kingston just one question? I would like him to comment on the roads leading to Ottawa from Kingston. Are you satisfied with that kind of highway?

Mr. Apps: I would be very happy to comment on those, because I travel them often and the one I like best is the one from Kingston to Morrisburg to Ottawa, because it is a little more direct, it is not quite as winding. If I am looking for a nice drive in the summertime, I go No. 15, because it is a beautiful drive up there through the vacation area. I would say that those highways—they are not the four-lane highways—can be improved. I am sure, as the hon. Minister has indicated tonight, that in the overall planning those highways will be improved. I dislike hearing people criticize a department which I feel is doing an excellent job, and as far as I am concerned in Kingston, they are doing an excellent job and we are very happy with them.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence (Russell): Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak if I might, on a point of privilege. When I was out of the House a few minutes ago, if I am correct, I understand that the hon. member for Ottawa East reported that I said that the roads in my area were the worst in Ontario. I have just drawn *Hansard* and had a look at the speech I made at that time, and there is no such remark in it whatsoever.

Now, if I might finish my comment, having sat in the House as many of us have, this strikes me as being typical of the Liberal attitude to these estimates. They stand up, wave their arms, use a loud voice and do no research, and in this regard I would like to

compliment the NDP. At least they speak more softly and do some research.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I would have liked the hon. member for Russell to quote some of the things that he said in that speech.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Very well, sir:

Next on the subject of highways it is difficult, sir, for a resident of the Ottawa area to view the superhighway connecting Toronto with Crown Hill, Ontario, and comprehend why there is no such road between Ottawa and Canada's largest city, and between Ottawa and the greatest sources of commerce and tourist dollars in the world, the United States.

Is that a statement that we have the worst roads in Ontario? Now, another interesting thing out of this:

How much money does the Liberal government put into the highways that give access to the national capital, apart from their grants to the trans-Canada?

Now, the second paragraph, for my hon. friend's edification, is a short one, and reads like this:

For example, sir, there is not a single paved road running north to south in my riding, and on this point I want to assure the hon. Prime Minister that it was purely coincidental and without malice aforethought that his visit to my riding last summer included the bouncing, dust and zig-zagging of a route from north to south in Russell.

Does that suggest that we have the worst roads in Ontario, or that I said that we had the worst roads in Ontario? I think the hon. member should retract his statement.

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): He does not need to. You retracted them by reading your statement.

Mr. Chairman: Order.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased that the hon. member for Russell has read this quotation and possibly he accuses us of not making any research. Well, I do not know—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If the *Windsor Star* is read as research, I am prepared to agree with him.

Mr. Racine: Some of the hon. members know how much research we have done on the subject. Anyway that is beside the point.

I would like at this time to comment on another thing, and this is an area where I would like to compliment the hon. Minister and The Department of Highways.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am overwhelmed, I can tell you.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, if I may be allowed, I mean every word of this. I would like to compliment The Department of Highways of Ontario, in conjunction with the federal authorities and the Quebec authorities, for this wonderful realization that has been accomplished in the Ottawa area in the past year.

Now, this new Macdonald-Cartier bridge, I think, is a wonderful bridge. I think it serves the purpose, and there is one thing I would like to point out to the hon. members of this House—this bridge was opened on exactly the date that the engineers and the other people interested said it would be opened, on the very day. I think this is something that perhaps the hon. Minister of Highways and some of his men could do, where they could pinpoint that a certain highway will be constructed or a certain bridge will be constructed and finished on a certain date. I think this very good.

Mr. Chairman, I am just bringing this in here to call the attention of the House to this little dialogue that took place at the time this bridge was being completed. There was a very unfortunate incident regarding the signs that were to be put going on the bridge or on the access roads to the bridge.

Because of the fact that many of the people using these commodities come from the province of Quebec or the people who live near the bridge are mostly French-speaking, there was the question of bilingual signs to be installed.

Apparently there was a lot of correspondence, a lot of phone calls and, if you would permit me I will read this statement that was made at the time, and I am quoting from the *Ottawa Journal*. By the way, this is a paper that is more often supporting the people on the other side of the House than it is supporting people on this side. I will read what is marked here regarding a statement by the hon. Minister of Highways:

He said that there were statutory limitations to the erection of such signs—

and I am referring to bilingual signs:

But we are not prepared to let technicalities stand in the way if the other two

parties to the agreement are in favour of such signs.

It would seem that one of the reasons was that the statutes of the province did not permit the use of bilingual signs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at this time that in many jurisdictions—even in the United States; in the state of New York for instance—there are many bilingual signs all along the highways—

Mr. A. B. R. Lawrence: Mr. Chairman, might I point out that this comes under the estimates of The Department of Transport and has nothing to do with The Department of Highways at all?

Mr. Chairman: Under those conditions, I declare the member completely out of order.

Mr. Racine: Under what conditions, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: The fact that the matter of signs should come under The Department of Transport and not—

Mr. Racine: Pardon me, Mr. Chairman—

Mr. Chairman: The matter of signs—at least I see nothing pertaining to signs in vote 807.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If I may say for the satisfaction of the hon. member, the statutory reference that I made in the article from which he has just quoted had reference to The Highway Traffic Act. There is nothing about The Highway Traffic Act associated with the estimates that are before the House tonight.

Mr. Singer: He is talking about signs.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: These are regulatory signs.

Mr. Singer: He is talking about all kinds of signs.

Mr. Thompson: Who puts them up?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We put them up. But the reference to the matter of the statute is completely out of order.

Mr. Singer: But the hon. Minister said he was not going to pay any attention to the statutes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: While I am on my feet I will tell the hon. member why, if the hon. member will concede the floor for

one minute. He could have followed up because I think that article says why.

The point is that the bridge was built by the federal government, the government of the province of Quebec and the government of the province of Ontario. Upon completion, it passed to the control of the city of Ottawa, which has no such restrictions. For the sake of a day or two or three, it seems silly to let this particular statutory consideration hold it up. This is the purpose of the decision that was made and we thought it was quite sensible.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I have a question with regard to Highway 18 construction. I note in the estimates that the proposed structure that was to be built at Amherstburg over a railway has been deleted from the book this year. Since the estimates of last year I have had the pleasure of working with some of the hon. Minister's highway officials in acquiring lands for the widening of Highway 18 in my riding, and I just wonder if the hon. Minister will be doing work in this area at a later date in this year.

Further, in the matter of the riding of the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich (Mr. Thrasher), the Turkey Creek bridge I notice is under way according to the estimates. The people in my riding utilize this road a great deal and have had correspondence with the department's district engineer complaining about the condition of the road in this particular riding. Apparently from the correspondence there is an indication from the department that nothing will be done on this route until late next year, and I just wonder if this work could be speeded up?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, the hon. member is quite right, there is nothing shown in the capital construction vote. I will make the complete information available about the programme on Highway 18, both for the hon. member for Essex South and the hon. member for Windsor-Sandwich.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Chairman, under this vote I have three or four questions.

The first one is regarding the reconstruction of Highway 63, including the construction of an overpass at the ONR crossing. Would the hon. Minister inform the House whether they have obtained the necessary properties to go ahead with construction this year, if the engineering drawings are completed and if construction will begin and be completed in this year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Does the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, have reference to the area from the North Bay city limits easterly, including the Ontario Northland railroad overhead, half a mile east of the city limits? Is that the matter?

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If the hon. member will look at page 73 in the programme, he will find this is programmed for construction. I think I could safely assure the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be programmed unless we had these matters resolved and could see our way clear to get on with it. If there were any difficulties such as the hon. member suggests, we would have been reluctant to programme it and put it in the printed programme. It is at the top of page 73.

Mr. Smith: I know it is in the programme, but would the hon. Minister guarantee or would he say that this will be completed this year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: We certainly propose to start it and complete it if at all possible. It is going to be the subject of an early tender call and award so we would hope this would be finished during the upcoming construction season; yes, that is correct.

Mr. Smith: I have another question, Mr. Chairman. It is in regard to the Huntsville district construction projects under Highway 11. I note that there is a paving and grading and drainage of 4.4 miles north of Severn bridge to the Cache Lake road. I would ask whether this is construction of a four-lane highway or is it two-lane. I would say that at the rate of 4.4 miles, if it is a four-lane, it will take another 25 years to reach North Bay. Since it has taken 15 years to get from Toronto to Orillia, it will take 40 years then to construct 220 miles of highway.

I think the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville pointed out earlier that 401 was being built at the rate of 27 miles per year. I would like to know if we could have the construction of Highways 400 and 11 to four-lane status brought to the same extent of construction as Highway 401.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The hon. member is making reference to Highway 11, of course. It has been stated a number of times, and publicly—I think in the North Bay press—that we certainly propose to widen Highway 11 as rapidly as the traffic demands warrant it.

Whether the House agrees with it, or not, we do have certain rules that dictate to us the extent to which highways require four lanes rather than two lanes, and we are keeping pace with this. As the average annual daily traffic approaches the figures that warrant four lanes, we are building four lanes and we are right on schedule with it, but there are sections of Highway 11 as you proceed northerly, where the volume of traffic simply does not warrant four lanes. We have assured the people of North Bay that this is a continuing programme and that as the traffic volume increases, the extra-lane programme will take place.

Mr. Smith: I would suggest to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that traffic volumes will not increase if traffic is stopped at the end of the four-lane highway, which is at present past Orillia at Severn bridge. If he would experience the congestion that is caused there during the summer months, I think he would understand why traffic does not go any farther. I would suggest that The Department of Highways should look forward to opening up areas rather than waiting until the need exists for some time.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, I did ask a question of the hon. Minister concerning the Queensway and I understood that he was to make a statement on it. Am I right?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I told the hon. member that I would get the information for him and either give it to him during the course of the estimates or submit it to him in writing, which is a practice we have followed with some success over the years and which is quite acceptable and satisfactory to many hon. members. I will undertake to do it, if I have the information made available to me, to present it to the hon. member before the estimates are completed. If not, I will submit it to him in writing.

Mr. Racine: Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this point, I have a quotation from the *Ottawa Journal*. I always seem to have a quotation from a Tory paper, I do not know why. There is a statement by Mr. Fogarty, who is a member of the board of control at Ottawa, saying that the board of control should have some kind of authority to keep the Queensway free of obstacles. I quote from the article:

The controller, Mr. Fogarty, pointed out that Highway 401 in Toronto is supervised by the provincial highways department, while here the city is responsible for Queensway supervision.

I do not ask the hon. Minister to give me an answer on this right away, but perhaps when he is giving an answer on the entire Queensway he could think of this statement here.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will be glad to.

Mr. Paterson: Are we ready to move on to subsection 2, Mr. Chairman? Is subsection 1 completed?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, my question deals with subsection 1 and that is on the subject of overruns. Has the department been involved in many contracts in which there were overruns in the past year?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Would the hon. member like to explain what he means by overruns?

Mr. Newman: I am using a term that I get from the department itself where the contract was for x number of dollars, but would ultimately cost more than they originally tendered for and, as a result, were given an extension on their contract.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Perhaps I should explain it this way to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. The contract procedures that the department employs now are largely based on unit prices; they are not lump sum contracts. The quantities are laid out in terms of estimates in the contract documents—

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, would the hon. Minister explain this unit price?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Let me say that a unit is a kind of gravel—a granular material, if you wish—

Mr. Newman: The hon. Minister has illustrated it; I understand now and I did not before.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: All right. Now these are the component parts of the road.

In 1964, the increase or decrease in quantities—the overruns or underruns, and I would have to look at them both—amounted to 2.4 per cent. This is because of the practical impossibility of being exact—road building is not an exact science. You cannot positively determine what is below the surface of the ground where a road is going to be built. We would characterize this as very accurate estimating and forecasting. As a matter of fact, going back to 1960, it was 2.8 per cent; in 1961 it was 1.5 per cent; in 1962 it was 1.3 per cent, in 1963 it was 1.8, and in 1964 it was 2.4 per cent—either below the estimate or

above it by those amounts. That is the difference in the total amounts of the actual finished work versus the amount of the contract awards. This is regarded as very close.

Mr. Newman: I am satisfied with the answer, Mr. Chairman.

An hon. member: I am glad you are satisfied with the answer.

Mr. Newman: If I do not ask the questions, Mr. Chairman, I will not know. I am willing to ask questions at all times; that is why I was sent here. I am very pleased that the hon. Minister is just as co-operative in answering the questions. It may hurt some of the hon. members who are disinterested, but the hon. Minister and I are still interested.

What is the status, Mr. Chairman, of the Highbury avenue link from St. Thomas to Highway 401?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The status of the Highbury link is simply this, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I will say that this was also categorized as high priority in the London area transportation study presentation. It is a matter that we have regarded with some priority for quite a long period of time. I would point out that the matter of finding an alignment from Highway 401 southerly is, at present, a bit of a problem. There are two tentative alignments which we are examining very carefully to determine the extent of property damage that may be involved if we pursue one rather than the other.

The city of St. Thomas presently has a transportation study under way that we hope will be completed some time in the current year. It is very important to us to know what that transportation study recommends, because it will have a material bearing on the precise point at which the Highbury extension should connect with the St. Thomas bypass.

I think the hon. member will be quite aware of the fact that the transportation patterns that the St. Thomas transportation study recommends could be quite seriously affected if the junction point of the Highbury extension with the St. Thomas bypass was not done properly.

These are matters that we hope to resolve in the not-too-distant future. When they are resolved, we will not only get on with the Highbury extension but we will get on with the St. Thomas bypass.

There is another matter affecting this whole area and the decisions involved and that, of course, is the impending location of

the Ford plant complex in that area. It is going to generate a tremendous amount of traffic and I think the hon. member will be quite aware of that.

So all these things, I think he will agree, will have to be reviewed carefully and thoroughly so that the job is done to the best advantage of the area and the travelling public that will use it. These are matters that are under close consideration at the moment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, has the fact that the Ford plant will go into Talbotville changed the studies substantially?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I cannot answer the hon. member as to the extent that it has changed the St. Thomas transportation study, but it is bound to have changed it to some extent. Access to the plant at Talbotville is an important matter. I think the street patterns in the city of St. Thomas that will affect easy access to the Ford plant for those workers who will be moving between the city and the plant itself are very important. I think it is bound to be affecting it. It certainly is going to have a bearing on our locations and alignments and connections in the area because the plant has to be serviced. It is expected that there will be a very tremendous volume of people from London and the entire surrounding community, moving to and from this plant in the course of their employment, so that when you contemplate a traffic-generating complex like this, I would hope that the hon. member will agree that it is important to review this in some detail and be sure, rather than sorry a little later on.

Mr. Newman: I am glad to hear the remarks of the hon. Minister, because the people in the St. Thomas area are quite concerned and have, in fact, contacted me concerning Highbury avenue itself. I really do not understand why they asked me to ask the question, but they did.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask the hon. Minister—he has been very co-operative with me—as to the status of the St. Clair parkway or the Bluewater highway that had originally been proposed back in 1930 by the Hon. Paul Poisson, the Conservative member of Parliament for Essex North? What is the status today, 35 years later?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Never mind the references to the 35 years previous. I do not think that these are too important because we have moved into this brand-new field. I will

tell the hon. member that the status is simply this: In the matter of the next few days—or weeks, at the most—I hope to introduce a bill into this House that will be entitled, An Act to establish the St. Clair parks commission. This will give authority to a commission established for that purpose to do all those things that are necessary to acquire land, control development, control construction and build and maintain roads—all those things that go toward the development of the kind of parkway that we hope that will be. I frankly think that this is going to be a piece of model legislation, Mr. Chairman, and I am very glad that the hon. member made mention of it. It is not only going to enable the department, in partnership with the municipalities and the people of Lambton, Sarnia, Kent and all the townships in between—the city of Chatham—to jointly undertake the development of what might well turn out to be one of the best park areas, not only in Canada, but on this continent.

There is nothing to compare with the beauty of the St. Clair river. We hope to develop this parkway to preserve it and to make it possible, Mr. Chairman, I will say to the hon. member that we will build Highway 40 on a new alignment east of the parkway to carry the rapidly increasing volume of industrial and commercial traffic between Wallaceburg and Sarnia, Chatham and Wallaceburg and Sarnia. In this manner we will be able to preserve the existing facilities for parks purposes.

I suggest that with the tremendous co-operation, and the great amount of interest shown by the people of the counties of Lambton and Kent, the city of Sarnia, the village of Point Edward, the town of Wallaceburg and all those communities; the tremendous enthusiasm and complete co-operation we have had from all those people from the time the concept was first proposed has made this all possible.

I point out further to the hon. member, that I regard this as a piece of model legislation. We have been working on it for quite some time with the representative people from that area—the committee that was established when the matter was first considered. I will be surprised if this piece of legislation does not make it possible to do this very same thing elsewhere in the province as a partnership venture, Mr. Chairman.

I say to the hon. member this involves the interest of everybody in the community and this is the way we are going to get these things done. We can do so much more when we work together, when the local people are prepared and interested and

enthusiastic enough to work with us for that purpose.

I am very glad that this question was asked because it is something that I have my heart in, and I am very enthusiastic about it. I think it presages a great future for that area of the province and many other areas of the province.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Newman: I thank the hon. Minister for his complete outline of the proposed St. Clair parkway. I had requests from people in both Wallaceburg and Sarnia to ask these questions so that they would get it firsthand from the horse's mouth.

Mr. Apps: Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister does not very often exaggerate, but I am afraid in his last remarks he exaggerated a little bit when he said that there was nothing more beautiful than the St. Clair river. I would like to point out to him that when he comes down to Kingston and goes over the bridge we are going to build down there and looks down the wide expanse of the St. Lawrence river to the Thousand Islands, he will realize that that is the most beautiful area in the world.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Mr. Chairman, I am very interested in the remarks that have taken place with respect to the St. Clair parkway areas, and I agree heartily with everything that the hon. Minister of Highways has said, in spite of the remarks of my good friend from Kingston and the Islands. I was so pleased to hear the way this whole thing was expressed by the hon. Minister of Highways; he did it much better than I could possibly do it and I have no intention of repeating what he said.

But I might suggest to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that if he would ask the people from the Wallaceburg area and the people from Sarnia, who, he suggests, asked him to ask these questions, if they would just try to keep up with the local press, they would find that it has been filled with parkway for the last few years. Had they done anything at all in an effort to get this into their own minds, they could have done it right at home without having to take such a weak method of finding out anything through the hon. member.

I may say that this hon. member could have found all this out—

Mr. Chairman: On vote 807, please.

Mr. Knox: I want to say that prior to 807, I had already given this information in the

motion to adopt the Speech from the Throne to such an extent that the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. Boyer) said that he supposed we were going to hear this ad nauseum. It is there, although not as well put as the hon. Minister said it—and I am happy that he did say it—but it is there if the hon. member wants to do a little research.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have been involved in this St. Clair parkway system for some eight years through the southwestern Ontario chambers of commerce, and I am quite shocked the hon. Minister did not make any reference to Essex county in his remarks. Essex county has been one of the prime movers in this concept with the thought that the parkway extend around Lake St. Clair, through Windsor, along the Detroit river and end up following the shores of Lake Erie at Rondeau park. I hope that the hon. Minister has not ceased his thinking on this matter, and that the road will terminate at the city of Chatham. I am sure that it would be a disappointment to a great number of area officials.

The hon. member for Kingston has spoken a great deal on highways, and I have before me a brief concerning the proposed Quinte parkway. I had thought this would be introduced under "Planning and Design" and other matters, and I wonder if that should be discussed at this point.

Now I want to say something on development roads, if I may.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say, Mr. Chairman, that we should stay strictly in order. If you are going to be out of order now, the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville, myself and the hon. member for Lambton West have also been out of order, so you might as well pursue it.

Mr. Paterson: Well, briefly, I have two or three quick questions regarding development roads. At this late hour I would like to toss a bouquet to the hon. Minister and thank him on behalf of the residents of Essex South for the development road between the counties of Essex and Kent. I might say our other exit roads are in such bad condition. This is the only passable one at the present time.

A letter crossed my desk this past weekend in regard to a meeting with the township of Colchester North who were seeking a development road in that area and as yet they have not had a reply from your office, sir. I hope your people will make a note of this. You will recall the discussions in that regard.

The other point is in regard to Point Pelee national park. Now there are some 800,000 people utilize this service every year, and I just wonder in your planning, in conjunction with, say, Highway 77, if there has been any thought of a development road to help the access into this national park. Has there been any consideration given to this?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I think I have to be frank enough to say no, there has not. With respect to Colchester North, I think maybe the answer I should give to the hon. member is that when he was visiting in the office about this, we indicated we would undertake the customary appraisal. It is a little difficult to do these appraisals during the wintertime,

Mr. Paterson: Not in Essex County.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, in any case, I can only assume that the work of appraisal has not been completed, and when this is done we will see if the warrants are met and certainly let the hon. member know.

Mr. W. D. McKeough (Kent West): Mr. Chairman, could I just revert for a minute? I did not realize we were on the subject of the St. Clair parkway and I think it would be in order if we tried to finish that subject before we proceed.

Mr. Chairman: Is this member finished?

Mr. Paterson: If it is agreeable, I would like to speak on the Quinte parkway, if I might, at a later date.

Mr. McKeough: I wanted to revert to that subject. I was interested to hear the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville and he seemed to be introducing a lot of places outside of Windsor-Walkerville tonight. He was saying that there were people from St. Thomas in Elgin county who were consulting him and asking him questions. There is an Ontario hospital there and I suppose perhaps some of the people in the hospital might have been writing him. Then he mentioned Wallaceburg—

Mr. Singer: Oh, you are funny tonight.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. McKeough: I really find it very hard to believe that any of the good people of Wallaceburg were writing to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville on this subject.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. McKeough: But the hon. member for Essex South did make a point that I want to follow up on. He always makes good points, but I do want to follow up on one point that he made. He said that he had been working on this in conjunction with the southwestern Ontario chamber of commerce for some eight years. I think probably this is true and I think it has been talked about, really, for 20 or 25 years.

There was at one time talk about a road of roses and the late mayor of Wallaceburg had something to do with it, along with others, and many people from Sarnia. But I just want to put this on the record, Mr. Chairman, and that is that about a year and a half ago this idea was taken up again, in particular by the hon. member for Lambton West and with the full support of the hon. Minister of Highways. This project has moved right ahead and if there are two people in this province who deserve the support and gratitude of the people of southwestern Ontario for what they are doing as far as the St. Clair parkway is concerned, they are the hon. member for Lambton

West and the hon. Minister of Highways, and that should go on the record of this House.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves that the committee rise and report progress and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report progress and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Wednesday, we will proceed with the Throne debate and on Thursday we will continue with estimates.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.30 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Wednesday, March 9, 1966

Resumption of the debate on the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Bukator, Mr. Root, Mr. Spence, Mr. S. Lewis	1325
Motion to adjourn debate, Mr. Eagleson, agreed to	1354
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Rowntree, agreed to	1354

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are always pleased to welcome guests to the Legislature and today we welcome in the west gallery, a group of new Canadians from the adult training centre, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have one question for the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), but in his absence I presume I had better hold it until tomorrow.

My second question is to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall), who is also absent, so I find myself speechless.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the member could read his questions and then the Ministers could take them as notice and give the answers tomorrow or the next day when they are in the House.

Mr. MacDonald: I am glad to note on what unsubstantive issues I can get applause in this House, Mr. Speaker.

My question to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development was as follows: Would the hon. Minister explain how spiralling construction costs alone warrant an increase of a million dollars in the construction of Ontario's pavilion for Expo '67?

And my question to the hon. Prime Minister was, in view of the statement made yesterday by Mr. Albert Shepherd, QC, counsel for the Hughes Royal commission, that loans and other matters related to British Mortgage and Trust Company would be dealt with separately from evidence related to the Atlantic Acceptance, would the hon. Prime Minister consider at this point establishing a separate inquiry into the operation of British Mortgage and Trust which led to last year's crisis and the takeover by Victoria and Grey?

Mr. Speaker: The Minister of Mines has a short statement.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I have an optimistic item that the hon. members will be pleased with. Mr. James Parlee, vice-president in charge of Canadian operations for the International Nickel Company, has advised me that they are going to start immediately to sink a shaft 1,050 feet deep on their property at Lake Shebandowan in the Fort William-Port Arthur area. This shaft will be for the purpose of further exploration underground.

If indications prove satisfactory it will mean a new nickel mine in that area. However, no decision regarding this can be made until further exploration has been carried out underground. It is my hope, naturally, along with the rest of the hon. members of this House, that it will prove successful.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The first order. Resuming the adjourned debate on the amendment to the amendment to the motion for an address in reply to the speech from the Honourable the Lieutenant-Governor at the opening of the session.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Mr. Speaker, when I adjourned the Throne debate last Friday afternoon, I was speaking on the problems of the Niagara parks commission employees. I said then that I had a bit more to say on the subject, so I would like to start where I left off.

I believe this newspaper clipping of the city of Niagara Falls sums up the picture much better than I can, so I am going to read some portions of this account to you, by one Louis Gregoroff:

PARK EMPLOYEES SEEK BETTER DEAL

The nation's second largest union has thrown its support behind 250 employees of the Niagara parks commission in a campaign aimed at getting full collective bargaining rights for the parks system

personnel. The national president of the Canadian union of public employees, Stanley Little, made the disclosure in an interview following a mass meeting of Niagara parks commission employees Friday night. CUPE's 94,000 members rank second in the country behind the steelworkers' union. These were the developments of last night's meeting held at the Canadian corps unit 104 club house. CUPE has offered full-time support to the Niagara parks commission employees in a full bid to have them removed from the anti-bargaining provisions of the present Crown agents legislation.

Two CUPE-sponsored demonstrations backing that position are being staged today at the Ontario Legislature at Queen's Park.

I would like to interject at this time, on behalf of these people who have come here to make their feelings known to the legislators of this province, who have come here in such a large number to let you know that they are not satisfied with the conditions under which these people have to work. I commend them for their action. I will continue to read from this account:

A large number of the Niagara parks commission employees have resigned from the Ontario civil service association in protest over the lack of assistance from the organization. The park employees indicated they will not negotiate any contract terms amounting to less than the labour rates comparable to that paid to civil employees.

The park systems labour rate currently is 65 cents an hour behind the latter. Mr. Little, who appeared before the meeting held, with Arthur Ridley, St. Catharines CUPE representative, told the *Review* the session had been intended to explore the possibility of collective bargaining. The meeting however went into all aspects of working conditions for the Niagara parks commission employees.

Park systems employees had joined the Ontario civil service association because they could not form a union. However they were dealing under legislative provisions which are stacked on the employers' side of the books. The CUPE president said the biggest problem is that they are employees of a Crown agency which excludes them from the terms of The Ontario Labour Relations Act. The fault lay in the wording of the statute which classified them as Crown agents.

Mr. Little explained it this way: "They are technically in the service of the Queen,

just like the army. So again technically speaking they cannot bargain with the Queen for a decent contract and working conditions."

These people, through the study interpretation, are therefore neither fish nor fowl when it comes to collective bargaining, he added. They belong to the Ontario civil service association but the parks commission does not recognize them on the basis of their being Crown agents. An undetermined number of Niagara parks commission employees have withdrawn from the Niagara parks commission branch of the civil service group in protest.

"We belonged to this association for eight years but we are paying for something and not getting the service," one Niagara parks commission employee stated.

"So we have promised our full support in this campaign to get them full bargaining rights," Mr. Little said.

"It is criminal that any civil servant should not have full rights to collective bargaining in this country."

The Niagara parks pay scale and other benefits were low in comparison to similar jobs in Niagara Falls outside of the parks system, Mr. Little continued. There is 65 cents an hour difference between them and civil employees, and the parks' \$1.60 labour rate is 81 cents an hour behind that of the St. Catharines civic employees.

I think that is almost enough, except the last two paragraphs, which I think are most fitting. They read:

One Niagara parks commission employee said local school janitors can earn \$5,400 a year, but there is nobody in the parks system who is paid that much.

Another man said, high ranking officers on the Niagara parks police force were not being paid as much as the city police or OPP constables.

Both men, as in the case of the comments made by a third NPC employee, requested that they not be identified for fear of reprisals.

For many years, employees of the parks system have come to me and asked me to speak on their behalf and they have said on occasion that they do not want to identify themselves for fear that they might lose their jobs—and they are good jobs, steady for the 250, except for summertime employees—but they would like better conditions under which to work.

As I mentioned here last week they pile up overtime credits for which they do not

get paid. They work holidays; they work evenings and they take the time off at the convenience of the commission or of the administrator.

I have before me a note from the president of that group. He addressed it to me, and it reads as follows:

Enclosed you will find a list of some of the wages and conditions that prevail in the Niagara parks commission. I hope that this information will be of some value to you. I am sure that the employees of the Niagara parks commission will appreciate anything that you can do.

It is signed Cliff Anderson. I will read the enclosure to hon. members:

The Niagara parks police department is the lowest paid department in Welland county. Members of the force are subject to the same qualifying restrictions of the Ontario provincial police; they must pass the same exams, attend the same training course; but receive far lower salaries. The pay differential between ranks is also much lower. Other departments receive a monthly service pay and dry cleaning, but park police do not.

Permanent employees of the service department cannot have any vacation from the month of May until Labour Day unless they get permission from the general manager. Lunch time is set at one-half hour and sometimes the help have to take less if the building is busy.

I can understand that as they have quarters where a lot of tourists come in and they take a little less time because they want to help their fellow workers:

Labourers' and truck drivers' wages are lower than in other cities in Welland and Lincoln counties. Overtime that is worked is not paid for, but the employees have to take the time off when it suits the commission. No extra time is given if the employee works on a holiday. Parks employees do not get time and one-half for working overtime as other workers in Ontario get.

In general, wages and working conditions in the Niagara parks commission are not as good as they could be. The labour rate again is \$1.60, and the truck drivers get \$2.35.

I mentioned to this House last Friday that this is an obsolete method of paying employees. There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when perhaps the employees of the parks wanted the time off in the winter months when they were not too busy and they piled up

their hours and took them off then. I have since checked about the police department and I find that three of their best officers have quit in the last couple of months because they did not care to work for the low pay and other jobs paid them better. They liked their work in the parks; they were good public relations men doing an excellent job. They have many millions of people to contend with, they assist that area and they do an exceptionally good job.

I am proud of the day I sat in the park in my car when an officer stepped out before me. There was a lot of traffic and I was a little upset, wondering why he would stop me—of all people. I thought that he knew me better than that, and knowing I was always busy working for the public of that area—

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Bukator: The man stopped me and I was a little upset. Then I noticed an elderly couple who had to get across in that traffic and this officer helped them across. This is one of the many services rendered to the people of that area with which I happen to be very pleased.

They have not been treated the way they ought to be; they are not being paid the amount of money they ought to get and therefore they are leaving that particular service.

I am very sorry that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Morningstar) is not here, because he has been appointed to a vacancy on the Niagara parks commission. I do believe that the gentleman is a man who looks out for the working people—I have always had him branded as 'such'—and I know he understands their problems and I am sure that of all commissioners this man will bring it to the attention of the commission, hoping that they will treat their employees the way they ought to be treated, except that it seems that there is a difference of opinion and the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) could very simply clear this situation up. These men have no right to bargain for their rights; they have no right to bargain for their wages; they cannot speak for themselves and there is no particular agency that can do that for them.

Interjection by an hon. member.

Mr. Bukator: I do not know whether the hon. member is making reference to the breeze from this side of the House or not, but if that is what is bothering him he had better

get himself a woollen hat because he is going to hear it often, that breeze will be blowing continuously.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, this is a problem that is most serious; I have known these men for many years and this is the first time that I have ever had any official request from them asking me to speak on their behalf.

The hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) is in his seat at the moment and I am told that these men have to take all of their exams and conduct themselves and pass their exams as any other officer of the province. I believe under The Niagara Parks Commission Act, hon. members will find they are called "guards and caretakers" and not official policemen of that particular department. Hon. members will find that on the side of their cars they have "Niagara Parks Police."

On this particular matter I stand to be corrected, but I think hon. members will find they are not called policemen, they are called guards and caretakers. And it is about time that particular problem was remedied.

I think when I finished last Friday I had only one other subject that I wanted to touch on. I have from time to time covered the waterfront and tried to take on as many departments of the government as I could, pertaining to the many problems of Niagara Falls, of that riding. Now I am going to branch out into the province after these many years and touch on a subject that I touched on lightly last year.

There seems to be a section of The Labour Relations Act, section 89, that civic employees are not too happy with. I might say that an hon. member of the New Democratic Party had a bill last year pertaining to that which our party supported. I understand the bill is coming up in another day or two from the same hon. member, dealing with this very serious problem that affects the employees of municipalities, and my hon. leader (Mr. Thompson) informs me that we have had a bill as well. Now, sir, we as members of the Opposition did not get any more attention to this bill than we have up to the moment, with the hon. Minister of Labour carrying on his bit of a conversation there with the hon. Minister of Mines (Mr. Wardrobe) who drove his shaft down 1,000 feet—and who knows, this time he might strike his diamonds.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Is the hon. member objecting to me speaking to the hon. Minister of Mines?

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, this is a good point that the hon. Minister of Labour brought to our attention. He asked do I object.

I believe a member in this House, whether he be a member of the Opposition, a backbencher, or whatever he might be, should get some courtesy and a little bit of attention from the front benches. I do believe these hon. men should listen to our pleas, our problems and perhaps do something about it instead of reading their papers and carrying on their friendly little conversations among themselves.

Yes, I do object.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Just so the record will be straight, he says "front benches"—

Mr. Bukator: And the backbenchers.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: I do not know that he is speaking for the front benches in his party, but I was not reading any newspaper and I go over *Hansard*, paragraph and sentence by sentence to look at what people on the other side say. I am very much interested in what the hon. members say, but I do not think the hon. member's oblique remarks make any headway or do him any credit.

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, I stand censored or corrected and I do not feel that I am out of order at all. I said it before and I say it again.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member is speaking entirely against the conduct of his hon. leader who interrupts regularly and reads newspapers all day long, including the hon. member for Grey North (Mr. Sargent).

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order—

Mr. Speaker: Order! Please be seated. There are going to be no more interruptions while the member for Niagara Falls has the floor. The member is making a Throne debate speech and it is not a time for interjections and a debate among interjectionists.

The member for Niagara Falls will continue with his speech.

Mr. Thompson: Well, I hope you are referring to the House leader and his erroneous interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I am referring to all hon. members who are interjecting at this stage.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Including the House leader.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bukator: Mr. Speaker, I enjoy this very much. I was trying to get the attention of the hon. Minister of Labour and if I have done nothing else I have done that. He is now talking to me and since he said that he reads *Hansard* very thoroughly, I would like to refer him to some sections of *Hansard* of last year that I read, pertaining to this very section, that he might look at again.

I would like to read from my comments of a year ago.

I am reminded of the opportunity which the government has wasted of not removing the prejudicial section of The Labour Relations Act only last year when the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer)—

and that was my hon. colleague:

criticized the government for failing to remove section—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: He is not here today.

Mr. Thompson: He is looking after his constituents. I notice some of the people opposite are not here.

Mr. Speaker: Order!

Mr. Bukator: This is a comment from *Hansard* that I was reading to the hon. Minister that I may refresh his memory if he skipped over this lightly and did not do a thing about it. So I come back to that particular section of *Hansard*, I made the statement last year, and I am quite pleased with it as a matter of fact. It did not get to first base then, I hope perhaps we can do a little better with it this year:

When the hon. member for Downsview (Mr. Singer) criticized the government for failing to remove section 89.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member should put his sentences just a little differently about what he has thought and the way he puts his verbs and so on, because he does not know yet what is going to be in the legislation.

And that was a year ago. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, we do not know yet what is going to be in the legislation. And this comes from the hon. Minister himself.

I would think that with the pressure that has been put on him—not pressure, no; the reasoning and the sense that has been made by the civic employees up to this day—

he would have done something about this section. Here are a group of people, many thousands of them, being discriminated against simply because the hon. Minister is too busy doing other things.

Interjections by hon. members.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member does not know what the section means.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Speaker, surely the hon. member for Niagara Falls can continue his speech without so many interjections.

Mr. Bukator: Let me tell the hon. Minister that I do know what that section means, let me tell him that municipal and civic employees—

Mr. Speaker: Order! The member will speak to the chair.

Mr. Bukator: Through the chair to the hon. Minister, I know all about that section, Mr. Speaker. Through the chair, this hon. Minister has come short of the mark. Civic employees who have a right to bargain cannot bargain for themselves through their local councils because this section deprives them of that privilege. It is as simple as that.

Mr. MacDonald: How about that Liberal mayor down in St. Thomas? He did the same thing two years ago.

Mr. Bukator: Thank God that we have the odd Liberal that is wrong too, because I would be so proud of the fact that I am a Liberal that you could not put up with me. We make mistakes from time to time and we come short of the mark, but I can assure hon. members that on this issue we do not come quite as short of the mark as the hon. Minister of Labour does. Thousands of people have been walking up and down here in front of this Parliament building, and I might say in a very orderly manner, to tell this government that they are not satisfied with the treatment—not that they are getting, but the treatment they are not getting.

Mr. J. R. Knox (Lambton West): Thousands?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, thousands, that is right, you count them daily. As a matter of fact I might read a little bit more of the local paper which does not kid anybody. We have a *Review* that when they print something it is really printed and it is accurate. I will come to that a little later, I thought I would wind up with that particular section.

By the way, if the hon. Minister does not know where I found that, that is in *Hansard*, February 13, 1964. When he reads this very thoroughly he can go back to that again.

We have now seen what the government has in mind. Sixteen months later I arise to speak again on the same section, section 89—

This was from my colleague, the hon. member for Downsview who apparently is not here.

The argument is still the same as my colleague commented a year ago, and now this is two years ago.

I would have hoped that this government would have been sufficiently interested to allow municipal employees to bargain the same as any other employee. This is not a new problem of a new law but perhaps a practical illustration of its effects might highlight the need for reforms.

In the January, 1965, issue of the *Ontario Hydro Employees Union News*, which is published by the Ontario Hydro employees union, local 1000, Canadian union of public employees, CLC, there is a lead story under the banner headline: "Kirk family compact use labour Act to banish the CUPE." I should not have said CUPE. I think I should let you know, Mr. Speaker, that I do know what I am talking about. It is the Canadian union of public employees.

The article tells the story of ten Hydro water utilities workers who lost their struggle for the mere right to join a union. The incident began in the spring of 1964 and I need not read this to the House. I am sure the hon. Minister will get that *Hansard* and read the rest of it. And this has happened several times since.

Just recently a school board has had the same problem. Not too long ago, the village of Crystal Beach sat down and bargained for their employees. They have very few employees in that particular village, but they sat down and bargained with them and it was a three to two vote in favour of forming a union in that village. By the next meeting one of the councillors thought that he was not quite doing the right thing, the village could not afford to pay more, they could not allow these people to bargain for themselves and he made an about-face. So that particular council did not sit down and bargain with their particular employees under The Labour Relations Act, section 89, with which I am not acquainted.

The hon. Minister gave me an opportunity

to let him know that I happen to know some of the things that go on. No one sits here for six or seven consecutive years, Mr. Speaker, without learning something about this government, and on this issue they have not moved. They are condemned—

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: The hon. member is informing me by his own words that he does not know anything about The Labour Relations Act.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Now once again, I am going to ask the members not to interrupt a member who is making a speech. We are not in committee of the whole House and I do not like the House to get into the same sort of question-and-answer type of debate as goes on in committee of the whole. So whenever a member is speaking, if one wishes to interrupt I would ask the member to rise and ask the member speaking if he would permit a question—or a correction. Then if it is allowed he may make whatever remarks he wishes to make.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Mr. Speaker, may I ask through you, of the hon. member, may I ask a question?

Mr. Bukator: Yes, by all means.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree: Did I hear the hon. member right when he said a moment ago that he did not know anything about The Labour Relations Act?

Mr. Bukator: I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, that this was not an isolated incident. The government has seen fit to remove from employees arbitrary rights to prevent the creation of unions. They have allowed the workers to organize in their own self-interests. Yet here, with municipal governments and the municipal board, they leave a huge loophole for the law which is unjustified and which discriminates against a particular class of employee. I said then, I proudly say it now, this was a year ago, and I am still quoting a bit from *Hansard*:

We—

and I meant the Liberal Party:

—heartily concur with the bill put forward by the hon. member for York South and urge its acceptance by this House.

The point that I am trying to make is we in the Opposition on this issue stand wholeheartedly together, both parties, simply be-

cause this government has not fulfilled its obligations to the civic employees.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in this debate, my first words are to commend you, sir, on the way you preside over the proceedings of this House. Your sense of judgment and fair play has made it possible for us to carry on business with dispatch, and while, at times, your task has not been easy, you have always endeavoured to maintain the dignity of this Parliament.

I would like to thank you, sir, and your competent staff, for the many kindnesses and courtesies they have shown to me and to the people I have the honour to represent. May I offer my congratulations to the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) on his appointment as Deputy Speaker, or chairman of the committee of the whole.

Mr. Speaker, I would want to commend the mover and seconder on the contribution they have made to the debates of this House as they moved and seconded the motion to adopt the speech from the Honourable, the Lieutenant-Governor. New hon. members have taken their place in this House, and I am sure they will find the proceedings interesting, and I am sure they will try to make a contribution to provincial affairs.

Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to some of the debates, and read some of the speeches of hon. members who sit to your left, members of the Opposition parties, I find it hard to understand what they are trying to prove by some of their critical remarks. I realize that fair criticism can be helpful in carrying out constructive policies, but sometimes I have a feeling that some of the hon. members are not trying to be constructive. There seems to be some indication that they are criticizing just for the sake of criticizing. Perhaps the lack of constructive criticism is the reason they are to your left, and the government and its supporters fill all of the seats to your right and overflow on to the other side of the House.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes during the debates, you would think that hon. members felt nothing was happening in the province of Ontario under the sound policies that have been pursued by this government and by other Progressive-Conservative governments that have had the responsibility of administering Ontario's affairs since 1943. I would suggest to this House that it might be useful if some of the hon. members, instead of just trying to criticize for the sake of criticizing, were to take a fair look at what has happened

in the province of Ontario under sound policies.

We can look at the tremendous growth and development in all areas of Ontario's economy. Our population has grown from around 4 million at the end of World War II, until today it is approaching the 7-million mark. No other province in Canada, under any government of any political stripe, has come anywhere near to equalling the great influx of people and of industry that has come to Ontario. I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Opposition members, who no doubt would like to secure power, are not right when they suggest that Ontario is not developing under Conservative policies, that the nearly 3 million people who have decided to make Ontario their home are all wrong.

When people establish a new home they assess all the factors, and try to establish their home in the best possible circumstances. I suggest to you, sir, and to this House, the fact that a vast majority—yes, over half of the new Canadians who have come to Canada since the end of World War II—did not come to Ontario by accident. They came here because they knew that the policies that were pursued by this government and by previous Conservative governments were policies that created the climate for a good life.

The same is true of industry. The vast bulk of the industry that has come to Canada, has come to Ontario. It was here they found the favourable climate for industrial development, the climate that was brought about largely by the policies that had been pursued.

We think of the power development policies that have been pursued, keeping available an abundance of cheap power for industry, for business, for farms, and for homes; the constant highway-building programme that has supplied the traffic arteries that made it possible to move goods to and fro in a speedy, efficient and orderly manner; an educational programme that has provided the training for a school population that now numbers approximately 1,750,000.

During the time the general population of the province increased by about 61 per cent, the elementary school enrolment increased by 137 per cent, and the secondary enrolment by 218 per cent. University facilities continue to expand at a rapid rate with government's support. This will enable the universities to cope with an increase of approximately 10,000 students each year through to 1970-71, when the total enrolment is expected to reach 100,000.

Today, employment is at an all-time high in Ontario and unemployment in Ontario is at the lowest figure in Canada—Canada, a land of opportunity.

Under the policies pursued by this government, great benefits have come to the farm people. The power development programme and rural electrification where rural lines were subsidized by the province has made it possible for practically all of our farm people to enjoy the benefits that come from having an abundance of cheap power in their homes and in their farming operations.

Better township roads, county roads, and King's highways, make it easier for farmers to get their products to the greatly expanded markets that have been created by our population growth, as well as by export markets that have been developed through the efforts of the government and the various marketing boards. Ontario has the most advanced marketing legislation in Canada.

To give you some idea of what the overall policies of the government mean to agriculture, Mr. Speaker, let me remind you that the Canadian people consume approximately 80 pounds of beef per capita per year. Our population has grown by close to 3 million new people under the sound policies of the government. Three million new people would create an expanded market for an additional 240 million pounds of beef per year.

What is true regarding beef, is equally true regarding pork, chicken, poultry, eggs, milk, butter, cheese, potatoes, tomatoes, vegetables, fruits, honey, flour and cereals of all kinds. I think we would all agree that the home market, where people use the same kind of currency, where there are no tariff barriers or changes in the value of foreign currency, is the most stable market.

The policies of this government, in addition to making a good way of life for people who live in urban areas, has had a tremendous stabilizing effect on the markets for farm products. Indeed, in some areas agriculture finds it difficult to keep up with expanding consumption of the products we produce.

Mr. Speaker, lest I leave the impression that all is sunshine for the farm people, let me remind you that agriculture is always confronted with problems. For example, and this was particularly true in the past, many farmers found it difficult to secure sufficient amounts of long-term financing, which makes it possible for farmers to carry on through a period when unpredictable things happen.

For example, during 1965, weather conditions were not average. In some parts of my

own riding, because of cool weather and slower rates of evaporation, seeding operations were later than normal. We all remember the cool summer months in 1965. While this weather produced good crops, it delayed the ripening of the crops and many of the farm people found their harvesting operations were under way after the boys on the farm had returned to school.

All of these things slowed down harvesting operations. Indeed, as time went by, the hours in the day when you could harvest became shorter, and then the fall rains came on, and with above-normal precipitation some of the farm people in the area I have the honour to represent were not able to harvest all of their crops. Indeed, some harvested very little.

This has created a serious problem for these farmers, and I can sympathize with them. In my years of farming, my brother and I were hauled out on two occasions, and found that we had gone to all the expense of growing a crop, and then had to turn around and buy grain to feed the livestock because the grain crop had been ruined by this adverse freak of nature.

These are problems that confront our farm people. I know that some farmers feel that the government should compensate for this loss, and I have placed questions and requests before the responsible authorities. However, I must add that the government has and is endeavouring to create conditions that will be helpful under the circumstances I have mentioned. Farm loans have been greatly increased, and the policies of this government have been followed by the federal government. In many cases the two governments work in unison. Today, farmers can borrow more money than farmers dreamed would be available just a few years ago.

In the Throne speech, there was an announcement that a crop insurance scheme is to be worked out predicated on an arrangement being effected with the government of Canada for the amendment of federal crop insurance legislation. The availability of crop insurance in future years should help to solve the problem that was created for many farmers during the past season.

In the northern part of my riding, and in the southern part of the riding of the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver), there is a flat plateau where quite often seeding is delayed due to poor drainage. Again, assistance can be provided for the farmers under The Municipal Drainage Act, where the government subsidizes in a very sub-

stantial way the cost of constructing these drainage systems.

Mr. Speaker, I am wondering whether the farm people in that area might organize and try to develop a system under the ARDA programme, which would bring the federal government into the picture so that even more assistance might be given. These are some of the programmes that are available to help agriculture through difficult periods.

Advancing labour costs, with shorter working weeks create a serious problem in agriculture, since:

1. No one has developed cows that will stop milking over the weekend.

2. Hens will persist in laying eggs regardless of the long or short weekend.

3. The humane society would take action if farmers did not feed their livestock from Friday to Monday morning.

Livestock, dairy and poultry farmers are faced with a seven-day week, not 40 or 48 hours. This is a problem that is making it very difficult for the small farmer, in that his operation is not large enough to stagger his working force.

Mr. Speaker, for a few minutes I want to leave matters that are close to my own riding, and refer to a trip that was arranged by The Department of Lands and Forests for members who were interested in seeing the northwestern and northern parts of our province.

I want to commend the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts) and the officials of his department, for the efficient manner in which that trip was carried out. We were given the opportunity to see a part of Ontario that is waiting for development in the days and years that lie ahead.

I think that one of the evidences of the development that is taking place in the northern and northwestern part of the province was the official opening of the highway between Fort Frances, Atikokan and the head of the lakes. I remember being present the day Premier Frost opened that part of the highway between the head of the lakes and Atikokan, and the minute the axe dropped on the ribbon, signs went up saying, "On to Fort Frances."

I am sure the people of the Fort Frances-Rainy River area are very proud and appreciative of the efforts that have been made through the years by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Noden). The building of the causeway across Rainy Lake and the opening of that highway are but an indica-

tion of the way we in Ontario are rolling back the frontiers and opening up the northern part of our province.

On the trip that we took by air up into the more remote parts of the province we had the opportunity to see the development of tourist operations. We saw mines, pulp and paper operations, mills, and power developments. We saw the end of roads that were pushing north, and then flew farther north into the more remote trading posts and areas.

The afternoon that we stood on the shore of Big Trout lake and looked out over that expanse of water, I could not help but feel that the days would come, and perhaps come much sooner than we expect, when we would see developments coming in that part of our province.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should all pay tribute to what has already been accomplished in those far northern areas by The Department of Lands and Forests, by the Hudson's Bay Company, through health services provided by the government, by the guidance and leadership that has been given by the churches that have sent their missions to these more remote areas.

When we look at an area like Metropolitan Toronto, it is hard to realize that just about 300 years ago the first white men stood on the shores of what later became "Muddy York." Perhaps they had a vision of the day when they would take enough mud out of the basin to make a harbour, when they would drive down piles and build tall buildings.

Men had vision in those days, we have seen the tremendous developments that have taken place in this part of Ontario. I am sure that men of vision will see to it that developments take place in that part of Ontario that we members had the privilege of looking at, on that well-arranged trip planned and carried out by The Department of Lands and Forests.

Dr. Vance, the chairman of the Ontario water resources commission, and I were very happy to be able to take that trip and have a preliminary look at the water resources that lie in that part of the province, resources that no doubt will play a very important part in the future development of Ontario's economy.

When I returned from that trip I hung a map of Canada on the wall and looked at it, and I realized that the most northerly settlement that we visited at Fort Severn is just about in line with Dawson Creek—the starting point for a 1,500-mile highway north that was built by the Americans, known as

the Alaska highway, to serve that part of the United States.

The most northerly tip of Ontario is approximately 700 miles south of the Arctic Circle. I understand the Russians have over 800,000 people living north of the Arctic Circle. The 49th parallel, or the international boundary line, is just a few miles south of Cochrane. When we keep these facts in mind, Mr. Speaker, I think we can realize the importance of turning our eyes northward and endeavouring to develop that part of our province, as well as the more southerly parts.

I realize that there are people who will say that the weather is cold in the winters farther north, and that is true. But it would be equally fair to say that when you go to the southern states, they have tremendous hurricanes that do great damage and cause great loss of life in a few hours. Nature has its way of compensating for things that are not too attractive. In the northern areas we are out of that hurricane belt, and with perhaps a different type of construction, people are able to have a good life.

I want to return to some matters that are causing concern in my own riding. I want to bring these matters to the attention of the House, because I have found through the years that this government is receptive to constructive suggestions. For example, I remember the first speech I made in the House. On that occasion, the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) moved the motion to adopt the Speech from the Throne, and I had the honour of seconding the motion.

In the course of my remarks I made a number of suggestions. I suggested that I thought the time had come when in Ontario we should have a pioneer village to preserve for future generations the story of the development of our province. I felt that this would no doubt be of great value in the education of our young people to the fact that this province was developed without some of the modern facilities that we take for granted today. I felt that the history of this country was of such a nature that it would become a great tourist attraction.

Since that time, many pioneer villages have come into being, museums have been built, and there has been a great upsurge in the restoration of historical sites. I think everyone in this House will agree that these museums, villages and sites have been a great attraction to tourists and a benefit to people who cater to that trade. I am told the tourist trade is estimated to be worth over \$1 billion per year to Ontario's economy.

These developments have given us pride in our own province and country that perhaps we did not have before.

Another suggestion that I made in that speech was that we should be thinking of constructing more farm ponds and water reservoirs. Today almost everyone is talking about water. We, who work on the water resources commission, have fought an uphill battle for ten years to bring pollution under control. When the water resources commission was established, it was suggested that over a 20-year period it would take something like \$2.4 billion to catch up with the backlog of work that needed to be done to provide our growing population with suitable, safe, clean water. We have reached the half-way mark, and we are over the peak.

Today we should spend more time drawing attention to where we have clean water, and in most parts of this province we have just that. I am not suggesting that there are not areas where there is pollution to bring under control, but the programme is well established and well founded, and we can speak of Ontario today as a province that believes in and promotes clean water.

This programme is carried out not only by the water resources commission, but the conservation authorities are establishing many reservoirs to provide clean water for our people. In addition to the reservoirs, we are now on a programme to bring water from the Great Lakes into the dry parts of the province—clean water.

Mr. Speaker, in one of the early speeches I made in the House, I drew to the attention of the government and the House, the fact that the government that was dismissed from office in 1943 had brought five or six highways to the borders of Wellington-Dufferin, and terminated the highways there, spilling the traffic onto the county and municipal road system.

I felt that this was an injustice to the people I had the honour to represent, and I have devoted my efforts to promoting better roads, and more roads, to serve that part of Ontario and to put in the connecting links that would tie these loose ends together and carry the heavy traffic through the area on provincial highways rather than on roads supported by the municipal taxpayer. I must say that much has been done, and I would be remiss in my duty as a member if I did not express to the government my appreciation for what has been accomplished.

At the time I entered the Legislature there were many miles of King's highway on the borders and in my riding that were simple

gravel roads. All of these highways have been built to high standards, and hard surfaced. Practically all of the highways that had a surface have been rebuilt and resurfaced, with the exception of one short piece from Guelph township through Eramosa and the village of Rockwood, and part of that has been rebuilt and resurfaced.

Some 98.45 miles of municipal road has been built or has been designated for pre-engineering for future construction under the development road programme. Connecting links that were left out of the highway system by the government that was turned out in 1943 have been taken into the system in most parts of the riding. This was done by extending Highway 89 from Primrose through Shelburne, Mount Forest and Harriston, down to 23 west of Palmerston, and by extending Highway 25 north from 7 at Acton to 24 at Ospringe.

It is the hope of everyone in the area that Highway 25 can be extended on north through the Orton-Grand Valley area to join Highway 89 between Mount Forest and Shelburne. This would give a shorter, more direct route into the Georgian Bay area for people who may be travelling north from certain parts of southwestern Ontario, and tourists coming in at Fort Erie, Niagara and the Hamilton and Burlington areas.

Mr. Speaker, if this extension of Highway 25 is considered it would not only benefit the tourists from the areas I have mentioned travelling into the Georgian Bay area, but it would be a great stimulus to development through that part of Wellington and Dufferin counties. If you look at a map you will find it would be located approximately halfway between Highways 10 and 6. In other words, a provincial highway would be carrying the heavy traffic that, at the present time, has to travel north and south on the municipal road system. I should point out that there is a distance of some 22 or 23 miles between Highway 10 and Highway 6 at Orangeville and Arthur; that gap widens to approximately 30 miles between Mount Forest and Primrose. I think all hon. members can appreciate that this wide gap should have a provincial highway to relieve the pressure on the municipal road system.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this matter to the attention of the House because many people in Wellington and Dufferin, particularly in Wellington, were concerned when the county carried out a needs survey. Some years ago, in a speech in the House, I pointed out that in the area I had the honour to represent, the percentage of miles that were designated

as King's highways was below the average across the county system in Ontario. The percentage of county roads was above the average, and I suggested that the province should take these factors into consideration and try to make a fair adjustment. These problems have been approached in many ways. In certain townships where the assessment is low and there is a high mileage of township road, provincial grants have been increased by increasing the percentage of grants. Some of the main county roads have been built under the development road programme.

All of these methods of assisting have been greatly appreciated by the municipal taxpayer, but I would be remiss if I did not say that when I came home from the opening of the highway between Atikokan and Fort Frances and found that the engineer had recommended dropping 100 miles of Wellington county's roads, I was most concerned. Within a short time I had received some six petitions from areas in the county that were particularly upset, and one from the county of Dufferin. Mr. Speaker, since the survey had been made by an engineer appointed by the county and the decision was to be made by the county, I had to decide what to do with these petitions, so I had them photo-copied and sent copies to the reeve of the municipality where the petitions originated, to the respective counties, and to The Department of Highways, since all were involved in a financial way to some degree. The county of Dufferin did not drop the road for which the petition was signed. In the county of Wellington, the recommendation of the engineer was accepted and many miles of county road were dropped, and some other roads were taken into the system.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to comment on the decision of the county councils. They are properly elected people, elected to deal with these matters. But I must say that I was concerned about one or two matters, and I want to bring these matters to the attention of the House.

At the present time, the railways are closing their stations in many parts of rural Ontario. Since my riding is rural, a great many stations have been closed as the people have turned to motor transport. Through the years that I have served as a representative of Wellington-Dufferin, I have tried to promote the development of better roads, and indeed more roads of higher standard to carry the traffic that has been diverted from the railways to the road system. One matter that has caused me concern is to see county

roads reverting to the townships when there is an increasing load of traffic to be carried. This is particularly true in the southern part of the county, since the industrial development that is taking place north of Lake Ontario is starting to spill over into the southern part of Wellington county. For example, in the township of Erin in 1945, there were some 2,235 people on the municipal roll. In 1965, that had grown to 3,421, or a gain of over 50 per cent. In the township of Eramosa, in 1945 there were some 2,210 people on the roll and in 1965 3,187. Many of these people have established homes in Erin and Eramosa township and commute north and south to work in the industries that have been established. In that area, the engineer who advised the county recommended dropping two main county roads and substituting these roads with one new road in between that terminates at Highway 24.

This recommendation of the engineer, which was adopted by the county, has created a situation where you have two main roads running north from Highway 401 to Highway 24 terminating at the highway, one main road coming south to Highway 24, terminating at the highway between the two roads that run south from Highway 24 to Highway 401, with the result you have three main roads turning traffic into a high-speed highway instead of going directly across.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to serve on the committee on highway safety. I do not think that by turning traffic into a high-speed highway, travelling for two or 2½ miles, and then slowing down while the traffic turns across the same high-speed highway, lends itself to highway safety. However, this was the recommendation of the engineer, and I am not sure whether highway safety was one of the factors that he considered when he made his recommendation. The same was true where Highway 19 coming up from the Stratford area intersects Highway 86. Instead of carrying the traffic straight across Highway 86 onto the county road, as it did previously, the county road was moved down a mile or so and again we have the situation where the traffic from main roads does not cross directly over the highway but turns into the high-speed traffic, travels for a mile or two, and then turns across through the high-speed traffic again. These are factors that I think should be considered in any future road needs survey in the interests of highway safety. If this type of construction is to be recommended, then I think the Department

of Highways should consider building accelerating and decelerating lanes to avoid slowing down the traffic on a high-speed highway or highways.

Another factor caused me concern in the way the county needs survey was handled, and this may not have occurred in other parts of the province. As I mentioned before, I received, in total, seven petitions. Why they came to me I do not know, since this was a decision that was being made by the county councils, and I was placed in the embarrassing position of having to forward these petitions to the people who were making the decision.

Many people were concerned that they had bought property on a county road, and had perhaps paid a higher assessment for years for the privilege of living on a county road. Perhaps they had paid more for their property for that privilege. Some people had established service stations and had purchased stores and places of business and mills, and suddenly they found that without any place for a hearing, their property values had changed because they were no longer on a county road system, but were back on a township road system. In Wellington county, four new area schools that were built on the county roads are no longer on the county roads system due to the changes that were made.

The suggestion that I would like to make is that perhaps in the interest of the rights of people, there should be some system developed whereby a person could have a chance for a hearing before the status of the road was changed, if this could affect the property values or the value of a business that had been established or purchased.

Mr. Speaker, I make these suggestions in the hope that in line with the progressive policies of this government some method can be worked out whereby people who feel their rights or properties have been interfered with, can have a chance to state their views before final decisions are made.

There is another factor that I think should be kept in mind when we are developing plans for the future traffic arteries throughout rural Ontario. There is a growing feeling among many people that there is not enough emphasis by planners on decentralizing industry to smaller centres of population. The tendency, in fact, seems to be the other way.

I sometimes ask myself, if we are going to continue concentrating great numbers of people in a small area, are we not working

at cross purposes with the policies of the emergency measures organization? This came home to me in my own area, when I saw that the main roads dropped through a number of small trading centres where there were several places of business. I think we should always keep in mind that the day may come when people would be very happy to know that there were some smaller centres to which people could be evacuated in case of an emergency.

When I drive in and out of Metro Toronto along some of the superhighways, and I see that lineup of factories, I ask myself, wouldn't it really help a lot of the small centres if two or three of these small factories were established in smaller areas, so that people could find employment without driving down into the traffic jams that are created every morning and night getting in and out of a metropolitan area such as Toronto? I ask myself, would it not be better if some of our industry were scattered throughout the province rather than having it concentrated in congested areas?

The time may come when we have to fight to defend this nation. I think people who are in the planning area, and people who are in the emergency measures area should get together. As we work out plans for the future development of the province, it would be my hope that very careful thought should be given to the desirability of decentralizing our industry and our population as much as possible—not just here in southern Ontario, but up through northern Ontario and into the more rural parts of the province. These thoughts I would leave with you, Mr. Speaker, and with the hon. members of this House.

In conclusion, let me sum up my remarks by saying that Ontario has gone through a period of development and expansion under the policies of this government and previous Conservative governments that has never been equalled at any time in the history of this province—a period of expansion and development that has not been equalled by any other province, under any form of government. We are proud of what has been accomplished, and I would suggest to hon. members opposite that when they try to say that this government is tired and lacks initiative, that they should take a look around Ontario and see what is happening and they will realize that that is just wishful thinking on their part. This province is moving as no other part of Canada is moving.

Mr. Speaker, to give you, and the hon. members of this House some conception of

what has happened in Ontario since the Progressive-Conservative Party assumed office and following World War II, our population has grown by nearly three million people. What do I mean by three million people? Well, some day start at the eastern boundary of Metropolitan Toronto and drive through to the western boundary.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Is that the hon. member's doing?

Mr. Root: This is the result of sound, progressive policies that created a climate that attracted people and industry and gave prosperity and more employment in this province than anywhere in Canada.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. G. Bukator (Niagara Falls): Thanks to the federal government.

Mr. Root: The hon. member's party is sometimes like a man on a roof; they are on a slide; sometimes his party slides off or out and we get caught with people coming off the edge of the roof and we have to pick them up and develop policies to rebuild the economy of the country. We are caught with the result of unsound policies.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. members apparently still have not been able to grasp what I have been saying, that we have had Progressive-Conservative policies in Ontario longer than in any part of Canada. We have had more prosperity; we have had more development; we have attracted more people and more industries and provided more jobs than any province with any political party of any political stripe. The answer is there and I suggest that the few hon. members sitting opposite who would like to be in power surely are not conceited enough to think that they are right, and the three million new people wrong.

Mr. Speaker, to give you and the hon. members of this House some conception of what has happened—and I am going to repeat since I was interrupted—since the Progressive-Conservative Party assumed office, and following World War II, our population has grown by nearly three million people. What do I mean by three million people? Well, some day start at the eastern boundary of Metropolitan Toronto and drive through to the western boundary.

Start at the lake, and go north to the northern boundary and in that area with all of its industry, business, homes, hospitals, churches and schools, you will find at least a

million less people than the increase in population in the province. If you want to get a grasp of what has happened in Ontario, you'd have to add to the 13 municipalities in Metro the population of Brampton, Georgetown, Acton, Orangeville, Shelburne, Owen Sound, Fergus, Elora, Guelph, Kitchener, Waterloo, Galt, Hespeler, Preston, Windsor, Hamilton and Brantford, and you would still be almost a quarter of a million short of what has happened in the province.

You would have to go into the north and add to that the population of North Bay, Sudbury, Sault Ste. Marie and some of the new towns such as Elliot Lake, Manitouwadge, Marathon, Terrace Bay, and Atikokan, Fort Frances, Kenora, Red Lake, Kapuskasing and Timmins. The population of these cities, towns and villages is the equivalent of the population growth in Ontario since the Conservative Party was charged with the responsibility of government in 1943.

This is what has happened to Ontario under the sound policies of this government. Expansion in all parts of the province. New highways, new power developments, new schools, new hospitals, great new markets for agriculture, employment and a good life for our people.

Mr. Speaker, when hon. members try to say to the people of Ontario that this government is not doing a good job, the people of Ontario say to them what is quite evident in this House—the Opposition parties are weighed in the balance and are found wanting, and that is why they sit to your left in Opposition. The Progressive-Conservative Party sits on the right charged with the responsibility of carrying on the administration of the affairs of this province. Mr. Speaker, for your patience and that of the hon. members in listening to my remarks, may I thank you.

Mr. J. P. Spence (Kent East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in the Throne debate. I first wish to congratulate you on the way you are carrying out your duties as Speaker of this House.

A few days ago the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) was critical of your cloak, your tricorne hat was hiding some of your charm. Mr. Speaker, if it does that, I am for changing it.

I want to congratulate the hon. member for Eglinton (Mr. Reilly) who was appointed chairman of the committee of the whole House. I know he is fair, I know he is impartial and, Mr. Speaker, I know he will carry out his duties in a very able way. I wish him well in this honourable position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since the session opened, two new members took their seats in this Legislature, the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben) and the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Smith). Since that time they have given their maiden speeches, contributed well to the debates of this House and you will notice, Mr. Speaker, they were seated on this side of the House. After listening to their maiden speeches, I would say they will be members of this party for years and years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I was also pleased the other day that the hon. Prime Minister of this province (Mr. Robarts), the hon. leader of my party (Mr. Thompson) and the hon. leader of the NDP (Mr. MacDonald) paid tribute to the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver). He is a man who has broken records, a man highly respected and I must say I did appreciate those remarks of the three hon. leaders.

Now, I would like to dwell and say some few words on regional development in this province. The government of this province has at the taxpayers' expense been engaged in a publicity campaign aimed at convincing the residents of this province that they are truly fortunate to be sharing in this affluent society, they have proclaimed this to be a province of opportunity.

We see these brave slogans everywhere we go, Mr. Speaker—on buildings, magazines, newspapers—and this seems indeed to be the province of opportunity. If one has the opportunity to drive down University avenue to see all the magnificent new buildings going up or visit the luxury shops in the great city, it is true there is a tremendous feeling of drive, of hustle and bustle, an atmosphere of progress in this city. This is a feeling which is recognized by all citizens and they all like to take pride in being a part of this exciting development.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many thinking people who certainly do not deceive themselves into believing that conditions like this prevail from one end to the other end of the province. Even in a magnificent city like Toronto there are areas where despair is the order of the day, where apathy takes the place of hope and where the poor citizen is desperate for a respectable home in which to raise his family. Those of us who care are all well aware that alongside the unbelievable wealth there is poverty, there is misery, there is lack of opportunity. The majority of the people of Ontario would like to see a new slogan here in this province: "The province of equal opportunity."

This problem applies all over but it most concerns me when I travel in the rural areas of this province, in areas where a goodly portion of Ontario, close to five million people, live and work in areas that do not provide the service or opportunities that this so-called province of opportunity could offer its citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I spend a considerable amount of time in small towns in southwestern Ontario and here, Mr. Speaker, in some of the forgotten areas of this province. The thing that strikes me most, apart from the fact that this government generally tends to ignore their problems is the fact that when it does decide to do something it does not go far enough. The government's actions give the impression of putting up a kind of a smokescreen, doing a little bit of dazzling everyone with footwork while by no means going to the heart of the very problem. As far as taking a long-range view, there is something that does not enter the picture at all. Quite often these halfhearted efforts are only a stopgap solution at the best.

It is with these forgotten areas of the province that my concern and sympathy lies. In these areas you generally find a particular pattern. The farms are disappearing as a family unit because the youngsters head for the higher wages of the city and the retired farmers are forced to sell their farms and spend their last years in a nearby town. Here, because the people are already taxed to the hilt, they cannot enjoy even the basic municipal facilities that the great city of Toronto does.

We are told, Mr. Speaker, that the people could have better facilities if they wanted to. Sure sewers could be built, public water could be provided, this is quite true, Mr. Speaker. But consider the taxes these people have to pay, and the fact that the majority of them are living on wages that are far below the industrial average of a city like Toronto, how can one criticize them for trying to manage with what they have? Even if it were possible, Mr. Speaker, to set up normal utility services, the cost in southern Ontario of trying to purify the water taken from the Great Lakes would be almost out of the question.

Purifying waters, Mr. Speaker, that this government has failed in its duty to keep clean. Purifying waters, Mr. Speaker, that this government shows and has shown little concern about. Surely if this government cannot arouse sufficient interest within its ranks to purify the water of the Great Lakes it could at least try to stop further pollution

so that any water purification plant attempted by these small towns will not run away with costs.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that many of these towns do not have the money, the know-how or the facilities to meet this complicated problem that they are now facing in competition with the industrialized areas of this provincial society. It is up to the government of the province of Ontario to take the initiative, to see that many of the problems are solved through a planned effort. There must be co-operation, there must be sincerity, there must be a true desire to see that regional development is properly carried out and to the benefits of all Canadians. They are all entitled to pure water in this generation and the following generations which, God willing, will live to enjoy the fruits of our endeavours.

It is time we realized that whatever we are, whoever we are, whether we are wealthy or poor, it is about time Ontario was made a province of equal opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, the government of this province has for some time now paid lip service to the principle that there must be minimum standards of service and opportunity for all its citizens, regardless of financial position or the locality in which they live. I say lip service, Mr. Speaker, because in spite of the grave denials to the contrary things have continued to get worse in these areas, rather than better.

The government proudly points to the Ontario development association as an example of their attempts to solve some of the problems in this province on the basis of regional organization.

Mr. Speaker, I say that this is a laugh. Unfortunately, it is not very amusing for the thousands in this province who have heard promises, who have been visited by dignitaries telling them what a wonderful thing is going to happen, who have read about them in the papers, who are still as badly off as ever, and in fact faced with a future which is likely to get worse before it gets better.

I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) has issued a very colourful little pamphlet, entitled, "How regional development works for the Ontario municipalities." The hon. Minister's pamphlet is a very fine piece of work, but, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that the organization it outlines is worth little more to the people it pretends to help, than the paper it is printed on.

The pamphlet goes into considerable details in an attempt to show how this generous government is co-operating with the local authorities, or so-called public spirited groups, in work of regional development. The hon. Minister seemingly has failed to recognize the fact that the federal government is playing a very significant role in the business of regional development, particularly in Ontario.

Take, for instance, the Ottawa group. One has only to look at the great many jobs it has produced and will produce for Ontario workers to see that this is proving very effective. Why is this government not working closely at hand with the federal government in this field? Is it because, Mr. Speaker, that this provincial government has no concrete plans in the field of regional development?

Mr. J. H. White (London South): Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. member what efforts are being made by the Liberal Party in Ontario to get the federal government to lower car prices?

Mr. Spence: Yes, I am just trying to explain it.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if he would outline to me what the government is doing?

Mr. White: We are doing plenty.

Mr. Whicher: Do not wake up all the Conservative Party.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Spence: Mr. Speaker, is it because the provincial government is not really interested in regional development? Is it because the provincial government has not really and honestly accepted the basic principle of equal opportunities?

They say there should be a minimum standard of service. They say there should be opportunities for all the citizens, regardless of financial position, and of the locality in which they live. We are all well aware of these conditions that should not exist. This government glibly agrees with all the schemes for the benefit of our fellow men, from the Bill of Rights down through the war on poverty and another high-flown plan that it has dreamed up, but there is too much talk about them and not enough action, Mr. Speaker. Poor Ontario residents cannot wait

another ten years for something to be done for them. They need some sensible planning; they need it now.

To return to the Ontario development association, there are a number of important flaws in the setup. First and perhaps foremost, it is taking for granted that each of these ten regions has the technical know-how to attack the problem in a proper manner for presentation to the government. Second, it expects that each region will take it upon itself to take action on the problem. Third is the failure of the government to draw up plans to solve the problems that are common to all or many of these regions. Fourth is the failure on the part of the government to bind these regional plans in a meaningful whole.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of the government in this vital area of regional development—as it is in pretty well everything else it does—is not to act, but simply to react to pressures that are put upon it. When a government becomes old, as this one has, like many elderly people it needs a hand to get along. It seems, however, that what this government needs is more than a hand.

It badly needs to get its ear to the ground, it needs to listen to the people for a change, it needs to change the dyed-in-the-wool belief that anything this government does has to be right. It needs to change the slogan to “the province of equal opportunity.”

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer close our eyes, ignore the problems and hope they will go away if the present provincial-municipal relationship remains unchanged. The situation can only get worse. The government must make an honest decision as to whether or not it really believes in regional development to get the minimum of services and opportunities for all the citizens of the province, and whether or not this is really the direction it is heading in. Having once made an honest and firm commitment, the government should lay out a plan in the real sense of the word, a plan to take a look at the problems of the province as a whole and one which is not merely a stopgap, a plan which will benefit Canadians for many years to come.

It is the responsibility of this government to start thinking of all citizens and allow them to be aware that the government is thinking of them and of their needs. The little man up in the designated area—in the riding of my friend, the hon. member for Algoma-Manitoulin (Mr. Farquhar)—must, if he is to believe in equal opportunity, get a feeling

that he is not forgotten. We must all begin to think and to act like a province of seven million people, rather than like a little pocket of people, according to the economic advantages or the spot on the map in which they live.

Plans for regional development, to be successful, cannot amount to a hodge-podge of different programmes not related to each other. This government must set up a structure which has as its aim administrative units, designed to give the public better service and to permit the various departments of government to create a development on a long-range scale.

If we do not run our province on a businesslike basis, we cannot expect to get anywhere except only by accident, and if the government does not take action, we shall never improve the lot of the little man in the rural areas.

I have the honour to represent a rural area, Mr. Speaker. I would like them to be quite sure that this is a province of equal opportunity. At the moment, very few of them believe that this is true and I hope that the government will give consideration to it.

I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I did not say a few words about agriculture at this time. The agriculture industry in this province is in a state of near chaos, and the reason it is is because of the lack of constructive programmes. The government is trifling with the aims of our farmers. Let me give you some examples, Mr. Speaker.

The government has done very little to help the plight of the small farmer. The province has approximately 121,000 farms according to the census. Included in these figures are some residential units and part-time farmers, but here is the interesting part—it is estimated that 30,000 farms in the province sold less than \$1,200 worth of products annually and another 30,000 sold less than \$2,500 annually. The government is not doing enough about the cost-price squeeze.

From 1952 to 1964 farm income in this province dipped from \$431 million to \$345 million. Operating costs—percentages of cash farm receipts—rose 48 per cent in the period from 1951 to 1954 to 66 per cent in 1962 to 1964. There are still problems with the milk industry and the government has caused a great deal of concern because of its sloppy handling of changes in milk marketing.

This province has not taken enough advantage of some of the very helpful programmes established under ARDA. In the past years, Quebec's spending on ARDA pro-

grammes has been twice as much as that of the province of Ontario. The government's budget for agriculture has been puny compared with the need for action and compared with those of other provinces in the Dominion of Canada. Quebec's agriculture budget for the current fiscal year is about four times that of the province of Ontario. The government lacks long-range plans for farm marketing. It has been estimated that 80 per cent of the food sales in Ontario are controlled by supermarket chain stores engaged in group buying. Economists say this trend will continue. It simply means that the farmers' choice of the market is constantly narrowing.

The government has been guilty of dictatorial actions. Its take over of the Ontario bean growers marketing board is a case I would like to point out. I notice that 58,000 members of the Ontario hog producers marketing board have asked for legislation to deny the government the power to dismiss a board without first holding a hearing and getting approval of a judge or some other impartial authority.

This is a sound suggestion, Mr. Speaker. In a democracy the government cannot trample on the rights of the citizens. The bean board was elected by the growers; the government has no right to step in and dismiss the board without as much as a warning. This high-handed sort of action is very much resented and has caused great concern in the minds of many farmers when they ask themselves: Will the Minister of Agriculture take over our board?

The government has done nothing to create trust in the industry.

Take the bean board. The government's action has left a cloud over every member of the Ontario bean growers board that was dismissed. Mr. Speaker, I say, an impartial hearing into every aspect of the bean industry is needed to clear the air.

But what did the government do? The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Stewart) called a closed meeting to explain his actions to the representatives of the farm community. That is what this government seems to prefer, closed meetings rather than impartial hearings held in the open.

The government has been slow to implement the policies to help our farmers. We are now going to have a sort of crop insurance programme but it comes after long delay. It comes only because the farmers and the Ottawa government had to push the hon. Minister to take action. The farmers

in this province are in near revolt, they are tired of promises, they are tired of being treated like second-class citizens, they are tired of government waffling.

About 300 farmers marched on the hon. Minister of Agriculture's farm recently. They were obliged to take action to make their problems known. There is talk that they will march on Queen's Park in the very near future. The farmer has been forgotten by this government but he will not be ignored. I expect that unless drastic action is taken the farmers will forget the government when the next provincial election comes along.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I shall dispense with the normal pleasantries and banalities. Without any ambiguity in my remarks, I think the Chair knows what I think of him and it need not again be declared in this Legislature.

I have one subject I would like to pursue at some length during the course of the afternoon, Mr. Speaker, but before I do, I would like to make one observation on the conduct of the House thus far during this session. Let me say that I, for one, feel that the tentative semblance of rules and orders and priorities and conduct of estimates augurs well for the future business of this House. I think it is a vast improvement over last year and gives us considerable hope.

I have, however, Mr. Speaker, one single strong reservation and I should like to put it before this House and, indeed in the presence of the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) while he is here, since he is directly involved. Despite the fact that we are into the seventh week of this session we have only had one major piece of government legislation before this House, and that was the medical care bill. I do not demean the import of other pieces of legislation, but I would point out that the hon. Attorney General is sitting, however amiably, upon loan and trust legislation, security legislation, consumer credit legislation—

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): I am not only sitting on it, I am holding it—

Mr. S. Lewis: —and legal aid legislation. All of this again will be forced into the latter half of the session for debate because of the unconscionable delay on the part of this government in putting it before the House. I am perhaps unfair in singling out merely the hon. Attorney General, but I think it is none the less true that the Throne speech suggested certain important areas

of legislation: we have seen only one major bill. We are into the seventh week and on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we say to the hon. gentlemen opposite: Do not put us again into the position that prevailed last year. Surely a government which spends six months between sittings can prepare its legislation sufficiently in advance and bring it forward in the first two, three or four weeks so it can have the thought and time which it supposedly merits.

Several hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. S. Lewis: With that brief introduction, Mr. Speaker, I should now like to move to the body of my remarks and deal with a subject in broad generality, which will be raised—I know that my hon. colleagues and I intend to raise it again—in estimate after estimate throughout this session where it is particularly relevant. So what I am going to do this afternoon is to try to strike the highlights, explain the nature of the issue involved and then we will pursue it, let me assure the hon. members opposite, we will pursue it indefatigably over the next several months.

It is very hard, Mr. Speaker, to draw a list of priorities in the province of Ontario. We all, for a variety of reasons, mainly those of political creed, are uncertain of the listing and where the emphasis should lie. I would like to have the temerity to suggest this afternoon that one of the gravest crises this province presently faces is the staffing of social services across the entire population.

By staffing of social services, Mr. Speaker, I not only refer to those professional groupings about which there is much talk in the House—social workers, psychiatrists and psychologists—but to all the ancillary groups; the welfare workers, the child care workers, the public health nurses—the technologists, as it were, of the whole spectrum of social services. I say that there is not a crisis facing this government more grave than the appalling absence of such people at critical points in our social life.

A crisis so grave, Mr. Speaker—to put it in general terms—that our family court system is almost totally crippled; our reform institutions have, in some instances, been rendered ineffectual; our blanket of welfare services, both public and private, are in a state of perpetual breakdown and in many areas are fighting for survival; our mental health apparatus is beaten, demoralized and grinding to a halt in this province; and our entire educational system is systematically defeating its own declared purposes, because

it is bankrupt of personnel to handle the vast percentage of children who are trapped in the despair of emotional and social problems. This tremendous problem runs right across the range of government services. To put it in short, we simply perpetuate the circle of hardship, turmoil and neglect for literally tens of thousands of people, because of our incredible manpower shortages.

I have often thought to myself, Mr. Speaker, that it is perhaps a demonstration of the height of indifference of this government, the quintessence of all that is wrong with this government, that it is content to do nothing in the face of absolutely proven fact. They are massive in their majority and they are equally massive in their neglect!

Now the perplexing and inexplicable fact, Mr. Speaker, is that everyone knows the problem. It is surely indisputable in this House. The Ministers themselves have gnashed their teeth at public wailing walls again and again, telling us that their departments cannot function adequately because they cannot find the staff. Editorials and informed opinion across the province have corroborated this general point of view. I would like to add, Mr. Speaker—and I stand to be corrected—that the select committee on youth, in its two years of travelling to every corner of Ontario, found that countless social agencies, public and private, were stymied, frustrated, blocked and rendered irrelevant by the absence of social service personnel. One has a feeling of overwhelming depression about it, because every brief that was submitted was another testament to the futility of finding an answer, and every brief was a search for people and policies that seem to be non-existent.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this political group in the House and, I suspect, on behalf of the Opposition as a whole, I simply do not believe that that has to prevail. I am going to advance toward the end of my remarks what I think to be concrete solutions which can be undertaken both in the short term and the long term. But before I do, I want to take a look at some of the departmental highlights to show the extremities of this problem, to give some idea of the numbers and the nature.

As I say, I will choose only highlights, because I do not want to speak for more than an hour this afternoon.

First, Mr. Speaker, The Department of the Attorney General. Let me, in relationship to that department, choose as my example, the family court here in Metropolitan Toronto. Mr. Speaker, everyone

already knows that that court cannot provide adequate diagnostic services because it does not even have a court psychologist in the diagnostic clinic. No matter how much the court advertises and no matter how much the public clamour, no one will serve because it is a dead end; because in fact the diagnostic clinic, in the context of our present attitude toward the family court, cannot operate effectively, except in a very limited way. It often takes four to six weeks of assessment for young people referred by the court to the clinic—assessment for young people who have desperate problems, who cannot wait the four to six weeks, and who are confined in the interim in a detention home, where we premeditatedly incarcerate them for the period of the delay.

The annual report of this family court, Mr. Speaker—and I have a copy of the most recent report—looks good on the surface. The most interesting part of this report is its analysis of the probation officers. On the surface it says that there are 30 probation officers. However, four of them are supervisors, leaving 26; two, I learned in conversation with judges, do nothing but the enforcement of reciprocal orders, leaving 24; four have left in the past few months and are unreplaced, leaving 20. We have 20 probation officers in the family court in Metropolitan Toronto to handle a caseload of 652 boys, 118 girls and 5,952 matrimonial counselling services—a total of 6,722 cases, making a caseload of one to 336 cases. That is indefensible, and the government sits idly and indifferently watching the situation.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, in one of the judge's chambers, it was found that in two instances the probation officer had not seen the case for eight months, so great is the pressure on the workload. Obviously, one cannot conduct adequate probation services in that fashion.

In addition to this caseload of one to 336, there were 10,000 counselling interviews conducted by the same people during the course of last year, which, if you work it out, is 500 per person on top of the 336 individual cases. I simply want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that it is generally accepted in all the material that I have read on the family courts and all the material that has been put into the hands of the hon. Attorney General, that a ratio of one to 40 is the desirable ratio, not one to 336, and that we should, in fact, have attached to the family court in Metropolitan Toronto 100 to 130 probation officers and members of the diagnostic clinic, rather than the present complement of 30 or 35.

This example of family court, Mr. Speaker, simply highlights one of the areas of manpower shortage.

Let me move to a second department, The Department of Reform Institutions. In this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, we have already discussed—or perhaps I should say that we have exposed—the effect of inadequate salaries on staff positions. We did that a week or two ago, and the hon. Minister (Mr. Grossman) has indicated his needs and has admitted that his services are woefully understaffed.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, everyone recognizes there is no possibility for the more than 1,000 youngsters in training school to receive any kind of adequate treatment in this staff shortage situation. They have 47 rehabilitation officers in The Department of Reform Institutions; their case workload works out at 45. Most of the people in the field—indeed, when the hon. member for Yorkview (Mr. Young) raised this in the House during The Department of Reform Institutions estimates, the hon. Minister did not dispute it—admit that it should be no more than 30 or 35. Again, in this one example of The Department of Reform Institutions in the rehabilitation officer class we have a shortage of 25 per cent now, let alone the pressures of the future.

But let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the whole attitude of that department and of the government is neatly summed up in the amount of money it devotes to training of personnel. That amount of money is \$75,000 out of a total budget of \$24.5 million—.3 of one per cent, Mr. Speaker; .3 of one per cent. It verges on the unbelievable; it makes a mockery of the ministerial protestations, it exposes the hon. Minister for what he is. But in the process, the hon. Minister makes one appointment after another, and the public is lulled into an indecent sense of security while the problem merely perpetuates itself. That is the highlight I choose to deal with in The Department of Reform Institutions.

Let me move to The Department of Public Welfare. Here is the saddest recital of all. I am glad the hon. Minister (Mr. Cecile) is in the House, because I cannot frankly comprehend how a department can watch the social services it administers disintegrate before its eyes and not even mobilize itself to twitch in the direction of a solution. When the hon. Minister's estimates come, let me say to him, Mr. Speaker, through you, that every conceivable question will be asked and that we will not stop until the answers are forthcoming. If the issue must be forced,

then we are prepared to force it because the time has come.

I want to take the children's aid societies in the province of Ontario as one part of a many-faceted overview. After The Child Welfare Act was promulgated—and again the hon. Minister can correct me if I am wrong, because some of these facts have not been discussed in the public arena—there was considerable dispute between the committee that the government had set up on regulations and the Ontario association of children's aid societies. And the dispute, Mr. Speaker, ranged around the question of personnel.

The general argument of the association of children's aid societies was, that if you do not stipulate your precise staff complement in the regulations then it will be impossible for this Act to work effectively. The government was not prepared to move. The government reneged on the promise it had given to the standing committee on health, education and welfare last year; it reneged on the undertaking it had taken in this House during clause-by-clause debate of The Child Welfare Act; it set up instead some kind of survey of the child welfare field to ascertain staff needs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it was not necessary to set up a survey. I learned with considerable interest that the past director of child welfare services, Mr. Bury, before he resigned, had himself undertaken a survey of the entire field and produced results. Those results—again the hon. Minister can correct me—were presented as part of a private memorandum to Cabinet, so desperate was the Ontario association of children's aid societies. I have that memorandum here, Mr. Speaker, and with it the figures for every single one of the 55 children's aid societies, the required staff complement, in the province of Ontario. I am of course not going to deal with them one by one—but I shall table the total figure and give the House an idea of what is involved.

Before I indicate what the precise figures are, let me read to the House the basis on which they were arrived at, and hon. members will see that it is a very reasonable ratio and case complement that has been worked out. Following a series of meetings the Ontario association of children's aid societies made this submission:

1. Every society shall provide the equivalent of one caseworker servicing children in homes other than their own—that is, children in care:

—for every 40 such children served.

Now, that is not an extravagant ratio, 1 to 40.

2. Every society shall provide the equivalent of one full-time caseworker serving children in their own homes for every 15,000 population.

Nor is that an extravagant ratio.

3. Every society shall provide the equivalent of one caseworker serving unmarried parents for every 45 cases open for continuing service beyond the point of intake.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of those broad guidelines, the Ontario association of children's aid societies said that in this year, 1966, they would need 1,272 caseworkers, that is, professionally trained social workers, across the province of Ontario. They have 951. The difference in need is 321.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are already more than 300 trained caseworkers short on our total needs for children's aid societies across the province.

And let me point out something, Mr. Speaker, which is not often referred to. That shortage is four times more than the total number of graduates from the University of Toronto and St. Patrick's college each year. In other words, we are so far behind under the present situation that it is absolutely impossible to catch up. And that is purely social work staff shortages for children's aid societies, Mr. Speaker, that is not for the entire range of alternative services in this province.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that the absence of these people makes a mockery of the Act. The hon. Minister can sit there quietly and indifferent if he will, but he proclaimed that Act in the Legislature, he indicated it would move from areas of care to areas of prevention. I say to him through you, Mr. Speaker, that that Act cannot operate adequately; that the staff complement is not there; that to all intents and purposes, as far as we know of this government, it will never be there.

I want to make another point just extending this. The Ontario association of children's aid societies, in its very careful analysis of the entire field, said that the increase in trained people would expand this way until 1970: I estimate 25 per cent in the first year, 20 per cent in the second year, 15 per cent in the third year, 10 per cent in the fourth year, and then a levelling off.

That would mean a requirement of 2,400 trained caseworkers in the year 1970. That would put us 1,000 behind present graduating numbers.

And, I say, 1,000 behind forever, Mr.

Speaker, because as things now stand more people are either resigning from or leaving or, indeed, dying in the social work profession each year than we are graduating. So it is safe to predict that on the basis of the present situation, where we are now 320 short, by the year 1970 we will be in excess of 1,000 short.

If, in fact, Mr. Speaker, each of these individuals is to look after a caseload of between 40 and 50, I ask you to multiply a thousand by 40 or 50 to see the numbers of children, unmarried mothers and family protective cases that will be neglected as a result of the government's refusal to move. It is an impossible situation. In a sane society this kind of thing does not conform with any standards of common sense.

Let me move to another area in the hon. Minister's own department, because this is the department that is surely the most vulnerable. The children's institutions, Mr. Speaker. There are 42 children's institutions presently under the schedule of regulations under The Children's Institutions Act, and every one of them is filled to the maximum. In fact the doors of Boys Village, as I understand it, are already closed, despite the government's tremendous expansion programme. Warrendale has its full complement, Ottawa's Protestant children's village has its full complement, Maryvale in Windsor has its full complement.

Everywhere across the province, Mr. Speaker, these children's agencies are filled to bursting with no room for movement and expansion. And all of them want to hire people and expand. They all feel that they might attract some people if they had the financial resources, but the government will not give a penny, not a penny for training. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, as I intend to do a little later, that overnight we could revolutionize this system of child care workers in this province. Overnight we could put a thousand more people on the social service labour market if we were prepared to channel money into the children's institutions and the children's aid societies for training purposes. As it now stands, I would tell the hon. Minister, we already need 500 to 700 people before the centennial year of July 1, 1967. And again, no possibilities of finding them.

I go yet further into the hon. Minister's department. In this year, 1966, if we are in any sense fortunate, a social revolution occurs in the hon. Minister's department. He will not take that personally: I am not implying that he will leave.

All the categorical aid programmes and related programmes, will be combined into The Canada Assistance Act. When that social revolution occurs, Mr. Speaker, something happens that I think the House has not given much attention to: the rationale of those programmes changes as well, and instead of being administered on a means basis, they are administered on a needs basis. All the people, all the caseworkers, previously dealing on a purely interview basis with the thousands of people involved, will suddenly have to exercise judgment, evaluation, counselling techniques and a consistent follow-up.

Now Mr. Speaker, that will also be true of general welfare assistance when it is brought within the needs test of The Canada Assistance Act. What then are the numbers we are dealing with? Let me give the House some idea. There are 111,000 people according to the most recent figures I have, receiving general welfare assistance; there are 24,000 receiving old age assistance; there are 1,877 receiving blind persons' allowance; roughly 15,000 on disabled persons' allowance; and slightly over 10,000 on mothers' allowance. The total figure of all these programmes that are likely to come within the new piece of legislation is 162,000 cases, at any given point in the year. I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker. These are not 162,000 cases annually. There are 162,000 cases at any given time.

The present caseload in servicing such people in The Department of Public Welfare is one to 396 cases and I think the hon. Minister was as embarrassed by the appalling nature of that figure as any other hon. member in this House when it was revealed in his annual report last year.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that reputable studies have now been done, and very excellent authorities in the field have established the required ratio for exactly these kind of programmes. I quote such an expert, Mr. Allan Winston, who is the U.S. commissioner of welfare, Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the United States. In conjunction with the committee on social work education and in conjunction with several state surveys, he came up with the proposition that the caseload is properly one to 60, not one to 396.

Mr. Speaker, that has incredible implications for this department. Instead of having somewhere in the vicinity of 400 workers involved with these cases, this government will need this year and next, 2,700 people skilled in the social services, and that is a

gap of 2,300 people, Mr. Speaker. Somewhere, I suggest to you, those individuals who are being serviced by this department will not have their needs evaluated properly. Although the Canada assistance plan may operate validly in every other province of this country, it will be bankrupt and empty in the province of Ontario, because there will be no people skilled in the evaluation of needs.

This is a highly sophisticated change that we are on the threshold of, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. Minister knows it well. Let me say to him that that 2,300-figure difference that we need, we could use by the middle of this year as an absolute minimum. Not all of these workers need be skilled. They do not have to be social workers, trained with post-graduate education; they can be welfare workers, they can be child care workers, they can be the technicians in this kind of administrative procedure.

But the government does not take it seriously. The hon. Minister of Public Welfare takes none of this seriously, because a cursory look at his estimates reveals this incredible fact: of a total budget of \$102,666,000, the hon. Minister of Public Welfare is spending \$66,000 on training, and that is .06 of one per cent. He supplements it by a six-week course.

I will deal with that six-week course in a little while, Mr. Speaker, but let me say to the hon. Minister again, and I issue it as a warning, that questions will come in his estimates to find out why less than a tenth of one per cent is spent on training in his department, when he faces a manpower shortage of absolutely overwhelming proportions in the public services.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that all these areas do not include rehabilitation services, they do not include family counselling services, they do not include the new skills required for the charitable institutions, and that my estimates are the absolute minimum estimates.

Since another hon. Minister has been kind enough to enter the House—he looks up curiously—let me deal with The Department of Health. Mr. Speaker, in this department, the situation is not critical, it is criminal. I find it hard to believe, although I guess it is part of that extraordinary heritage of his, how the hon. Minister (Mr. Dymond) sits year after year with such equanimity when these things are pointed out.

Let me take some areas of his department, Mr. Speaker.

Take mental health, for adults and children. Last year I established in this House, and

established it after consultation with superintendents of Ontario hospitals, that in five Ontario hospitals in the province—I will remind you which they were: St. Thomas, New Toronto, London, Whitby and Hamilton—the shortage at that time for those five hospitals was roughly of this range: 44 psychiatrists, 80 psychologists, 150 social workers. And nothing has changed.

When you look through an issue of *Canada's Mental Health*, and I look at the issue of January-February, 1966, you find the province of Ontario advertising for every conceivable position. Allow me to read the list of the institutions for which people are required.

Appointments are available in Brockville, Cedar Springs, East York, Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener, London, New Toronto, North Bay, Orillia, Port Arthur, Penetanguishene, St. Thomas, Smiths Falls, Thistletown, Toronto, Whitby, Windsor and Woodstock—all levels of training and experience required.

Again the hon. Minister's inclination is to say, "We do not have the personnel," just as it is the inclination of the hon. Minister of Public Welfare and the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the absence of personnel lies with their own conscience as well as the answer for it I hope to give that in just a few minutes' time. But I have to point out what happens in institutions when you do not have this kind of proper personnel ratio.

Let me make another observation on the hon. Minister's department, Mr. Speaker. He has not yet brought before this House the interdepartmental committee report on emotionally disturbed children. I would like to venture an opinion to this House as to why that has not happened. Nothing the interdepartmental committee can recommend can be staffed. There is not a single thing that they put concretely on paper by way of expansion of services about which they could be confident that they would find the personnel.

Indeed, when that interdepartmental committee comes, I venture to guess that it must stipulate as its first recommendation, a crash programme on manpower, or its report will never be tabled before this House. For the hon. Minister to say that he might not table it this session, as he suggested in reply to a question a few weeks ago, is again a shocking abdication of responsibility on the part of the hon. Minister of the Crown. Characteristic, Mr. Speaker, but a shocking abdication nonetheless.

Of course the reason is very simple—there

is nothing these people can recommend. They all see the gaps, they all know the needs, and they are as frustrated as the government permits them to be.

Those are just two of the specific areas, but let us take a look at some of the things that have been proposed in the mental health field, Mr. Speaker. There are very close figures available in the study of Metropolitan Toronto hospitals that was released in the last two years—figures which quoted and corroborated those presented by the Canadian mental health association to the Hall commission report; figures which suggested that there should be one mental health clinic for every 100,000 population, or 25,000 children, staffed by one psychiatrist, two psychologists, six social workers and three speech therapists. That would be a total for the province of Ontario of some 68 such clinics, requiring 68 psychiatrists, 136 psychologists, 408 social workers and 200-plus speech therapists—and that does not include any of the auxiliary staff.

That is in excess of 800 people required today, and we have fewer than 150 in the field in those areas.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is a gap which is in excess of 600 trained people in the areas of mental health and The Department of Health. Mr. Speaker, it gives rise to unbelievable situations.

I was up in the happy hinterland of Simcoe county yesterday morning—as accident has it—chatting with the medical officer of health. Simcoe county health unit includes 143,000 people, with such centres as Barrie, Orillia and Collingwood. There is not a single mental health clinic for those 143,000 people anywhere in the county, and at the closest Ontario hospital at Penetang, there is not even an outpatients department. The entire health staff in the county unit is in despair, because all the referrals and all the needs run into a total impasse. There is absolutely nowhere for young people, or indeed adults, to turn.

The same situation—and I think this is a field we should explore more fully this session—prevails in public health. We are now on the verge of an equal crisis in public health nurses. We are already running 40 to 50 behind each year in our requirements; the University of Toronto school of nursing is gradually dismantling its certificate course for public health nurses who come from the nursing diploma school, and likely will have abandoned it by 1968 or 1969. We will then be deprived of a considerable complement of public health nurses every year thereafter.

But it is worse than that, Mr. Speaker, because just now the whole field of public health is undergoing a tremendous expansion. Instead of the original emphasis on communicable disease and immunization, public health is now becoming responsive to mass screening, problems of aging and problems of mental health after-care. There simply will not be the public health nursing personnel to handle the situation.

What about nursing homes, Mr. Speaker, which are now in the hon. Minister's department? The hon. Minister said blithely, during the second reading of The Nursing Homes Act, that 150 homes would be closed down because they would not meet the proper standards imposed by regulation.

Mr. Speaker, taking a leaf from the Ontario welfare council study, and assuming at bottom that only ten people are turned out of each of the existing 150 homes, it means that in the next little while, 1,500 older people in the province of Ontario will simply be discarded from nursing homes, with no obvious place to turn.

The reason for this, Mr. Speaker, primarily, is that the regulations will demand a certain level of staff complement for which this government has made no plans whatsoever. Indeed, the hon. Minister himself admitted that the shortage of registered nursing assistants was critical. For all of these services in the hon. Minister's department—mental health, disturbed children, public health, nursing homes—the outlook is exceedingly bleak, and we have a social service personnel gap which, at the moment, cannot be bridged.

Let me turn finally to The Department of Education. I am sorry that the hon. Minister (Mr. Davis) is not here; I am sorry because I wanted to break, if I could, that "noblesse oblige" which exists in so much of education debate today. I want to say that the pinnacle of failure—the real sense of responsibility—lies on the shoulders of the hon. Minister of Education and University Affairs. His department stands wanting in every sense. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, all the lavish plans for the extension of education and for the provision of equality of opportunity, are rendered absurd by our inability to bring the social service personnel into the school system so that children who have problems in a sophisticated society can be responded to.

I refer again to Simcoe county and my visit yesterday—just to give a specific instance. Of 143,000 people with a very large elementary and secondary school population, there was not a single person anyone could turn to—other than the ordinary vocational guidance

counselling that is available. School systems cannot pronounce themselves such examples of worth and merit when this kind of situation continues to prevail.

I spoke today to one of the head psychiatrists at the Toronto board of education. I had had brought to my attention over the weekend a painful and unhappy incident of a little seven-year-old boy who had been suspended from class last Friday in a public school. This little boy had a history of severe physical and emotional illness. At the age of seven he was suspended from school. He cannot get an appointment for two or three weeks, despite the fact that the child adjustment service of the city of Toronto is one of the finest anywhere in the province—indeed, perhaps the only viable child adjustment service in the province. When I spoke to the psychiatrist, she said to me, rather plaintively: "You know, Mr. Lewis, there were seven such little boys in the past few days; I do not know what is happening to the little boys of this city."

It is very simple, Mr. Speaker, what is happening is that despite all the protestations to the contrary, our educational system is failing at its root, because in a sophisticated and advanced society, and in a society which pretends to some sensitivity and social conscience, one of the first areas of concentration is on providing the personnel to deal with the social and emotional problems.

Let it be said, Mr. Speaker, that except for the city of Toronto or Etobicoke or North York or Forest Hill or perhaps Scarborough, there is virtually nothing in the entire province within the educational system to handle those who are difficult in social ways. This again was corroborated by visits of the select committee of youth to every single corner of the province. I think my colleagues on that committee, whether they be on the Liberal benches or on the government benches, would admit that that was the truth. It is not only a failure in reform institutions and in the Attorney General's department, and in Health and in Welfare, but it is most fundamentally, a failure in The Department of Education.

Yet some standards have been established. To give this House an idea of the dimension of failure, Mr. Speaker, let me indicate the results of staffing ratios which have been established in the United States after very serious consultation, analysis and research. I quote from a rather good authority in this field, Wilbur J. Cohen, who is Assistant Secretary of The Department of Health, Education and Welfare in the United States.

They have established that the desirable ratio of social workers, skilled councillors or skilled case workers—however you would wish it—to students in the school should be one to every 2,000. Now let us see how that works out in this province of Ontario, which glorifies its educational system—

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): How does it work out in the United States?

Mr. S. Lewis: How does it work out in the United States? They are considerably behind, but as I will indicate to the hon. Minister, through you, Mr. Speaker, they are making changes; we are not.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: So are we.

Mr. S. Lewis: The hon. Minister is not making any changes.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Going backwards in this province!

Mr. S. Lewis: In 1964 there were 1,673,000 students in elementary and secondary school, public and private, and at a ratio of one to 2,000 students we need 836 trained people in our school system. If that sounds perhaps a little high, let me relate it to schools and to teachers, because I think this brings it right down to a concrete frame of reference. If we had such numbers of trained personnel, it would be one for every 74 teachers and one for every eight schools. I do not think in the middle of the 1960's, Mr. Speaker, that that is too much to ask in the province of Ontario. We are already, in this department, over 700 short of such people; as a result, children of seven are suspended from school, and as a result, when select committees of the Legislature travel around the province they meet everywhere a sense of despair and frustration amongst those who make the presentation.

There has to be an answer here as well. We are not suggesting in any sense that that skilled person, the social worker or that social welfare worker should be one per school or one per teacher. We recognize that these services are primarily supervisory and counselling, but at the moment the ratio is impossible, and so again another department has failed in its task.

There has to be some kind of solution, and the solution obviously has to involve something more than social workers of the trained specialties alone. If I can put it in summary for this House, just in the few areas I have dealt with, just in the few that I have highlighted—in the areas of Attorney General,

Health, Welfare, Education and Reform Institutions—we can now on this day assert a shortage of between 4,000 and 5,000 social service personnel for those precise areas. Without any hesitation I would assert that that shortage is more likely between 10,000 and 12,000 trained social service personnel when you take in the entire spectrum of public and private agencies.

I ask you to relate those numbers to individuals served, or more accurately, individuals lacking service, and the enormity of the government's neglect becomes obvious. For the job is obviously impossible, Mr. Speaker, in our present context. It may interest the hon. members of the House to know it, and I am spelling out these figures and these details specifically because I think they should be on record, although figures sometimes tend to overwhelm.

The total social work enrollment in the province of Ontario in 1964-65 was 242—the total enrollment, all grades, all years. The total psychiatric enrollment, that is in medical schools, in 1964-65 was 75. The total enrollment of psychologists in the schools for which we had reports—Toronto West, Waterloo, Western, Windsor, Carleton and Queen's—was 258. In other words the problems are massive, they cry for remedy. And just before I set out that remedy perhaps the House will allow me to make one further reflection—a little unorthodox—but something that I think needs very much to be said.

While I suggest to this Legislature that the government is primarily responsible, there is one other agent in collusion, as it were, and that is the professional associations themselves. It causes me much distress to have to make the remarks I am about to make, but I suggest to you that no group is more aware, yet no group presses less vocally compared to that awareness.

One is moved to ask where are the poundings of the Ontario association of social workers? Where are the voices of the Ontario welfare council and the social planning councils? Where are the Ontario association of psychiatrists, and the Ontario association of psychologists?

What peculiar combination of professional vested interests and professional timidity results in this silence, this muted retreat, this occasional humble supplication to government in an occasional document or an occasional brief?

I want to point out that the Ontario welfare council is having a conference in May, as they do annually, in May of this year, and in their conference programme they

have a series of areas for discussion. One of their discussion groups says: "Manpower, is there a crisis looming?"

Well, Mr. Speaker, they know that the crisis is not looming, the crisis is upon us, yet with that unexpected reticence, that inexplicable reserve, which characterizes so much of the profession's behaviour, very little is said about it. They appear to be willing to let the crisis go, unreported and unlamented, rather than to speak out. They are so concerned about the unprofessional implications of speaking out, and so-called pressures from the community, that the professional groups are rendered, as it were, respectable.

I say, Mr. Speaker, these are the groups who should be lobbying Queen's Park. These are the groups who should be putting pressure, persistently and relentlessly on this government in order that we come to some kind of solution and the government ultimately succumbs. There is no doubt that they have documented the field, but they have done very little beyond that, and that is a matter of very, very great concern.

The answers to all of this—this tremendous paralyzing manpower shortage—are not easy to find, but there are guidelines. After all, there have to be guidelines and they are particularly relevant. I repeat a banal cliché when I say that in this part of the 20th century we move into the area where services to people are likely to attract the greatest part of the population. The effects of the technological society move everything in that direction, it compels all of the work force to channel itself in that direction. We are not talking about something that cannot be achieved. Services to people make sense. It is a matter of organizing those services.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the magnitude of this crisis is so vast, and its implications so great, that we cannot allow a single department to be responsible. Indeed, Professor Krueger pointed out that interdepartmental conflict and a sense of irresponsibility frequently hamstrings any genuine efforts to develop programmes. I do not think that we should talk about one Minister speaking to another, or about a single department taking control.

I want to suggest to hon. members that we should establish—and let it be said I do not think it an unwarranted or extreme suggestion—we should establish a Prime Minister's task force on staffing the social services.

All the hon. Ministers directly involved would be responsible to him, plus a repre-

sentative citizens committee drawn from all the agencies concerned across the province to advise and make the required submissions. On top of that, of course, the specialized personnel would be present to enact the programmes.

Now the guidelines, Mr. Speaker, that I want to suggest would be appropriate for this crash programme on the part of the Prime Minister's task force are several in number. I have eight specific suggestions I would like to make. Some of them have been referred to in this House, some of them have not. Some of them may not meet with the approval of government. On careful reflection, I suggest that they are all equally indispensable.

First, Mr. Speaker, we must have undergraduate degrees in social welfare and social work. That suggestion is not likely to be palatable to presidents of universities and to those who worry, I think somewhat esoterically, about watering down the liberal arts content of our undergraduate courses. But I suggest to you that there is no other more effective short-term and long-term answer. It may be that the hon. Minister of Education, instead of abdicating his responsibility in this field year after year, will have to lay down the law.

I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that the states of California, New York and Massachusetts have taken tremendous strides in solving this problem of social service staffing in precisely this way. And when the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions says that they are doing nothing about it and we are doing something about it, the reverse, of course, is exactly true.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that just as we have to sort out the problem of having community college graduates move freely into the university stream—and that is something about which there can be no equivocation—so also must we sort out the equal problem of getting university administrators and leaders to accept the absolute necessity of undergraduate social welfare and social work education. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that it will take some considerable persuasion.

There is a body that has been trying to persuade them. The Canadian welfare council set up a sub-committee, a commission on education and personnel, and for years with the extraordinary energies of Mr. Edward Watson at the helm, they have been trying to assess this whole field and come up with some solution.

At one point not so long ago, in the middle of 1965, they circulated all universities in

the province of Ontario and asked them about an undergraduate course in social welfare or social work. Let me read the answers from university presidents into the record, because I think they are indicative of the problem we can anticipate.

This letter is from Trent University in Peterborough, Mr. Symons president and vice-chancellor:

Thank you for your letter of 20th July. I am sorry to have been at little delayed in replying to it but trust you will understand it was held up by the postal strike. In answer to the general inquiry posed in your letter, may I say that I concur in your committee's view that in this matter the US experience is of limited relevance to the Canadian scene. I think that we should be very careful indeed before shifting the emphasis in courses in the liberal arts and social sciences at the undergraduate level in Canada towards more vocational work. It may be that some movement in this direction would now be desirable, but it should be made only after the most thorough and careful consideration.

Mr. Speaker, we have been considering it to death:

I wonder if it might not be desirable to explore the possibility afforded by the development of community colleges and polytechnical institutes for some helpful contribution to the social welfare field? If these institutions are planned and operated upon the high level which is being suggested for them, it might well be possible for them to make an important contribution to the preparation of people for responsibilities in some areas of the welfare services by providing educational opportunities to appropriate levels.

Let me interject and say, Mr. Speaker, that of course it is obvious the community college system will have to move in at this level. But that does not mean that the universities can remain in their state of withdrawal and unconcern.

A letter from the University of Western Ontario, signed by Mr. M. K. Inman, vice-president of arts and science, states the same reservations. He says:

I have talked to Dr. Mary Wright, head of our psychology department, regarding the suggestion of courses in social welfare work be offered at the undergraduate level. Dr. Wright's view, which I share, is that no attempt should be made to provide undergraduate courses in this field. Dr. Wright informs me that this problem has been discussed extensively

at meetings of the Canadian psychological association. One problem of great importance is that of certification. Would persons who had taken courses in social welfare work receive professional recognition?

Again we encounter this professional mystique. Says the letter:

If not, there would be little justification in providing such training at the undergraduate level.

Mr. Inman ends up this way:

May I suggest that your council ask each Canadian university to appoint a committee—

that sounds like the Legislature:

—to evaluate what is being done and to indicate what might be done to accelerate the training of social welfare workers in this country? It seems to me that such a survey would be helpful not only to your council, but also the universities involved.

Mr. Speaker, we have the surveys. They need not be further made. I point out that these letters are a reflection of the stiff resistance we are going to meet. I suppose it is the same kind of resistance that the hon. Minister of University Affairs is meeting when he talks about the continuum beyond community colleges.

From Queen's University, from J. A. Corry, the president. Let me read the last paragraph:

As far as I have been able to reach a view of my own, from what you tell me, I judge that your commission has made a most careful study of needs and has reached views about the kind of undergraduate programmes that would be useful in meeting the need. I appreciate very much your recognition that this may raise problems for the universities, particularly in the question of how far the universities should be expected to go now with vocational preparation. Clearly this is a matter that the universities will have to think about and make their decisions. I also believe it is a matter on which you can fairly expect the universities to try to give you some of the answers you are seeking. Your sincerely.

I often answer constituents' letters in much the same way, Mr. Speaker.

Finally, just to show you that the view is not unanimous, that there is some hope in the field, I want to read a paragraph from the reply of Mr. James A. Gibson, president of Brock University in St. Catharines. This

is what Mr. Gibson says, and I think he hits the nail on the head:

The question of the extent to which directed vocational preparation should enter into a broad liberal education based on preparation in the social sciences and humanities is one which is constantly under our notice. My own answer to the further question whether this blending can be done without undue or inappropriate inroads being made into the content or integrity of a liberal arts education is, again, yes.

Mr. Gibson comes down flatly on the side of expansion in this field.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I think that the hon. Minister of University Affairs has a real responsibility, that there is no other possible solution than to think in terms of undergraduate social welfare and social work education. We are not dealing in the realm of scores of people, we are dealing in the realm of thousands of people and tens of thousands of human beings to be served. Universities have to be flexible in their attitudes if we are to achieve that kind of thing.

I would note in this House, Mr. Speaker, that Sir George Williams University in Montreal and Memorial University in Newfoundland have already established such programmes, with very considerable success, and with no deleterious effects on their liberal arts content. I would also emphasize in this House, Mr. Speaker, that a survey was done of some 30 liberal arts colleges in the United States which have made the same kind of change in the field of social welfare work. It shows that students who graduate from that course move easily, and fluidly into social service status, again without watering-down the content.

I gather, Mr. Speaker, from behind the scenes, that there is some appreciable movement in this direction. I gather that there are quiet negotiations going on to institute this kind of programme. They should be declared publicly; indeed, they should be proclaimed publicly by the hon. Minister.

That is the first suggestion I have, Mr. Speaker.

The second, I suggest, should be an immediate announcement on the part of the hon. Minister of Education that two-year courses in the field of social welfare work personnel will be established, as a matter of practice, in every community college across this province. Society desperately needs precisely this kind of technologist.

After all, we have a welfare worker course at Ryerson now, and it has worked extremely well.

But let us take such courses seriously, Mr. Speaker; let us take them seriously. We started the Ryerson course and we nearly abandoned it; it floundered for almost a year. This year, Mr. Speaker, just for the edification of the House, there are 22 students in the second year of the Ryerson course and 32 students in the first year of the Ryerson course. They turned away well over 100 students. Yet our shortage in the field is between 10,000 and 12,000.

Mr. Speaker, again it is an intolerable situation. The evidence of graduates from welfare worker courses suggests that they fit in nicely with children's aid societies, with mental health clinics, with Ontario hospitals, and with family counselling services. If community colleges were to establish such a course immediately upon the creation of every community college, as part of its original curriculum, we could be turning out easily 1,000 people a year in these areas in two or three years time. That is the kind of thing that has to be done in order to begin to cope with this kind of crisis.

The third concrete proposal that I think the Prime Minister's task force should undertake, Mr. Speaker, is the establishment of at least two more schools of social work in the province of Ontario. I say at least, because I recognize the problem of finding teachers and the general staffing situation is involved. But the general feeling is that we could have two more social work schools in the province of Ontario; no one on this side of the House is particularly exercised whether it is at Waterloo Lutheran, York, Western or Queen's. The point is the need for these schools, and with the schools, a reorientation of the kinds of things graduate social workers do and learn. A reorientation in the sense, first, of continuing work in graduate education, second, specialized training for people in the field who return to schools of social work for six to nine months for upgrading, so as to fit into the field of desperately needed administrative and supervisory staff; and finally, social work research to sustain all that is being done—social work research which has necessarily been neglected in our great efforts to produce bodies.

The fourth suggestion I have is that the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts), should summon—I use the word advisedly—the leaders of professional groups and leaders of all the agencies involved, to discuss new

crash programmes. This is the way an answer was found in the state of California.

For the professional groups, Mr. Speaker, the psychiatrists, the psychologists, the social workers the area of response is fairly straightforward: lavish bursaries and scholarships beyond anything that the government is presently giving; much more prestige to the place of these selected skills in the faculties and professions involved; a social service public education programme which spreads dramatically into the high schools and the vocational schools at this point in time, so that somehow we salvage the situation by 1970. It is instructive, Mr. Speaker—and I point this out as yet another sad anomaly—it is instructive that the Ontario mental health association is the only agency in the field which is helping teachers in this regard. It is, I suggest, preposterous, that a private agency should be doing the work of a government department.

The private agencies themselves—for children's aid societies, for children's institutions, for health units and for all the others—should be given, again immediately, unqualified grants for training purposes. I cannot emphasize this too much. I know it seems difficult to conceive of, Mr. Speaker, but the fact remains that if all these private agencies were given grants for training purposes, they could double their own personnel and turn into the field this secondary stream of workers—social welfare workers and child care workers—to fill all the required jobs.

They would do it quickly—in six months to a year. They have the capacities to do—indeed, some of the school boards have the capacities to do it. The very sad thing about it, if I can point to the situation which prevailed in 1964, is that in the private agency field there were 74 individuals doing some training of staff. But not a single person in the entire private agency field, not one of the 74, was full time. They were all part time because they did not have the funds and there was no government interest in the granting process.

If you want to turn out these people; if you want to staff our impoverished social services; you do it through the agencies which have the skills and the training. This is a tremendous potential and an untapped resource. I suggest that delay is myopia of the worst kind.

A fifth point, Mr. Speaker, and an equally obvious one is a crash government in-training programme to be administered by this Prime Minister's committee. I would suggest

that three per cent—and that is a minimal figure and much less than industry spends, and much less than has been advised in the studies in the United States—of each departmental budget go to retraining and upgrading in-staff training in their own departments. In Reform Institutions, instead of \$75,000 you would have \$.75 million spent. In Welfare, instead of \$66,000 you would have \$3 million spent.

Otherwise, we are reduced to this farce of six weeks in-training courses, which consist of reading the rules and regulations of the Act which apply almost irrelevantly to the field, which do not prepare any of the workers for any of the concrete needs in the days of the Canada assistance plan. One asks whether there is perhaps one ounce of hard-headed business compassion in the government so that they can design the programme to serve the people involved.

I put it to them, if I can, in economic terms, because the cost to this government of human deterioration as a result of the absence of social service personnel is incalculable.

Point six, Mr. Speaker, is one I am going to relate only briefly because it is something which should be dealt with in considerable detail in the estimates. We need an entirely new programme for the teaching profession in the province of Ontario. It means that in all the teachers' colleges and in the Ontario colleges of education there must be—I emphasize this—there must be mandatory courses on identification of emotional disturbance; on coping with such disturbance; on human growth and child development. Teachers should be provided at summer school courses, and at night schools, if you will, with financial increments, to form some kind of inducement to their taking these courses. Because, Mr. Speaker, this surely fundamental. We will never close the gap unless the teaching profession can wade in and put their finger in the dyke for the three or four interim years, because I make the assumption of course that the Prime Minister's task force will move quickly.

Seventh, and here I repeat something I have said previously in this House, but I will say it again and we will not stop hammering at it. Somehow we have to have a manpower survey for the social services. Surely there is some chagrin; surely there is some small particle of shame on the part of this government that they alone are the only jurisdiction I have been able to find on the North American continent—despite all their worldly pretensions when bills are presented to this House—the only jurisdiction on the North

American continent that has not made a manpower survey of social service needs. There was a survey of all Canada in the 1950s and Ontario boycotted it. There was a very real effort to set up such a survey this year and Ontario refused again. As a result, the federal Department of Health and Welfare has almost assuredly abandoned its plans.

Basically, Mr. Speaker, the government is afraid of what they will find. The fragmentary bits of information we have, the fragmentary pieces that I presented to the House this afternoon show a shortage of 10,000 to 12,000 in the entire area, perhaps much more than that. This kind of illustration of information frightens the government. They know the crisis proportion of the problem, but they are simply not prepared to move. It is much easier to proclaim inertia in the absence of information. That is exactly what has happened.

I suggest strongly that we must have this manpower survey. The hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree) has, through his research branch, launched some tentative manpower studies into his department and into the work force. We will deal with those under his estimates shortly pending. But, Mr. Speaker, nothing has been done in the field of social service staffing, public welfare, education, health. Nothing! No one knows the precise needs, none of the material is before us. Nobody knows how to plan, and that is why we need this kind of undertaking by the task force.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, and related to it, we need some kind of study of utilization of the personnel we now have. We have to have some established ratio of workers to cases. What caseloads should people carry in any given government department, in any given branch, in any given field? The hon. Minister of Public Welfare could not tell us. He would not have a hope of telling us, not an idea of what was involved. Nor would the hon. Minister of Health, nor would the hon. Minister of Education, because nothing has been done here that has been done in other jurisdictions.

The only thing that has been done is when the Canadian welfare council took a look at selected agencies, to analyze the utilization of staff personnel they found that supervisors were doing casework, that caseworkers were doing administrative jobs, that

clerks were doing specialized jobs, that specialized personnel were doing mundane jobs and that we were using badly even those very few we have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that what I have proposed are the fundamental answers. I cannot refine them any more than that. The data is not available. Even if the data were available, I would not be privileged to it. I would not have access to it.

But this government faces a crisis of untold, incalculable proportion. There is no use trotting out the case histories on the floor of this Legislature over and again. I trust that we will not have to do that again, because it demeans the Legislature, it is not an effective way of moving government, and it is often difficult for members to be reduced to that level. But that is what is happening. That is the position the government is putting the Opposition in, because they refuse to work in all these areas; they are completely indifferent to the individual tragedies that are involved as a result of dropouts in our educational system, of the absence of mental health clinics, of the problems in family courts and, particularly, of the inability to cope with any of these areas because we do not have the social service personnel and are making no plans for them.

Until such time, Mr. Speaker, this is a guilty government of guilty men—collaborators in neglect of the worst kind. As we say on this side of the House, we will pursue these areas in one departmental estimate after another, because there must somehow be a forcing of the issue.

Mr. R. A. Eagleson (Lakeshore) moves the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. H. L. Rowntree (Minister of Labour): Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment of the House, tomorrow I suggest that we take up the estimates again and continue with them through tomorrow, subject to the five-to-six hour for private members' matters.

Hon. Mr. Rowntree moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock, p.m.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Afternoon Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 10, 1966

First report, standing committee on natural resources, wildlife and mining, Mr. Rollins	1357
Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act, bill to amend, Mr. Gisborn, first reading	1357
Presenting report, Mr. Yaremko	1357
Welcoming "Timmy for 1966" re Easter Seal campaign, Mr. Robarts, Mr. Smith, Mr. MacDonald	1362
Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, continued	1363
Notice of motions Nos. 8 and 12, continued, Mr. MacDonald, Mr. Oliver, Mr. Root, Mr. Young	1375
Recess, 6 o'clock	1386

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1966

The House met at 3 o'clock, p.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: Presenting reports by committees.

Mr. C. T. Rollins (Hastings East), from the standing committee on natural resources and wildlife and mining, presented the committee's first report which was read as follows and adopted:

Your committee begs to report the following bills without amendment:

Bill No. 3, An Act to amend The Public Lands Act;

Bill No. 21, An Act to amend The Crown Timber Act;

Bill No. 22, An Act to provide for the expansion and improvement of privately owned woodlands.

Mr. Speaker: Motions.

Introduction of bills.

THE HOURS OF WORK AND VACATIONS WITH PAY ACT

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East) moves first reading of bill intituled, An Act to amend The Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act.

Motion agreed to; first reading of the bill.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, the present Hours of Work and Vacations with Pay Act provides that after an employee has service of one year with an employer he receives one week's vacation with pay. The amendments to the Act that I have introduced will provide two weeks vacation with pay after one year's service with one employer and three weeks after five years of service with one employer.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Hon. J. Yaremko (Provincial Secretary): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present to the House the annual report of the St. Lawrence parks commission for the year ending December 31, 1965.

Mr. G. Ben (Bracondale): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Reform Institutions (Mr. Grossman), notice of which has been given.

(1) How many guards were dismissed or resigned from service at the Ontario reformatory at Guelph during each of the years 1963 to 1965, both inclusive? (2) How many of the guards at the same reformatory who signed a petition in 1964 asking for a meeting with the hon. Minister are no longer with the department?

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): I take it, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the three questions the hon. member asks?

Mr. Ben: It is one of three questions.

Mr. Speaker: Does the member want to give all three at once?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: It is all right, Mr. Speaker, I would just as soon answer this way.

In respect of that particular question, this requires a great amount of detail and I will take that as notice and perhaps have it tomorrow or Monday for the hon. member.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My next question is: (1) Are the log books at the detention cell at Guelph still being kept in permanent bindings; and (2), if not, when was the system discontinued and on whose order or instruction?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no, to part one, and therefore part two is answered by part one.

Mr. Ben: Could I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker. Was the hon. member's question in the negative or in the positive? Are they still being kept in permanent bindings? Is that the question?

Mr. Ben: Yes, that is the question.

Hon. Mr. Grossman: The answer is yes.

Mr. Ben: And a supplementary question. Where could I avail myself of these books for inspection?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Presumably at the institution, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now my third question is: Is Mrs. Andrews, whose husband died shortly after receiving injuries during the disturbances in Guelph Ontario reformatory in 1959, receiving a pension from this government? And if the answer is yes, how much per annum?

Hon. Mr. Grossman: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that question is no.

Mr. Ben: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton), a copy of which has been submitted to him.

In view of the inclusion of a gas company propaganda booklet in the official Department of Highways publication, would the hon. Minister inform this House:

1. Why he authorized the insertion?
2. What was the cost to the department?
3. What charges were levied against the Canadian gas association for the insertion?
4. Whether the Canadian gas association paid any or all of the postage charges?
5. If the hon. Minister would allow other private industries or corporations to insert similar institutional advertising pamphlets in future departmental publications?

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Speaker, to proceed in order with the answers to the hon. member's question:

1. "Why he authorized the insertion?" The insertion was authorized by the assistant Deputy Minister upon general direction from the Minister that the *DHO News* was to serve the best interests of staff to the greatest extent possible.

2. "What was the cost to the department?" No cost to the department.

3. "What charges were levied against the Canadian gas association for the insertion?" Nil.

4. "Whether the Canadian gas association paid any or all of the postage charges?" There were no increased postage charges.

5. "If the Minister would allow other private industries or corporations to insert similar institutional advertising pamphlets in future departmental publications?" In this

instance, it was not a private industry or corporation, but a Canada-wide association. It contains nothing whatsoever of a promotional or propaganda character.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, upon examination I and my senior staff feel that it is one of the finest safety booklets we have even seen. I would draw the hon. member's attention to the first page, and he will read a statement by Dr. Robert J. Imrie, chairman, accident prevention committee, Ontario medical association, staff physician, hospital for sick children, Toronto:

Most civic-minded citizens realize the high incidence of permanent injury and death associated with all types of accidents in and around the home. The precise, accurate, comprehensive booklet, "Home, Safe Home," has as in the past and I know will continue in the future, to reduce this unnecessary waste of human life and limb by its simple, direct suggestions on accident prevention in the home. I highly recommend its widespread distribution into every Canadian household.

And then from Mr. P. G. MacLaren, general manager, national safety league of Canada:

Excluding the motor vehicle, the home accounts for most of the fatal accidents and the greatest number of injuries. This fearful situation can be remedied only by constant attention to eliminating accident hazards in the home and developing safe practices. "Home, Safe Home" is one of the most valuable instruments in the programme of the national safety league of Canada. It emphasizes the vital need for home safety and provides ways to achieve a safer home environment.

And from Judy Adams, home safety director of the Ontario safety league:

"Home, Safe Home" is a vitally needed contribution to the accident prevention field. Over 2,000 Canadians die yearly, and thousands more suffer crippling injuries from accidents in the home. The Ontario safety league's home safety department has made extensive use of this booklet in conjunction with its public education work over a period of years. We have yet to discover a better, more comprehensive piece of literature designed to prevent accidents.

I would ask the hon. member to take a look at the back page—if he has not already done so—at the list of those contributors to this contribution entitled "Home, Safe Home":

The Canadian gas association; the national safety league of Canada; the Canadian Red

Cross society—Ontario branch; the national safety council of the United States; industrial accident prevention associations; Ontario safety league; Canadian medical association—Alberta branch; Occidental Life Insurance Company of California; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company; fire commissioner's office, Saskatchewan; *American Druggist* magazine; United States Department of Health Education; Department of National Health and Welfare, Ottawa; Newfoundland Department of Health; Ontario Department of Health; Manitoba Department of Health and Public Welfare; Manitoba Department of Agriculture and Immigration; Saskatchewan Department of Public Health; Alberta Department of Public Health; British Columbia Department of Health Services and Hospital Insurance; British Columbia safety council.

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the hon. member, we feel that the insertion of this booklet at no cost with the distribution of our *Department of Highways Ontario News*, is a service to our staff and we will continue to provide them with this service.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask of the hon. Minister a supplementary question?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, of course.

Mr. Newman: Is the hon. Minister aware that on page 22 of the booklet it shows the heating plant hazards, especially by electricity, with a very unfavourable light? You have one department of government working at cross purposes with another, with Hydro.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would say to the hon. member that if he reads this through, he will find—explained, equally and as fairly—hazards that can arise from the use of gas. They describe certain preventive measures that should be taken in terms of the use of gas. I think they deal with the matter very fairly and I repeat, we are quite happy to make this booklet available to the staff of The Department of Highways.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a series of questions, two of which are holdovers from that speechless condition I found myself in yesterday.

First to the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts): In view of the statement made yesterday by Mr. Albert Shepherd, counsel for the Hughes Royal commission, that loans and other matters related to the British Mortgage and Trust Company would be dealt with separate from evidence relating to Atlantic Acceptance, would the hon. Prime Minister

consider at this point establishing a separate inquiry into the operation of British Mortgage and Trust, which led to last year's crisis and the takeover by Victoria and Grey?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the question is "no." We are not considering at this point the establishment of a separate inquiry.

If one examines the terms of reference of the Hughes commission, as it is now called, included in the terms is a request that "he investigate, inquire into and report upon"—and I am just quoting part of it—"the activities and conduct of any person, company, corporation or organization in relation, whether direct or indirect, with such failure"—this refers to Atlantic—"and in the activities and conduct of any person, company, corporation or organization—including British Mortgage and Trust Company—who is, was, or claims to be"; and so on and so forth.

So that in the terms of reference of the commission, it is very clear that they are asked to investigate into the affairs of British Mortgage and Trust. In checking the newspaper reports of what in fact Mr. Shepherd said, at least as reported in the *Toronto Globe and Mail*, he said the loans made by British Mortgage and Trust Company of Stratford required some explanation. Because it would be impractical to interrupt the flow of evidence respecting Atlantic Acceptance the matters concerning British Mortgage and Trust would be dealt with separately.

Now this simply is a question of the commission exercising the judgment he is given in deciding how he is to conduct the inquiry within the terms of reference we laid before him. I gather from what has been said, it is purely a procedural matter. In the terms of reference, of course, the affairs of British Mortgage and Trust, inasmuch and as far as they relate to Atlantic, will be investigated as the commissioner sees fit. He is an independent commissioner.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, the second holdover question was to the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall).

Would the hon. Minister explain how spiralling construction costs alone warrant an increase of \$1 million in the construction of Ontario's pavilion for Expo '67?

Hon. S. J. Randall (Minister of Economics and Development): Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the hon. member for not being here yesterday, but I joined the hon. Prime Minister in the town of Hanover, opening up one of the largest, most modern furniture factories

in North America. I might also say that four times this year I have been here to answer questions, and the hon. member who posed the questions did not show up. So I think now you understand, Mr. Speaker, it is mutually a little inconvenient. I am sorry, I apologize, and I can assure the hon. member we will answer his question.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Meanwhile, back at the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Randall: Do not go away!

Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of the hon. member: Because the nature of Ontario's Expo '67 project and the complete lack of Canadian experience in world fairs and exhibitors' cost experiences at the 1964-65 New York world's fair, a close cost control system was instituted for Ontario's Expo '67 project.

A firm of quantity surveyors, G. A. Hanscomb Partnership, were retained to work with the architects and engineers in running a continual cost survey on the Expo project. The cost surveys were run on four different occasions throughout the project, the last being November 19, 1965.

At that time the steel for Ontario's pavilion was estimated at \$899,000 and the roofing membrane at \$227,291. The lowest tender received on February 9, 1966, was as follows: For steel, \$1,312,455 and for the roof, \$462,875, reflecting an increase of \$659,039. In the estimate for the general contractor, job overhead was \$263,000. And the lowest tender received was \$716,000, reflecting an increase of \$453,000. So the total increase is therefore as follows: Steel and the roof was \$659,039, the general contract, \$453,000, making a total increase of \$1,112,039.

That answers the hon. member's question, but I think it would be of interest to the hon. members of the House for me to proceed a little further and give them a little more information, which I hope to do during the presentation of my estimates. But they may be a little time away and I would like to give the information now, because I think there is a certain amount of damage being done to the Expo programme itself with some of the comments made by not only government officials, but by others who perhaps do not have the complete story.

The news reports are somewhat confusing and I understand that the hon. member got this information from a newspaper here this week, because on one page it said the cost increase was up 50 per cent, and on the next page it said the cost increase was up 100 per cent. Well, I want to clear up all confusion

with reference to the Ontario pavilion. The cost increase is up 60 per cent over the \$5 million figure, which was established on January 1, 1964.

At that time it was decided that the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information (Mr. Auld) would take on the centennial projects in Ontario and my department would take on Expo '67. At that time when we picked out the lot it was still under water. They were still filling in. We hired our designers and our architects and said, "Well, here is a body of water which will be filled eventually. Will you get under way, time is short, and design a building for us. Use your imagination and your ability and your vision and design something like Walt Disney would design so that we can attract people to Expo '67." We established that programme and got it under way.

We took what we thought was an estimated figure, which we wanted to keep somewhere close to that cost. I suggested to the Cabinet that I thought the building would cost us between \$5 million and \$7 million, but I would suggest that you give me a working figure of \$5 million and we will do our best to stay within that limit.

Once the designers and the architects got under way and designed the kind of unique building that we have, and the various displays we will have under there, they kept coming in with new programmes. As we looked them over, we said, "Well, we have allotted \$2 million for the interior, we have \$2 million for the building, and we have allotted \$1 million for administrative maintenance, uniforms and staff."

And I might say, Mr. Speaker, we have contracted for the interior of the building, and it comes to \$1,860,000, so we are under the \$2 million figure estimated in January 1964. And the \$1 million for administration; as near as we can figure right now, it is \$816,000, so we are below the estimated administrative figure.

Now the \$2 million for the building has been explained in the answer to the hon. member's question, and it is covered by the last three contracts that we were not able to let until just recently. I might say there is only one source from which we can get the roof. It is an entirely new concept. There were only two people tendered on the steel and we took the lowest bid. There were only two contractors tendered on the building itself, and under The Public Works Act we could not tender until we had the blueprints and had approvals. So we could not do this two years ago.

I might suggest to the hon. members, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Russians have given their building to an Italian concern, who will bring their workers over from Italy to build their building.

I understand the Americans did not ask for a tender, they just said "Here is the building, go ahead and build it at cost."

So you can see we have not taken this kind of a gamble; we have done what we thought would be necessary to get the building finished on time and within what we felt was a reasonable cost.

As most of the hon. members know, we showed them the model of the building in February, 1965. We are on schedule with the building and it will be opened a year from the 30th of next month, or the 28th, whatever that date is, and while we will have invested approximately \$8 million, Mr. Speaker, the province of Ontario has already received \$35 million in contracts from the contractors down there, and we estimate that this \$8 million investment will bring \$200 million of business to the province of Ontario. So I do not think it is an expenditure; it is an investment in the future, if we look at it on that basis.

Mr. Speaker, I have suggested this is an investment in the future; it is not an exercise in futility, as some have described it, in building Expo '67. I am perturbed when I see so many Canadians criticizing Expo— and I am not referring to the hon. member here, and I hope he does not take exception to this.

Since taking on this project, I have worked with the Expo '67 people. We were the second province to sign a contract with them. I have appeared on platforms both here and in Quebec, to sell Expo '67. I find it difficult to accept some of the criticism that Expo is getting, because we are going to celebrate our 100th birthday, and this is the first time that we have had something to unify the Canadian nation outside of two world wars.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that from here on in, if we, as the province of Ontario, and I mean all members of Parliament, will devote our efforts to assisting and selling and getting enthusiastic about Expo '67, we will more than get a good return on the \$8 million total that this province will spend in Expo '67.

Mr. MacDonald: On the questions of today's vintage, Mr. Speaker, my first one is to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Connell), in two parts.

How does the hon. Minister reconcile the fact that carpenters are being laid off, allegedly because of the shortage of work, when there are projects in this building alone which have not been completed, allegedly because the tradesmen are otherwise occupied?

Second, is seniority not accumulative for all the periods that a tradesman has worked for the government, and if so, how can the seniority of Mr. F. Hawe of Amherst street, who has been given notice of a layoff, be calculated only from August 17, 1964, when he worked for the department since November, 1957, with the exception of a layoff between March 13 and August 17, 1964?

Hon. T. R. Connell (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, the answer to the first question is that work on the main building is proceeding according to schedule established over a year ago, and is now nearing completion. Any work project, requires a schedule which uses the various trades in sequence, and while plumbers, steamfitters, and so on, are at work, the other trades, such as carpenters, electricians, and so on, may not be required.

In Metro Toronto and throughout the province, The Department of Public Works has been trying, wherever possible, to contract work instead of using day labour. Results have proven this effective and economical. The day labour staff of the department has been progressively reduced from its maximum of 3,050 in 1959, to less than 760 at the present time. It is the department's intention to lower the number of casual employees still further and to engage tradesmen on the same basis as other civil servants on the permanent staff, at a fixed yearly salary, to do the routine maintenance required. Tradesmen will be hired for other projects only as required.

The answer to question number two is no. A man may be quite easily taken back on the job because of previous employment and experience, but this in no way implies that he has greater seniority. And of course that makes the answer no for the third part.

Mr. MacDonald: May I ask a supplementary question of the hon. Minister? When he is referring to "main building," is he referring to this building?

Hon. Mr. Connell: Basically.

Mr. MacDonald: Basically? Mr. Speaker, I do not know what—

Hon. Mr. Connell: I am speaking of the buildings in this general area here.

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, but I do not think the hon. Minister has really answered my question. I asked, why are men being let off, allegedly because there is no work to do, when there are projects that have been waiting for three and four months to be completed, allegedly because the men are too busy?

Hon. Mr. Connell: I will try to run the department, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, my other question was to the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree). I will hold it until tomorrow.

Mr. S. Lewis (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the hon. Minister of Economics and Development.

1. How many units of new construction by merchant builders have been completed for the Ontario housing corporation in Metropolitan Toronto?

2. How many are at present under construction?

Hon. Mr. Randall: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the hon. member's question, there is a total of 280 new units offered to the Ontario housing corporation in response to its advertisement for proposals from merchant builders that have been completed to date.

The answer to the second question is that at the present time there is a total of 652 new units under construction to the Ontario housing corporation of Metropolitan Toronto. This figure does not include certain merchant builder proposals totalling over 1,500 units, which have been accepted in principle by the Ontario housing corporation, where the proponents are now seeking the necessary municipal approval.

Mr. S. Lewis: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the hon. Minister to explain the first part of his answer? The 250 units were in response to the advertising campaign?

Hon. Mr. Randall: I said a total of 280 new units was offered to the Ontario housing corporation in response to the advertisements, yes.

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I would like to introduce to the hon. members of the House a young gentleman by the name of Paul Picard, who is sitting under the gallery. Would you stand up, Paul, please?

Paul is Ontario's Timmy for the annual Easter Seal campaign. Some years ago he had an accident and fell out of an apple tree and fractured his right arm, which neces-

sitated amputation. He has an artificial hand, operated electrically, which is a very advanced piece of work indeed. You will be interested to know that his hobbies are building model aeroplanes, model boats and collecting stamps. So you can see he is a young man of great strength and power in overcoming his deficiency as a result of this accident.

He lives in North Bay. He is bilingual. He is very fond of hockey and in this he displays a marvellous non-partisan attitude in that his favourite athletes are Gordie Howe, Henri Richard and Bobby Hull. So he covers the situation pretty well in that regard.

His ambition is to become either a lawyer or a pharmacist. I do not think anybody here will offer him any advice in which direction he should go in that regard, but I think I speak for everyone in the House, Paul, when I wish you well in the work that you are doing and when I tell you that we appreciate what you are doing by being Timmy, in helping many unfortunate children in this province. The best of luck to you.

Mr. R. Smith (Nipissing): Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege on behalf of the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. Thompson) and the Liberal Party to welcome Paul Picard to the Legislature. Since he comes from my riding and the city of North Bay, I am doubly proud and I am sure that the hon. Prime Minister and the other hon. members of the Legislature who have talked with Paul will realize why we in the district of Nipissing are proud of Timmy and the manner in which he is representing the crippled children of Canada in support of the Easter Seal campaign.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Speaker, there is an old adage which we hear periodically—that is, "You should not send a boy to do a man's job." I must say that every year as I watch the job that is done by Timmys on behalf of crippled children, I think they do a magnificent job of refuting that old adage. I watched Timmy this year on television, as I have done on previous years, engaged in pursuits which I suppose most young boys of his age would find not only overwhelming but a little bit terrifying. Yet he does it with such poise that I suspect that he is not going to be a lawyer or a pharmacist, but a politician. I suggest that our hon. friend from North Bay had better watch his laurels in that area.

I want to join with the hon. Prime Minister and the hon. leader of the Opposition in ex-

pressing my appreciation to Timmy, not only for that triumph of human spirit over his own disability, but for the magnificent job he is doing on behalf of other crippled children across the province.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The twelfth order, House in committee of supply, Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

(continued)

On vote 807:

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a short observation before we proceed any further with vote 807, and it is with a bit of reluctance that I do this.

You, sir, and hon. members will recall that when we were talking about the estimates and the capital construction vote 807 on Tuesday, at that time when replying to the hon. member for Fort William (Mr. Freeman), I made some references to part of the programme in the north and northwestern part of the province. My observations were categorized by the hon. member for Kenora (Mr. Gibson) as "a lot of garbage."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to you and to all hon. members of the House, that I recognize my responsibility as that of answering questions to the best of my ability, accepting any reasonable and sensible criticism that can be made. I would rather like to propose to hon. members that I have been reasonably patient in doing that. But I do say that when an hon. member of this House who has not—and I think I am accurate in this—been in his seat for more than 12 days out of two sessions of the Legislature; who has not, to my knowledge, been in my office in an attempt to do anything on behalf of the people he is supposed to represent; and who failed to attend with the delegation from the northwestern Ontario associated chambers of commerce when they presented their annual brief to the Cabinet last month, makes this type of comment, it is unbecoming. I say to you further, sir, that this hon. member is perpetrating a fraud on the people he is supposed to represent and he is perpetrating a fraud on the province of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 807, please.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I really fail to understand why the hon. Minister is so exercised on this point. Perhaps there is an explanation, but I do not believe that it is in order for an hon. member of this House to say that another hon. member is perpetrating or has perpetrated a fraud, and I would ask that the hon. Minister withdraw that comment.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Chairman, also on a point of order, I think this sort of an attack by the hon. Minister of Highways is entirely uncalled for. I think that if somebody is keeping score—I do not know whether they are or not—the scorer could well look at the other side of the House and at certain hon. members. I am not going to have the audacity that the hon. Minister does, to single people out, but I think everyone has a right to sit here if his voters send him here, until his voters decide otherwise, and if we are going to start naming names and running around the House, then I think the hon. Minister should look to his own colleagues and to his own side of the House.

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, my point is on a specific comment, not on general comments.

Mr. Chairman: I am inclined to agree with the member for Woodbine that remarks of this nature are construed as disparaging remarks and should not be said in the House.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I will withdraw any remarks that might be considered disparaging; the general substance of what I have said, I will not withdraw.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Chairman, on March 7 the hon. member for Riverdale (Mr. Renwick) asked a question regarding comparative costs, and the hon. Minister said this:

I can assure the hon. member that we will not take any longer than required to get these answers. If we can make them available during the course of the estimates, I think you might even get back to them on 807.

The hon. member for Riverdale is not here this afternoon. He was unable to come and he asked me if I might question the hon. Minister as to whether or not he has these answers for us yet.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I must confess to the hon. member that I do not have them. They are in the course of

preparation now and we discovered that they are going to take a little longer to prepare than we thought, but we are actively in pursuit of this information. I will make it available as quickly as I can for the hon. member, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Young: I would like to point out for the information of the hon. Minister that a question was tabled in the province of Saskatchewan lately for C. George Willis of Melfort-Tisdale. He asked—

Mr. Chairman: Is this on vote 807?

Mr. Young: Yes, Mr. Chairman. He asked regarding the mileage of highways oiled in 1965 out of the capital programme, and the average cost per mile for oiling done by government crews and those done by private contractors—right on this very point, Mr. Chairman.

The answer was tabled by Highways Minister G. B. Grant, and showed that a total of 806.36 miles of highway were oiled. He said:

Based on expenditure to date incurred, cost per mile for oiling by government crews was \$2,356 per mile; the cost per mile of the oiling done by private contractors was \$3,119 per mile. This represents \$583 per mile difference.

This perhaps is significant. Whether the conditions are the same or not, I bring them to the hon. Minister's attention. Certainly the experience of that province seems to be in this respect, at least, that the government itself is doing the job more reasonably than the private contractors.

Vote 807 agreed to.

On vote 808:

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, the other evening I brought up the subject of the Quinte parkway and I would also like to discuss the proposed Lake Erie causeway under this vote, if this is in order.

Mr. Chairman: I am not quite sure that it is; just a moment.

Mr. Singer: It is under planning and design.

Mr. Chairman: Under planning and design.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. Dealing first with the Quinte parkway, I have a number of articles here from the Kingston *Whig-Standard* pertaining to this proposal, and also the Ellis report that was submitted to the economic council on the tourist industry back in 1962.

The report contained a proposal for a Quinte parkway system running between Collin's Bay and Adolphustown.

I attended the committee on commissions a few weeks ago with the St. Lawrence parks commission and apparently they had studied this matter themselves. The information I received was that they were not recommending that The Department of Highways proceed with a Quinte parkway, and were just recommending the preservation of land along the existing Highway 33. But in the submission to the economic council—I do not wish to take up too much of the time of the House—there are some fairly strong charges against The Department of Highways in this area. I will just read a brief paragraph here on page 6 of this report:

Ten years ago people could stop along the shoreline almost at will. Today there is a fence put up this summer by the DHO that would seem to bar all but a few areas from the public and some of these points of access were left only through the courtesy of new owners.

How much of this shoreline was lost in the manoeuvres of The Department of Highways which traded shoreline properties to obtain a right-of-way for a proposed four-lane highway in the areas, is not known, but it certainly would seem the government has relinquished in the past few years control over most or all of the six miles of shoreline between Collin's Bay and Bath.

And it carries on in this theme.

This was back in 1962. Here we are in 1966 and the Kingston *Whig-Standard* again has articles on this. I just wonder if there is any interest in this area. At the conclusion of one of these articles it states:

There still isn't much interest even, we often feel, on the part of those who have fought the hardest to have a parkway established, although we must admit that we wouldn't blame them for tossing in the towel after nearly a decade of knocking their heads against a stone wall of political indifference and procrastination.

In a planning study of the Kingston area it estimates the population in that area will rise to 130,000 and it states further that there should be more study for more parks in this area.

I just wonder if the hon. Minister could enlighten the House on this. I have checked through *Hansard*, the past two years but could see no speeches on behalf of this Quinte parkway.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we are certainly aware of the situation. I would point out to the hon. member that there is a very sharp difference of opinion involved in the area between the proponents of the Quinte parkway, which is a group of citizens, I believe, who have associated together for the purpose of promoting their case. On the other hand, I think it is fair to say that the good majority of the municipalities involved in the area of Highway 33 are not as kindly disposed to the proposition as are the proponents.

I think I would point out to you, too, Mr. Chairman, and to the hon. member, that it is a little difficult for us to do anything other than accept recommendations and proposals from, shall we say, duly elected bodies along the mileage of Highway 33 referred to. And there have been no material proposals advanced to us by those who might be called people in authority.

I think really that is the best answer I can give the hon. member. We have been kept quite aware of this, but there has been no really official proposal or recommendations laid before us.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, there are some 16 recognized groups.

Mr. S. Apps (Kingston): I would like to correct the statement of the hon. member for Essex South who indicated he had gone through *Hansard* and had not seen anything in connection with the Quinte parkway. I think if he takes the trouble to look more carefully he will see that I have mentioned this on two separate occasions, and I think is well documented in *Hansard*, the comments on the Quinte parkway.

I think there has been something done in connection with surveying of the area, and I understand there is a report now in the hands of the St. Lawrence parks commission, recommending certain things be done in connection with this particular parkway. I do not think that has come to the attention of The Department of Highways yet, but I understand this is being contemplated and some action is being taken to implement to some degree some of the suggestions made in the report that the hon. member mentioned.

Admittedly, it has not gone as far as that report and there may be something desired as yet, but I believe it is a start on what I consider to be a great idea to implement some sections of this parkway and reserve to the people of the area and also to the

people of Ontario a very historic route through Kingston across to Adolphustown.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, if I might reply to the hon. member, I checked through the listings in *Hansard* since coming into this House and could see no reference to it. Possibly the clerks overlooked that.

Mr. N. Whitney (Prince Edward-Lennox): Mr. Chairman, as the representative of Prince Edward-Lennox, through which most of this highway runs, I think perhaps I have a little closer concern than any other hon. member of the Legislature.

I might say that this is a very historic section of highway, not only from Kingston West to Adolphustown, through Lennox and Addington county, but on through Prince Edward county, to Trenton, and it is certainly one of the loveliest drives in the province of Ontario.

We appreciate the energy and enthusiasm of the people who have been behind this parkway proposal, but I can say that a great many of my own people in that area have not gone along with some of their ideas. However, they did bring certain things to the attention of the general public and I feel their idea that this drive should be enhanced, that it should be better known and that a great many features should be preserved, is entirely correct. I also do feel that additional park space can be provided.

But I want to point out at one and the same time that The Department of Highways does not get the credit it should get for what has already been done to see that Highway 33 is preserved. In Prince Edward county at the present time they have under construction and rapidly approaching completion, the new Quinte skyway to Hastings county, which will remove considerable industrial traffic and commercial traffic from Highway 33. At the other end, near Millhaven, they have a new access road, No. 133, travelling from Highway 33 to the Macdonald-Cartier highway, which likewise will help remove industrial and commercial traffic at that point.

So in point of fact, The Department of Highways is already spending millions of dollars in this direct way, as well as providing excellent ferry service at Adolphustown, where there is a free boat ride for everyone amid beautiful scenic conditions, and I may add this ferry service is made available 24 hours a day throughout the entire year, unless adverse weather conditions prevent it.

Now I think that last summer the hon. member for Essex South did have a view of the Lake-on-the-Mountain and the ferries plying back and forth on the Bay of Quinte, and I do feel that certainly he would agree that a great deal has been done in the area.

I have read the proposed Quinte parkway feasibility study, which was prepared by Mr. Cantelon of The Department of Lands and Forests at Tweed—who is a very fine parks expert—and by Mr. Lemon, from the St. Lawrence parks commission, and I feel that they did a masterful job.

One of the objections of the local residents has been to the name “parkway,” because the very fact that people have come and have climbed fences and done a various number of things, has been a source of annoyance to them. At one time some people made a lot of noise near a house where a funeral was taking place, and the local people just did not like it.

Another feature we must consider is the safety of the travelling public—because sometimes they park vehicles indiscriminately and walk across the highway and permit their children to play there. Certainly, these are all factors that enter into the problem.

I do feel that parts of this highway should be rebuilt. If there are severances, I feel that these severances should be transferred to the parks authority. In fact, I feel that The Department of Highways, as well as the St. Lawrence parks commission, should give this report very serious consideration at the proper time.

I am going to mention one specific thing, that is contained in this report and I do not think it will do any harm. That is, that the proposed name is the Loyalist Route, Highway 33. Now I think that will be a very fine name. I think it will be a descriptive name—an historical name—and I do not anticipate anyone objecting to that particular name.

One of the objections we have had is the fact that while they wanted to call this the Quinte parkway, the Bay of Quinte does not start until actually halfway up the highway towards Adolphustown. Whereas, down near Kingston and Bath and all along that area, it is not the Bay of Quinte area at all. So the name would be a misnomer. Secondly, many people object to the name parkway because they think some people would get the idea that all land adjacent to it is public property.

The third reason in favour of this suggested name is that it would carry on through Prince Edward county as well as to Trenton.

So that as far as tourists and the travelling public are concerned, the Loyalist Route, Highway 33, would extend from Kingston on the east, to Trenton on the west, and I think that people therefore would be induced to travel it both ways and enjoy the great pleasures available throughout this fine historic and scenic area of Ontario.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, just to conclude here. I spent a couple of very enjoyable days in that area of our province this past summer, and will certainly support these two hon. members in any of their efforts to acquire greater and better tourist facilities for that area.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Yorkview.

Mr. Young: Mr. Chairman, that note of harmony should not be broken, I suppose. I must say that in regard to the matter of which I want to speak, that I should start by congratulating the hon. Minister too, because the more I see of the design of Highway 401 as it passes through my riding and adjacent ridings, the more impressed I am at the engineering skill that is built into that highway and the safety features that are there. The hon. Minister must have gathered around him a group of men who are top-notch in this whole field of highway design, and men who, I think, contribute greatly to the future highway system of this province. So I want to say that word of congratulations.

I think though, that the hon. Minister ought to be looking—and it is not a “but,” but a bit of advice—at the question as to why people are being killed on these highways. In that respect, I would like to suggest to him that there is a job that The Department of Highways itself ought to do, because this matter of safety is divided up among various jurisdictions. I suppose the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart) has part of it, the hon. Minister has part of it, and the hon. Minister of Transport (Mr. Haskett) has part of it. It seems to me that this ought to be gathered together.

I am suggesting to him this afternoon that we ought to set up a safety research bureau within his department, to ask why accidents happen on his road system.

When we look over the last statistics available for 1964, I find these rather startling facts: that the largest group of accidents is caused by or happened to people between the ages of 25 and 34; that in driving experience, the largest group has ten years or over; that the condition of the driver in the largest

group is apparently normal; driver action in the largest group is given as driving properly. Then we come to the type of vehicle; a passenger vehicle is responsible for most of the accidents. Condition of the vehicle in the largest group is apparently good. Direction of travel in the largest group is going straight, and the next largest group, stopped.

Looking at these figures, Mr. Chairman, one would wonder how accurate they are, because if in effect these accidents occur and these statistics are accurate, it looks as if there is something lacking in our attempt to find out what really happened, because this just could not occur. There must be more to it than this picture. Certainly there are other categories here and they are well laid out, but the largest group involved in accidents seems to be a group which is between 25 and 34, with ten years experience, apparently normal, driving properly, and the condition of the vehicle good and the direction going straight.

Mr. Chairman, in view of these findings, we must take another long look at what is happening on the highways. That is why I am suggesting that we should set up a safety research bureau. The functions of that bureau should be first of all to look into this matter of road design. It should study every accident that occurs in the province, if humanly possible. I know that is a big job and a big assignment. But certainly every fatal accident and everyone with serious injury should be looked at and looked at in depth.

Mr. Chairman: I think this is done by the Ontario provincial police.

Mr. Young: It may be done by the provincial police, Mr. Chairman. My point is that evidently from these statistics, they are not getting the thing done in sufficient depth, because we are not learning enough of the actual cause of the accidents.

If I could elaborate on that just a bit. The first problem is a matter of road design. The hon. Minister has been looking at that, and certainly we need a great deal of study on it to find out what accidents occur, where they occur in the road system, whether at intersections, and why, or on straight roads, and why. What part has the road system itself to play in the accidents?

Then, second, I should think they should look into the driver's mental state, if you will, as far as it is possible. Did he have a momentary lapse? Did he become careless? Was he under great emotional strain? Was he fatigued? I know we look into whether he

was intoxicated or not, and that is important. But these other matters, I think should have more study, as to the state of mind and state of body of the people who are behind the wheel, or the people who are involved in accidents.

In the third place, I think we should look at the tire situation. How many of these accidents are actually caused by tire blowouts, whether the blowout occurs before or after the accident, because there is a lot of investigation across the continent in this particular field.

In the fourth place, this bureau would look into the structural defects or weaknesses of the cars themselves. Again we have some statistics on this. But certainly if this were done in depth and in detail, by a bureau assigned to do this job and staffed by experts who know their field, I think that we could learn a lot, as to what might have been done to prevent this, in the matter of car structure. How many people were impaled on ornaments? How many were impaled on the knobs inside the car? How many accidents occurred because of weakness in the side structure of the car? All these things should be looked into and carefully studied.

I have before me a release telling of a survey conducted in Sweden last year, where a government-controlled safety agency conducted a survey of 550,000 vehicles, not all exactly relating to the in-depth study that I mentioned. The testing period was January 1 through November 30. Out of the various cars that were tested, I have here the list of defects that were listed. The defects were listed by makes and models of cars, which is significant, and the results are made public.

This kind of thing, of course, brings certain pressure to bear upon manufacturers and also upon the owners of the cars, to get those defects cleared up. When owners have to have them fixed up on certain cars, the next time they look for a safer car and it is up to the manufacturer to see that each car is made safer the following year.

Out of this kind of safety research, it seems to me would come recommendations regarding highway construction and driver education, recommendations to overcome defects and poor training of drivers, and recommendations regarding improvement in car design. The University of Michigan has been conducting tests along these lines and has carried out certain studies. Dr. Shulman, I notice, has made certain recommendations and is trying to interest some of the car manufacturers in them.

It seems to me that some public authority

—specifically The Department of Highways—ought to set up this safety research bureau and go into this matter in depth, with the co-operation of other departments and of the provincial police and the co-operation of every agency that can be gathered together.

As I said at the beginning, Mr. Chairman, we have the nucleus of good highway designers. The hon. Minister has people who are experts and there are people in The Department of Transport who know something in this field, but instead of the separation of responsibility, there should be a drawing together and there should be a real study of this whole field. I wonder if the hon. Minister has been thinking in this regard and whether he has any words of encouragement for us.

This happens in the aircraft industry and in the whole air transport field. We see what has happened in Japan with the recent air crashes, where everybody concerned moved in to find out the reason for those crashes. Millions of dollars are going to be spent to find out what were the contributing causes to the disasters.

I think we should be conscious of this in the motor car field where we are killing and maiming thousands upon thousands of people in this province over a period of time. The time is here for co-ordinated action in this field and I would like very much to see this kind of a bureau set up within The Department of Highways.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult, if not impossible, to quarrel with the interests of any hon. member in matters of highway safety. I am sure that we are not alone; I am sure that everybody across the province, the country and the continent is equally concerned about the tragic loss of life that takes place on our highways.

I can say to the hon. member that we do have a special section of the department that assigns all its time to those matters of highway safety which, by any stretch of the imagination, could be attributed to, shall we say, defects in the highways themselves. This section is headed by a man with a rather broad and very acceptable reputation in this field.

At present we are working with the Ontario provincial police very closely. We have records in the office of the department of each and every accident and certainly all fatal accidents. We consult with the Ontario provincial police in each and every circumstance and, in fact, we visit the site of the accident with the Ontario provincial police

and then we do our best to translate that into reasons why the accident occurred. We examine the particular section of highway to see if it has what are known as "accident prone" characteristics, and if that is so, at the earliest possible time we undertake some reconstruction to remedy it.

We do all these things, and as I said, certain officers of our department are in almost constant contact with the national highway research board and with the safety leagues and safety councils in all the Canadian provinces. As a matter of fact, we send representatives to seminars on this all over the continent, but notwithstanding, we find it very, very difficult to determine why these highway accidents take place.

The hon. member made reference to fatigue. Certainly this can contribute to a fatal highway accident. I personally think that preoccupation while behind the wheel is a major contributor; I know I find myself while I am driving, preoccupied occasionally—

Mr. MacDonald: Perhaps you should never drive a car!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: You should not, but certainly I think it happens.

Intoxication is a major contributor; plain carelessness and recklessness are factors, and probably defects in some of the highways and structures. We will not deny that that is possible but I still submit to you, sir, and to the hon. member, that it is difficult to know. That is why I am prepared to say right now that I have much interest in the proposal that he has made.

I think that any reasonable proposal that will reduce the tragedy of loss of life and property and human suffering on the highways of this province or any other jurisdiction warrants any type of investigation that may tend to reduce it. I certainly say that we will give very careful consideration to the recommendations of the hon. member.

Mr. Young: I thank the hon. Minister for his answer. The only problem that I see with it, as he admits, is that the investigation is primarily from the point of view of the highway, and what in the highway system caused this. That, of course, is the hon. Minister's particular problem, but here again, it seems to me that this bureau ought to investigate all facets of the accident.

It ought to be prepared to move in, not only to look at the highway but to look at the driver as far as possible, if he is still alive, to find out what happened to him just

before, and also to look at the car and to see what parts of the car really were responsible, what improvements might be recommended—all this, so that the accident is looked at as a unit. I think if that could be done and such a bureau undertook this kind of a project, we would be a long way toward accomplishing what we want to accomplish.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, that is really what I had in mind when I said that I liked the hon. member's proposals sufficiently well to look into them very closely.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, this will introduce a new area, and I believe the hon. member for Yorkview has a point.

Mr. Chairman: Is it in the same area?

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the hon. Minister a specific question? On occasion there are absolutely baffling developments with regard to a certain stretch of highway in various parts of the province, where there are regular occurrences of accidents. I think of one on Highway 2 in the Orleans area east of Ottawa—

An hon. member: Highway 17.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Seventeen—that is right.

Mr. MacDonald: It is a straight stretch. I have driven it many times when I used to summer in that area. Yet regularly, once or twice a year for the last number of years, there have been one or two people killed in that area. I remember seeing that when still another fatal accident had taken place and there was a news account to the effect that The Department of Highways was going to make a study. Was this done in this specific instance and was there any conclusion drawn as to what conceivably could have caused that persistent succession of fatalities?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that when one drives that highway, it is just as the hon. member has said. It is a straight highway; there is no visible impairment of the sight-distance factors; the signing appears to be good, and I say quite frankly that we are at a loss to know why these accidents occur. We do know that at one time, in the majority of instances, the accidents involved drivers from out of the province. Whether this is because of unfamiliarity with the stretch of road, of poor driving habits on the part of those who came in from their neighbouring province, we do not know.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): How could you go wrong on a straight stretch?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: How can you, unless you are driving too fast or you are not in a condition to drive? But in a very great number of circumstances, this turned out to be the case. I would not like, Mr. Chairman, to attribute that as the reason for the accidents, but the frequency of this situation was of enough interest to make us think that it had a bearing on it. I say frankly that we could not find the road too deficient, so that it is a bit of a mystery to us.

However, we do hope in the not too distant future, to have a controlled access facility south of that and in due course take the through traffic off that road and leave it for local purposes. A heavy mixture of local and through traffic is not good. It can contribute to accidents too—turning movements on the part of people travelling short distances, or what we call "local users," mixed in with through traffic can contribute to accidents. I think when we do get this controlled access facility from Ottawa to the Quebec border it will at least relieve the existing highway of that through traffic and we will have nothing but local traffic on it. This should be beneficial, I think.

Mr. Chairman: If the member will yield the floor, the member for Ottawa East would like to speak on the same point.

Mr. H. S. Racine (Ottawa East): I have a comment or two to make on that subject, Mr. Chairman.

I think that in the last big accident on that highway, four or five people were killed and I think every one of those involved in the accident was a resident of the area. I would like to get this point straight. I think two of those people came from Alfred and the other three came from Ottawa.

I would like to disagree with the hon. Minister when he says this is a straight stretch of highway, because if I recollect correctly, there is a distance of a mile and a half or two miles in the Cumberland area where there are a number of curves, and where there is a continuous double white line, which prevents cars from passing in that area.

I would like the hon. Minister to tell us what he intends to do besides building the new road that he talks about, for that particular stretch of highway in the Cumberland area, and whether there is any possibility of extending or widening that highway. I think possibly the Deputy Minister knows that area

—there is a hotel-motel in that area—and that road is not quite straight. I think this is where there were a number of accidents.

Perhaps the hon. Minister could tell us whether there is a possibility that that road may be widened for at least a mile or a mile and a half.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, we can certainly look into this. I will not deny that there may have been accidents in that mile-and-a-half section, but the great volume of accidents, a great volume of them, comes from the straight section the hon. member for York South has referred to. Now we can substantiate this statistically. I will not deny there has been an accident in the section the hon. member refers to, but compared with the incident rate of accidents on this straight section, it is quite low.

However, I am prepared to say we can have the district office up there to examine this section and see if there are any remedial measures that can be introduced that would improve the situation he has referred to.

I might say—and this is back to a matter the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Nixon) discussed before the orders of the day, not too long ago—we certainly proposed at that time to make a more intensive examination of what was causing accidents at a highway junction in the area in which he lives. But I will say this, that even there we feel now we have done everything possible, short of grade separations or something—which would be very costly—to take care of the situation.

Nevertheless, we are going to pursue that very vigorously. But there are situations in the province, I assure hon. members, in which, upon investigation, it is very difficult to know why the accident took place, from the standpoint of the roads. But that does not minimize the importance of continuing to try to do something better about it.

Mr. R. F. Nixon (Brant): Mr. Chairman, I am glad the hon. Minister has referred to the specific instance that I brought to his attention previously at Osborne's Corners in the county of Brant. I would like to say this to him, that although he has promised another careful investigation, and the people in the area appreciate this, nothing has been done as yet. About a month has passed and I know that the hon. Minister's examining officials are very busy in many matters. But I must say, every time I go home I listen to the news with some trepidation, because there have been eight separate fatal accidents at this corner since the last work was done on it.

There is one thing that I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that would not have been permissible before the orders of the day. That is, at the time of the last investigation, it was seriously suggested by myself and others that an overhead stop sign might solve the problem there. The representative of the department said at that time that this would cost \$7,000—the price may have changed—and that surely we were not suggesting that this sort of thing would be installed at every corner where there was some hazard.

I would certainly suggest this most seriously at this particular corner. If, in fact, the expenditure of this amount of money or much more would make it into a safe corner, then I believe that the money should be spent. The signing there is adequate by the standards presently required by the department, but evidently they are inadequate as far as the people who have the misfortunes in the area. In every case I believe the accident has been where the driver has either not seen the stop sign, or not heeded it, and gone right out into the four-lane highway that intersects there, where the speed limit is 60 miles an hour; and the resulting catastrophes we are all aware of.

So I hope he does not agree with the departmental officials who were objecting to the expenditure of this money. Particularly in that it might set a precedent that would then involve the department in additional expenditure. Certainly we are going to have to spend a lot of money if we are to improve our safety record at this particular spot, and elsewhere in the province.

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully request the hon. Minister to do something concerning the intersections on Highway 401, in the Essex county area, from the fact that the tourist coming into the county is accustomed to driving on four-lane roads that are generally limited access, and once he gets beyond the city limits he starts accelerating and finds himself suddenly confronted with a crossroad. The hon. Minister has in his plans for this year six overpasses which will remedy this situation at six danger points in the county. I know he cannot construct all of the overpasses immediately, but he could sign the highway in some fashion to warn our American friends who use the highway that there is a danger ahead, because of the number of crossways or crossroads in the Essex county area. The signing does not go on 401 itself, and possibly the signing might be on the crossroads themselves, so that the

farmer or the individual using the crossroad will definitely slow down before he comes to Highway 401.

I understand that half of the accidents that occur between Windsor and London have occurred in the Essex county area—I am subject to correction—and half of those accidents involve our friends to the south of us, our American friends. We want to keep these people coming into our country; we do not want to kill them off. We would certainly request that the hon. Minister do some type of signing or something to notify our friends across the border that this is not a limited or a controlled access road, that there are inherent dangers as a result of the number of accesses to Highway 401.

Mr. Paterson: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask three questions of the hon. Minister in regard to the sensational announcement last July by the Governor of Ohio, that his state was contemplating erecting a high-level bridge or causeway across Lake Erie. And to bring hon. members of the House up to date on what has transpired on this subject, and a little background, I might read into the record a brief editorial from the *Sudbury Star* of last July. The caption was:

OHIO GOVERNOR'S ERIE HIGHWAY WILL
COME ONLY TO THE BORDER?

At the worst it may have been an act of discourtesy on the part of Governor James Rhodes of Ohio to ask for a feasibility study on the causeway across the eastern end of Lake Erie without first consulting with Ontario authorities. The Canada side would be within Ontario's boundaries. The action of the Ohio Governor is not of a nature which will build up friendship with Ontario's government and highway officials. Nothing along the line proposed without the co-operation and assistance from this province—

And further:

Now that Governor Rhodes has gathered in his modicum of political publicity with his surprise and perhaps premature announcement, the Ontario government might ask the Ohio Governor just what he has on his mind, and ask him if his proposed study extends only to the international boundary line.

On March 3, this is the latest press in my area concerning this. I have had informants in Ohio and this topic is still bubbling over there. To bring the hon. Minister up to date, recently Mr. Rhodes ordered a further study of the plan after he received favour-

able reports from the state highway engineers in The Ohio Department of Development.

One proposal: a link from the Sandusky area across Kelly's Island and reaching into my riding at Pelee Island and proposed to go to Point Pelee. The estimated cost is \$250 million, for approximately a 40-mile stretch. The other proposal would run from the Cleveland area into the riding of the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. McNeil), somewhere in the Port Stanley area, with an estimated projected cost of \$600 million.

I would ask these three questions of the hon. Minister: As yet has the Governor or any department of Ohio contacted him on this proposal? Second, will your department co-operate in any way, in the light of the problems you have, say, in the St. Thomas area now, with locating highways, and lend co-operation to this sort of study? And further, will this government possibly make an economic study of the impact and the benefits to industry and tourist development and other facets of our society, should this proposed Lake Erie causeway ever become reality?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: First, Mr. Chairman, I would say to the hon. member that all I have ever heard about the proposed causeway across Lake Erie, whether it be from Sandusky to Point Pelee or from Cleveland to Port Stanley, is what I read in the newspapers.

Mr. MacDonald: Maybe they are going to pay for the whole thing themselves.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I was just about to come to that, as a matter of fact. I think this thing first started about a year ago, as I recall it, and I really have not changed my opinion. Nor do I think has my department changed its opinion since we heard about it a year ago, at which time we replied to the press, pointing out that for the kind of money it would take to consider either of these proposals—and our engineers think their estimates are very low—there are certainly many, many priority items to take care of in the province of Ontario before we need a causeway over Lake Erie. I have not changed my mind on that, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to a study, if Governor Rhodes wants to pay for this study, we would be prepared to give his study consideration. We might then find that we had some views and ideas in this particular respect that were at some variation to the views that he might develop in a feasibility study, but we would be prepared to review it.

I would point out to the hon. member a feasibility study of this type would be quite expensive. I should think it could run certainly to \$1 million or more. It could be quite expensive to undertake a full feasibility study. It is not too difficult to undertake an engineering feasibility study, but a full one, which would involve economics and so on, is quite an operation.

As I say, against this background and the opinion of myself and others, that kind of money can be used to better advantage in many areas of the province than for a causeway over Lake Erie. I am inclined to think that we are not too keen about even participating in the cost of a study, although I would not rule that out. We would certainly be prepared to examine any proposal advanced. On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I will conclude these particular observations by saying it is very difficult for us to contemplate anything, until Governor Rhodes makes some type of official contact with us. So there is where the matter stands.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Hamilton East.

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, under planning, I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he could explain the problem on the Queen Elizabeth between the cut-off of Highway 10 and Oakville. For the winter months that highway has been left in one awful mess. Would this be the contractor's fault that it was left in this condition, because he did not clean it up right last fall, or did he start to do too much work and was not able to finish it?

It is really a dangerous situation now. There is no white line in lots of places. You are curving in and out of traffic there, I would think that a contractor should be compelled to leave the highway in better condition than he has for the winter months.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, I have to agree again with the hon. member. There is some responsibility on the contractor, if he leaves a job completely. I am not too sure there was not some work going on there all winter. But certainly if he leaves a highway contract at some stage in the fall until the next spring, there is a responsibility on him to leave it in a condition that is as acceptable for driving as possible. I think I would have to ask the hon. member to let us investigate this situation a little further.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, if I may ask the hon. Minister, would he mind replying to the previous suggestions I have made concerning Highway 401 and the crossroads?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Of course. In that respect, Mr. Chairman, I had some information out here to reply to the hon. member just a moment ago; I will see if I can find it.

We have undertaken what we believe to be an accelerated programme. Actually, while there are six more contracts for interchanges and flyovers, to which he made reference, to be awarded in the 1966 construction season in Essex, there are in addition to that three in various stages of completion that were awarded last year. That makes a total of nine. As we proceed a little further, we find there are a number in Elgin and in other parts.

What we try to do really, Mr. Chairman, because we cannot build them all at once, is to pick out those which constitute priority locations. We try to build these where we think they are needed the most. Again it is probably safe to say these might be considered more-accident-prone grade crossings than others.

This is the way we are trying to get on with the job, but we cannot possibly build them all at once, I would point out to the hon. member, Mr. Chairman. We do feel we have accelerated the programme in that manner.

Mr. Newman: Actually, Mr. Minister, we would like to see them built immediately. We know we cannot. It is physically impossible, but the sooner you do it, the better off not only the residents of Essex county are going to be, but our many American friends.

I had mentioned signing the crossroads rather than 401 in certain areas. Would this not be an advantage to the tourists?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would be very much surprised if there is not a readily visible stop sign at any township or county road that intersects 401, where the grade is not separated, and on 401 I would be very much surprised if, well in advance of the intersection, there is not the customary sign that indicates a crossroad. If there are any of these locations that are not signed in that manner, I would be happy to hear about them, because of course they should be.

Mr. Newman: I would say, Mr. Minister, they probably are, but maybe not sufficiently far enough back to warn the individual. Now, rather than using the main roads in going to

the lakes in the summer, a lot of our people take these short cuts by using some of the county roads.

I was going to ask the hon. Minister if he is aware of the Doxiadis study that involved the cities of Windsor, Detroit and Sarnia. This study concerned a megalopolis that would start with the city of Milwaukee, go into Chicago, from Chicago through to Detroit, to Windsor, Sarnia, and the three counties in southwestern Ontario, skirt down to Toledo, follow the lakeshore to Cleveland and Buffalo and then go right up to Toronto.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I am not, Mr. Chairman. I would be happy to know more about it.

Mr. Newman: May I suggest to the hon. Minister that he get a copy of it, because I think it will have a tremendous impact on Essex, Kent and Lambton counties.

The study is a Detroit research project, undertaken by Detroit Edison in co-operation with Wayne State University and Doxiadis Associates of Athens, Greece. It concerns this megalopolis extending from Milwaukee at the extreme west, right up to the city of Toronto. The economic impact that this study will have on the three counties is tremendous. There was a full-page insert in the *Windsor Star* several months ago mentioning it and I would suggest that The Department of Highways get a copy of it because it can have a real impact on the area.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, on vote 808, planning and design, I would like to make just a brief comment regarding the Burlington skyway bridge and perhaps the hon. Minister would answer two or three queries.

Mr. Chairman: This is on planning and design?

Mr. Gisborn: Yes, it is in regard to planning and design.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be necessary shortly, in my opinion, to widen the Burlington skyway bridge. In regard to planning and design—as you reminded me, sir, this is the vote we are on—one would have wondered why this was not done in the first place to provide for a six-lane bridge, three on each side. We are developing the Queen Elizabeth Way from Toronto to Hamilton to six lanes and there are plans on the board for the development of controlled access from there on to Niagara Falls.

I understand that shortly after the bridge was completed there was some question in

this regard as to why it was not made a six-lane bridge. I believe there was a statement by an official of The Department of Highways that this bridge could be extended very easily by putting an extra lane on each side. I wonder if that is the case and if there is anything on the board now to develop the skyway bridge to a six-lane traffic artery.

I understand that traffic crash barriers are being put in at the present time and I noticed from the press release on it that it was estimated that the cost would be between \$250,000 and \$500,000. This is quite a differential between an estimate and an actual cost. I would like some comment as to how these figures were arrived at.

The necessity to construct these crash barriers was brought about, I believe, because of two accidents involving fatalities and caused by trucks going out of control and crossing the median and colliding with other traffic. I have looked the situation over. Certainly I do not oppose the construction of these heavy steel crash barriers, but I do not think these barriers would have prevented the two accidents that precipitated the action because they both happened on the lower part of the incline. If the crash barrier had been there, I cannot see any other thing than that the vehicle out of control would have gone on down and collided with traffic that would have been stopped for the toll gates, or it would have crashed the toll gates themselves.

I think in regard to this sort of possible accident, other measures have to be taken. The speed is too great on that bridge. I know that vehicles are barrelling down there at 65 and 70 miles an hour and I think the first thing that has to be done is to have some control of the speed on that bridge. I think, second, that trucks should not be allowed to pass on downgrades and I think this would be another improvement in the safety factor on that bridge. The hon. Minister will realize that it is a narrow bridge and two large trucks there certainly create a hazard in going downgrade at such high speeds.

I would like the hon. Minister to advise me as to whether there are plans being made to widen the bridge to three lanes on each side, and to comment on the differential in the cost of the construction of the crash barriers.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member I would certainly say to him that we are aware of the early—certainly not immediate—necessity of widening the Burlington skyway. The four

lanes will not provide capacity much longer for the traffic volume that is developing, so I would suggest to the hon. member that we feel that in the foreseeable future, either a widening of the bridge, if it is possible, or the construction of another bridge, may have to be considered.

I suppose it is safe to say that at the time the bridge was built, it was a little more difficult to anticipate what we can see clearly today. I doubt very much if we would have ever considered six lanes versus four lanes—it might have been better to consider eight lanes versus four lanes. But at the time the bridge was built we would have had quite a tremendous investment for capacity requirements that were not going to develop, shall we say, for a period of 15 or 20 years. At least that is the way it appeared at that time.

It may look like false economy, but then, of course, there is a limit to the extent that these facilities can be provided in advance of need, although some of that has to be anticipated, as well. Certainly I admit to the hon. member and to the House, Mr. Chairman, that we are aware of this matter and it is under study at the moment, as to the best means of implementing more capacity for the crossing of Burlington Bay at that point. We hope to know just when it should be done and how it should be done in the not too distant future.

With respect to the matter of grade separations on the Queen Elizabeth Way, we again have been aware of this problem for quite some time and we have a programme now ahead of us which will eliminate all grade crossings. Again, it is difficult to say that we can accomplish this immediately; we certainly know that it should be done as soon as possible and as I mentioned with respect to another similar matter just a few moments ago, we are trying to pick out the priority locations on the Queen Elizabeth Way and do those first. We know that this Queen Elizabeth Way should be, and eventually will be, completely access controlled. This is our plan now and it is programmed for some work to be done in each of a number of succeeding years until this is accomplished. Of course, as the hon. member knows, we are on with the widening now.

The cost of the median barrier that he makes reference to was \$352,000. At the moment I do not have the tender costs but the contract actually involved \$352,000 and the engineering will make that total \$358,670. That is what we will be expending for

the median barrier. Those expenditures are substantial, when you consider that in the not-too-distant future we hope to have it access-controlled. These are interim measures to provide some safety that is required before we can accomplish the full programme.

Mr. Gisborn: There is just one other brief comment that I would like to make, Mr. Chairman. I would hope that in the planning and design of either a new bridge or the widening of the present bridge, consideration be given to the problem of the lack of run-off in case of accidents on the bridge. I hate to imagine what the situation would be now on that bridge if there was a serious tie-up on the top of it, and if an ambulance tried to get up there. I know this problem was raised in regard to the Gardiner expressway and I hope that in the future this problem will be given the greatest consideration.

Mr. Chairman: Shall vote 808 carry?

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in my original—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if I could just have a word in reply here. It will only be a brief one, but again I am bound to agree—I am very agreeable today—that I shudder sometimes when I cross that bridge myself.

Maybe we will have to look into the matter as the hon. member proposed, such as passing of trucks on a two-lane stretch going one way or down. I have some doubts whether trucks should be allowed to pass on many sections of our controlled-access highways, or any roads. This may be worth looking into and certainly we will have a look at the speed limit. I just wanted to say these things.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Windsor-Walkerville.

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, in my original comments on the hon. Minister's discourse concerning his department the other day I made certain recommendations. Would the Minister mind giving me a comment on my recommendations? I would like to know if what I have suggested is feasible or not, or if it is practical.

Mr. Chairman: Are these recommendations under planning and design?

Mr. Newman: Yes, under planning and design.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, these would be the recommendations that were part and parcel of his introductory remarks. It is going to take us quite some to make an analysis of them. I say to the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville that we want to make an analysis of them, and I say very frankly that we want to have some knowledge of what it might cost if some of them were to be implemented.

Mr. Newman: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: So this will be done, and we will be happy to comment on them for the hon. member a little later on.

Mr. Newman: Right. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

Vote 808 agreed to.

On vote 809:

Mr. Newman: Mr. Chairman, on vote 809, may I ask the hon. Minister to reconsider the case of Mr. Clare Ford, the individual who had the nursery business and was dislocated from the nursery business as a result of expansion to Highway 400, because the department in their approach to the problem have simply driven the man right out of business, and I understand the man today is seeking public welfare.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I am not familiar with the matter the hon. member raises, Mr. Chairman, but I am informed that it has been thoroughly investigated and the man in fact was a tenant, not a proprietor, and it was not an isolated case. The best I can tell him is that we do not get any satisfaction out of this sort of thing and yet, on the other hand, there are circumstances when we cannot build roads unless somebody is dislocated. I wish I knew the answer to the problem in a general way. I would be happy, as a matter of fact, if the hon. member is interested, to let him review our file.

Mr. Newman: Right. Mr. Minister, we know you are legally right, but I think you are morally wrong in the way the man has been treated. You review the case and I think you will give more consideration.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, I will let you review it, too.

Mr. Newman: Thank you.

Vote 809 agreed to.

Vote 810 agreed to.

On vote 811:

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, I have quite a little bit to say on this vote and I wonder if we should not adjourn it until after—

Mr. Chairman: I think so; we will wait for the leader of the House.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed, Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Clerk of the House: Thirty-third order. Resuming the adjourned debate on Resolutions Nos. 8 and 12 respecting water resources.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS NOS. 8 AND 12 (continued)

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, in resuming this debate I confess to a certain difficulty at the outset. The hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha) introduced these two motions, but his remarks were devoted almost solely to the motion No. 12 standing in his name. He did not even read motion No. 8, so that in a sense it really is not before the House—though it is formally, I acknowledge, Mr. Speaker. My position is something like that of the hon. member for Lambton West (Mr. Knox). He got up and was shooting at a missile which had not yet been put into the sky, so to speak. And he was attempting to shoot it down.

Some time before the debate is over, Mr. Speaker, presumably the hon. member for Grey South (Mr. Oliver) is going to speak to his motion.

Meanwhile, I am going to join the hon. member for Lambton West in shooting at it before it gets into the sky—if not to shoot it down, at least to discuss its contents.

I wanted to devote my remarks to Resolution 8, and I shall confine my remarks to 15 minutes so that one of my colleagues can speak to the other motion that stands in the name of the hon. member for Sudbury.

Dealing with the motion itself, Mr. Speaker, just let me read it:

That the Ontario water resources commission be instructed to report upon the feasibility of piping water from the Great Lakes to drought areas in western Ontario.

Mr. Speaker, in my view this motion is a few years out of date. I do not think the problem is really to consider a fresh water piping system to cope with drought areas. I would acknowledge that we have had to face the problem of drought, and therefore the need for water to cope with drought. But it seems to me that on focusing on drought areas and drought problems, you are hitting the outside of the target instead of the bull's eye.

The real problem, the basic problem, is the question of greater fresh water supplies, not only to cope with drought areas, but to cope for all of the far-ranging needs of water and our shortage of it, particularly in southern Ontario.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Drought, in the resolution, conveys shortage of water for industrial uses and through anti-pollution measures.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member for Grey South interjects that his definition of drought area is any area that is short of water, even if it is a city. If he is putting that definition on it I would accept it—

Mr. Oliver: I do not see how anybody else can interpret it otherwise—

Mr. MacDonald: When I think of a drought area I think of a drought area such as the farmers have to face. I think most people have up until now. All the more regret therefore, that the hon. member for Sudbury squeezed the hon. member for Grey South out, or we might have had his explanation of his resolution before we misinterpreted it.

However, let me go back, Mr. Chairman, to show you how long-standing is the need and how tardy this government has been in coming to grips with this need. I have in my hand a copy of the report of the Conservation committee for the year 1950. This was a select committee of this Legislature. The hon. member for Grey South was a member. I think another of the important members of the committee was my predecessor E. B. Jolliffe. However, let me quote one or two passages from it. On page 95:

Two million people or almost one half of our total population of 4.5 million—

this is 1950, I remind the House:

—are dependent upon subsurface water supplies. As shown on the accompanying map these include the larger cities of London, Chatham, Guelph, St. Thomas, Owen Sound, Woodstock, Brantford, Kitchener, Stratford and Galt—cities whose sole limiting factor now for industrial and population expansion is water supply.

In other words, as far back as 1950 a committee, the overwhelming majority of which was made up of Conservatives, came in with the unanimous report that said that the sole limiting factor for the industrial development of these cities stemmed from the shortage of water supply.

On page 96, Mr. Speaker, another quotation:

Evidence presented to this committee, particularly from western and south-central Ontario, has been most emphatic on the apparent lowering of ground water supplies. Not only do farmers complain that their wells are going dry but many of the large cities mentioned above are finding it difficult to secure water for an increasing population, or even for their present number. This growing demand by our large inland cities has caused serious difficulties for farmers adjacent to deep urban wells which deprive the shallow farm wells of much water.

In other words, once again, they were spelling out a condition which has persisted and only in very recent years has there been any action or programme of any proportions at all to cope with that basic situation.

A third quotation:

To increase the ground-water supply there is again no easy solution. Reforestation, the reclaiming of certain swamps for their original purpose, and proper land use are all important. Also necessary is the construction of storage reservoirs at strategic points in the river valleys, which would serve the dual purpose of assisting flood control and recharging the soil beneath the impoundment, especially if the subsoil is gravelly or absorbent.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some effort to this end through our conservation authorities and related bodies—like The Department of Lands and Forests—in building dams so that we could capture some of the water, so that it would be held in our river basins, instead of running off into the lakes. From there it could conceivably get down into the subsoil and do something to check this disastrous lowering of the watertable.

But the comment of the hon. member for Lambton West was that all of this problem has really been coped with by the establishment of the water resources commission. The answer to that, or the comment on that comment, is: yes and no, but only within the context of "the fullness of time" in which this government operates.

I only intend to mention this and move on to the main points of my remarks. It is true that the Ontario water resources commission has come to grips with the desperate need for local water, for sewage purposes, for fresh-water purposes, and so on. For years this government refused to face up to the fact that the capital requirements involved in this kind of a project were away beyond the capacities of many of the local municipalities, Mr. Speaker.

Only last year—15 full, long years after this conservation report and after an impressive accumulation of evidence that the previous approach was not working—did this government finally recognize that they must break through the financial barrier. Therefore they have now adopted a policy whereby the Ontario water resources commission will plan the project in co-operation with local authorities but will resume responsibility in terms of the capital outlay for building it, and then lease it back so that the payment can be put on the tax rolls year after year until it has been met.

As the hon. member for Lambton West reminds us, the result of this breaking of the log jam, so to speak, has been that the water resources commission now has 100 applications. Indeed, there is some prospect that because of the backlog of work that we did not get done despite the desperate need, despite the continued pollution and all of the other factors involved in it, now there is such a rush of work that the Ontario water resources commission is likely going to have to establish priorities. They will have more than they can contend with.

However, I leave that aspect to go back to what in my view is the point in the resolution of the hon. member for Grey South. This is the proposition that he has been advancing in this House for a number of years and that certainly we in the New Democratic Party have had as a specific part of our programme—the development of a water grid in southern Ontario, comparable in a general sense to the hydro grid that was developed some 50 years ago—in order to get this vital resource to all of the people who need it, since we know what that desperate need has been since 1950.

I was very interested to have what I presume is an up-to-date report of what has happened on this from the comments of the hon. member for Lambton West. I took the trouble of getting a copy of his speech so that I could read the details carefully. I just want to recapitulate what has happened in this intervening period. From it, Mr. Speaker, I suggest there emerges a clear lesson that once again this government is indulging in what I would choose to describe as Tory planning—namely, you leave the development to come like Topsy and then when you have inequities and anomalies emerging in it you try to devise some sort of a pattern out of this Topsy-like development.

All this, instead of sitting down, assessing your need, which was clearly delineated as far back as 1950, and mapping out a programme, devising a grid, making it available so that everybody knows what this grid ultimately is going to be, even though its implementation may be gradual in accordance with the highest priority needs.

What the hon. member for Lambton West reminded us of was that in 1963, the towns of Leamington and Essex, and certain industries in the area like the Heinz plant, had taken the necessary steps to establish a system of piping water from the lake, known as the union water system. But here is the interesting point, Mr. Speaker: Within three years of this being established they recognized that this was not the way to go about it, and that you should not be doing it in a piecemeal fashion with each little municipality dabbling in the overall problem.

The hon. member for Lambton West now tells us that the OWRC is considering taking over this whole system as a project that would be part of the OWRC's overall network—the equivalent of a hydro grid. Having taken it over, then they will proceed to the necessary expansion to meet other needs in neighbouring areas.

He also reminded us that as far back as 1957 another bit and piece in the picture was started, namely, in Dunnville, with certain industries working with the municipality. They got approval for a pipeline that brought water in from the lake to that area. He pointed out that in 1963, for the first time apparently—13 years after the clear delineation of the problem by the conservation committee—the OWRC made a survey and a study of what the probable water pipeline requirements would be. His report to the House, which I have no reason to believe is incorrect, indicated that there would be 19

new pipelines needed, 11 of them in south-western Ontario. He said that nine of these are either under construction or in the process of negotiation.

I for one would like to know what this system is. I remember last year, Mr. Speaker, when I went with the standing committee to the annual visit up to the OWRC on the 401 bypass, I asked the question about this grid, or whether there was consideration of developing a grid. One of the officers of the OWRC said, "Oh, we have a grid worked out." I was a little startled to learn of this. I am wondering why they are so secretive about it.

If they are attempting to build a grid; if they have plans for building a grid; if as the hon. member for Lambton West said, there are 19 new pipelines required, why cannot the OWRC—and this government, in keeping with a planned policy—map this out, make it available to us, the members of the Legislature, and all of the municipalities and the public in southern Ontario so that we will know what the plans are, instead of keeping them in the dark?

Indeed, to continue with the recapitulation that the hon. member for Lambton West gave us, he pointed out—and I am curious to know whether this is in keeping with the 19 pipelines that he referred to, or whether this is in addition to those 19—that since 1964 when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) announced on behalf of his own home city of London that the OWRC was going to bring water in from Lake Huron—the so-called Lake Huron water supply system which is going to sell not only to London but to other municipalities along the pipeline. It will be completed by 1967 for \$18 million—obviously a project of considerable proportions.

Last year St. Thomas was in need, and another bit in the broad picture was met with plans for a pipeline from the lake. Finally the hon. member for Lambton West told us that regional studies are now being made in Lambton and Peel for secondary services to the Lake Huron water supply; in Kent and in the lower Grand Valley.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, I am puzzled as to why the government is going about it in this apparently unplanned fashion. If it is more planned than is apparent, what is the reason for the delay in publishing an overall plan? I put this to the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root) who sits on the Ontario water resources commission. What is the reason for the delay in the production of a map which will indicate to us,

as Hydro does in its grid system, what precisely is planned; what is going to be tackled, for example, in the next few years; what is anticipated as a need 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 years from now?

It would seem to me that that kind of rational, sensible planning, rather than an attempt to impose a plan on all of this bits-and-pieces kind of development, would result in the future in avoiding wastage and uneconomical development. If we go about it piecemeal, I can see the possibility that on occasion we are going to run a pipeline to a certain area, and it will be of a certain size and we will discover five years later that there are many other municipalities in that area which will need water and we will have to loop the pipeline. It would have been much more sensible and much more economic to put in a larger pipeline to begin with, to meet those needs that are immediate and those needs that will have to met some five years later.

My concluding remark, Mr. Speaker, keeping within the 15 minutes that I said I was going to take, is a plea to the government, in light of the motion of the hon. member for Grey South, that we rescue all of this vitally important development, particularly in southern Ontario, from the apparent secrecy, and the apparent piecemeal approach, and let us present it to the House as a fully developed plan, even though the implementation of that plan may be staged over the next 10, 15, 20 or 25 years.

Mr. F. R. Oliver (Grey South): Mr. Speaker, I confess to the hon. member for York South, and the House generally, that if another occasion should arise when anybody suggests that two motions, one of which is mine, should be fused, I shall oppose that recommendation very strongly indeed. It puts one in a rather awkward position, in that the motion standing in my name has been discussed, and quite well discussed, by a number of hon. members up to this time.

My hon. friend from York South—and I agree entirely with what he said, which is a strange thing for me to say—has outlined the programme and the proposition in a manner that meets with my approval and coincides with what I would have said had I been the original speaker.

Now my hon. friend mentions the conservation committee report. I would say to the House that this was one Opposition resolution that was accepted by the Tory government of that day. I moved the origi-

nal resolution that set up the conservation committee, and in the speech at that time, I stressed that one of the main reasons for setting up this conservation committee would be an examination of the water potential of the province, its use and its management.

That committee was set up 15 years ago, and today we stand in this House, recognizing that if the use of water, its potential and its management were important 15 years ago, they are much more important today. We are, in this province, rapidly becoming a great industrial giant. Our industries are springing up all over the place, you might say, and as we become more of an industrial unit, our requirements for water double and triple and on up.

We need water in great quantities. If there is one thing industry needs to be assured of in Ontario, it is ample water to meet this growth in the years to come. In Ontario, we are very fortunate in that we have an availability of supply almost unlimited. Other countries, or other provinces, are not as fortunate as we are in that regard. We have at our back door all the fresh water needed for industry, needed to clear up pollution, needed to alleviate the distress caused by drought conditions on the farms, and needed for any other variety of purposes that one might conjure up in one's mind.

I agree with my friend from York South, that the danger as I see it today—I am not completely lacking in the knowledge of water conservation matters in this province—is that we are going at this matter in a haphazard and a dilapidated sort of way. We are doing it, as my hon. friend says, by bits and pieces. One project seems to be not related to the other. There is no relationship between a pipeline here and a pipeline there, and I would say that the greatest need that we have in Ontario today is for an Adam Beck for water, as he was for Hydro many years ago.

There is a great danger, it seems to me—I said this at the time the London pipeline bill was going through. I disagree entirely with these individual commitments to serve local communities, unless that commitment is bound together in one whole that will serve the provincial purpose over a broader area than we have enveloped in our thoughts so far. That is the point I wanted to leave with the House.

I say we are in great danger of not having enough water for all the multi-purposes for which water is necessary, and if we are

going to harness that water for the best use, then we should do it under a public utility or a good system that will bring some sense to the management of this important product. Then we will have some degree of uniformity and there will be some sense of direction to it. It will not be growing up as it is now, like Topsy, without seemingly any direction or any advice that is sound on a provincial wide basis.

That is what I urge upon the government this afternoon, and it is why I introduced this resolution, because I think there has not been progress enough in 15 years. I think the need for water has greatly advanced, doubled, trebled in the last 15 years, and our determination to meet that problem has not kept pace with the problem itself. And unless this government, and my hon. friend who speaks after me, can show to the House what they have done and what they intend to do—do they intend to have a grid system? Do they intend to make this a public utility? Do they intend to make it available for the people of the province of Ontario, or do they want to keep their light under a bushel, if indeed there is a light?

Certainly, if you have plans, this Legislature is entitled to them, because we are the ones that have to fight for it or against it, in this Legislature and throughout the province.

I hope that when my hon. friend speaks he will reveal, perhaps for the first time, what plans the government have in mind, and if they are cognizant of the great need for water, not only today, but in the plans that extend into the next decade or so. Are we looking ahead, are we making plans? There is no visible evidence, I suggest, that we are making sufficient plans in a proper way to meet what I think is an emergency now, and which will be a greater emergency as the years go on.

Mr. J. Root (Wellington-Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes at my disposal, I want to make some comments regarding the resolutions standing in the name of the hon. member for Grey South and the hon. member for Sudbury.

In the course of my remarks, I will reply to some of the comments we listened to today. Last Tuesday evening, the House leader called for resolution No. 8 and immediately we saw evidence of organized confusion. The hon. member for Sudbury got up and said he was going to talk on resolution 12, with some reference to 8, and this led to the confusion which the hon. member

for York South mentioned; all of which was contrary to the agreement that had been made.

As the hon. member proceeded with his address, it became apparent he was going to ignore the gentlemen's agreement that had been worked out by the Whips, that he would speak for about half an hour and leave 15 minutes for the hon. member for Lambton West, representing government supporters, and 15 minutes for the hon. member for York South, representing the ND Party.

Since the hon. member for Sudbury was reading from a prepared text that was in the hands of some hon. members, it was evident that he had prepared enough words to take up practically the whole hour. That we could expect, from previous experience in the House.

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, it may be that this hon. member has something of value to contribute to the debate, but he is attacking my colleague, the hon. member for Sudbury, in his absence. I think he is misstating the facts. He has misstated several of the facts and I think he should be told to desist from this unless he wants to properly state the facts. I think if he were carrying on in the manner of a member of this House, he would at least have the courtesy to wait until the hon. member for Sudbury was back.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order!

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will not deduct that short speech from my time. The hon. member knew that this debate was to be called tonight and if he is not in the House, that is his business. His absence from the House is something that we are accustomed to.

As a result of this lack of co-operation on the part of the hon. member for Sudbury, we are debating both resolutions. It is not my purpose today to make any extended remarks regarding the resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Grey South.

The hon. member for Lambton West dealt very fully with this resolution, pointing out the great programme that had been carried out by the Ontario water resources commission, in surveying areas, providing information to municipalities and proceeding with the construction of pipelines into areas where there is need for water that has been recognized by the municipal governments.

At this point I want to make some reply to the suggestion that we have a water grid. I would point out to hon. members of the House that good water is drawn from many sources in Ontario. We have ground water in abundance in many parts of the province, we have surface water, and it would be entirely unrealistic to build expensive pipelines into an area where there is an adequate water supply. Our policy has been to build pipelines into the areas where there is not adequate water of suitable quality, and I think this is sound, because people will use the cheapest source of good water.

Are the hon. members opposite suggesting that the OWRC should force people to abandon sources of good water to take water from a grid that they indicated they had no intention of wanting?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: The 19 areas that were mentioned in the speech of the hon. member for Lambton West were areas where we had checked to see if there was any possibility of constructing an economical and feasible pipeline. The areas we are working on today are the areas that have shown the greatest possibility of an economic construction.

What is our plan with regard to water? This question was asked, I believe by the hon. member for York South. Our plan is to supply water in the most economical manner possible. We are oversizing pipelines to take care of the reasonable demands that have been projected into the future, wherever we are building pipelines.

Our programme is a provincial programme, recognizing all sources of water and supplying to our people good water from the most economical source available.

Mr. Speaker, I want to return to some comments that I wanted to make regarding the address that was delivered by the hon. member for Sudbury. He knows his resolution and I am not going to take the time of the House to read it because hon. members have read it. I am sure that if the hon. member for Sudbury would keep himself informed of the great programme that has been carried out and that is being carried out by the Ontario water resources commission, he would ask to have that resolution removed from the order paper. I listened with interest to his rambling remarks on March 8—

Mr. Singer: Read his speech!

Mr. Root: I have read his speech and I must say that I still am not sure that the hon.

member had really organized his thoughts. There was some comment about dinosaurs and precambrian shield—in fact, the whole language of the text that he read did not do justice to the oratorical ability of the hon. member for Sudbury, all of which indicates that either did not prepare the text himself or he was not familiar—

Mr. MacDonald: Let us get away from the text and get down to the real issue.

Mr. Root: I am coming to it, I am coming to it!

All of which indicates that either he did not prepare the text himself or he was not familiar with the subject-matter of his own resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have said that I am not going to waste the time of the House replying to the rambling remarks that were read on that occasion, other than to say that I take strenuous objection to any reflections he makes on the general manager of our commission, Mr. Caverly, or the staff of our commission. I would suggest that there is a no more dedicated group of public servants anywhere in the province of Ontario, than we find on the staff of the Ontario water resources commission. We have gradually built this staff up to something like 475 persons.

We are dealing with 978 municipalities wherever there is evidence of pollution. We are dealing directly with the industries that discharge their wastes directly into streams. Other industries are dealt with through municipal sewage disposal systems.

Under the terms of reference that have been given to the commission by the Legislature and by the government, our programme extends as far north as the Severn river where it discharges into Hudson Bay. This river is one of the northern rivers that we will survey to develop accurate information regarding the amount of fresh water in the Hudson Bay and James Bay basins.

This, Mr. Speaker, is very necessary if we are going to make wise and sound decisions that may have to be made in the days that lie ahead with regard to the possibility of diverting water into another watershed; and at the same time, protecting this valuable resource that may be needed for the future development of the northern part of the province.

Our programme extends as far south as Windsor, Essex county, and out into Lake Erie, where we are carrying on surveys, gathering information and assessing the quality of the water that we may provide suitable water

for the various needs in that part of the province.

Our programme extends as far west as the Rainy River and Kenora districts—to the Manitoba border, and as far east as the Ottawa and St. Lawrence river valleys.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. member for Sudbury cast reflections on the 475 members of staff and suggested that they are not discharging their responsibilities, I challenge him to show me any other group that is carrying on such an extensive programme with such a limited staff.

In the short time at my disposal this afternoon, it is not possible for me to present to the House all details of the very broadly based and extensive programme the Ontario water resources commission is carrying out. I will be making remarks in other debates in the House and will try to place before it, as I have always tried to place before the House, a record of what we have accomplished, and what our programme may be for the future.

Before I go further, I want to put this in the record: I am surprised that the two resolutions we are debating should come from hon. members of the Liberal Party. I am particularly surprised that resolution 12 should stand in the name of the hon. member for Sudbury. This member, of all hon. members, is the last one in the House who should have placed this resolution on the order paper. He is a member of the standing committee that summons the Ontario water resources commission to appear and present its programme and answer questions.

The OWRC was asked to appear on February 15 to give members of that committee a comprehensive review of the work of the commission. We arranged for transportation and took the members up to the laboratory on 401 highway. There, the members were met by senior officials of the commission and taken on a tour of the laboratory, so that they would have first-hand knowledge of the work carried on in that important arm of the commission.

They could see where thousands of tests were made every year on water and sewage samples. They could see some of the research projects that are being carried out. Following the tour, the members of the standing committee assembled in the conference room, where officials of the commission presented a brief outlining the work of the commission, and then answered questions submitted by members of this committee—the committee that represents all parties in the Legislature.

Mr. Speaker, let me hasten to correct that statement. The Liberal Party gave a clear

indication of their interest in the work of the water resources commission by being conspicuous by their absence; they were absent when the commission was giving information regarding the programme that is being carried out. The New Democratic Party did a little better than the Liberal Party. They had one man there, and if my memory serves me correctly, he asked no questions during the question period.

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): What's the use of asking questions? It is the same story every year.

Mr. Root: How would the hon. member know, he was not there.

Mr. Speaker, the only party members who indicated they were really interested in the work of the Ontario water resources commission and the great programme that is being carried out, were the members of the Progressive-Conservative Party, who had a strong representation present to review the work of the commission, to ask questions and to gather information. The hon. member for Sudbury is a member of that committee; he was not present to see what was going on, to hear the brief or to ask questions.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, if I could carry on I would get to some very valuable information which apparently the hon. members do not wish to hear. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes despair of ever getting through to the hon. member for Sudbury. At the last session, at the time when the estimates of the Ontario water resources commission were presented to the House, I tried to give a comprehensive report of our programme. I spoke at some length, but again the hon. member was not present; indeed, if my memory serves me correctly, we did not see him for several weeks during that session.

Annually we present a report to the Legislature. The information is there for all to read. We are constantly giving press releases to keep the public informed. It is very difficult for me to understand how a member of this Legislature, a member of the standing committee on government commissions, could be so woefully ignorant of what is going on that he would stand up in this House and make the speech he made last Tuesday and handed out to the press.

Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that are left to me I want to point out some basic information.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: First—are the hon. members ready to listen?

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: They should get their heads out of the sand so they can see and hear.

First, let me point out that The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act was passed ten years ago and the commission was charged with the responsibility of picking up the backlog of necessary work that had developed throughout the entire history of the province of Ontario. At the same time, the commission had to keep pace with the tremendous industrial development taking place in the province and the population explosion that paralleled the industrial development.

When the Act was passed in 1956, some months were necessary to acquire office space and set up the organization. However, since the commission began its programme in 1957 a tremendous construction programme has been undertaken throughout the province in the field of water supply and pollution control.

For example, under The Ontario Water Resources Commission Act, all plans for the establishment of any waterworks or sewage works, as well as the extension of and changes in the existing works must be submitted to the commission. No such works may proceed until commission approval has been given.

I am sure hon. members will be interested to know that at December 31, 1965, the number of certificates issued by the commission since 1957 with respect to such works totalled 15,095 for an estimated value of over \$1 billion.

Mr. Singer: Of whose money?

An hon. member: Whose should it be?

Mr. Root: Let me ask the hon. member—

Mr. Singer: It is municipal money and that is the whole problem.

Hon. A. Grossman (Minister of Reform Institutions): They get it from people.

Mr. Root: Let me ask the hon. member, is that a deplorable record?

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that this is a tremendous programme that has been carried out by the Ontario water resources commission in co-operation with the municipalities. Let us keep in mind that at the time the commission was formed, it was fore-

cast that over a 20-year period it might require something like \$2.4 billion to pick up the backlog and keep pace with the booming and expanding economy of Ontario.

The figures I have quoted indicate that the programme is right on schedule and that at the same time our municipalities are providing many other needed services for the people.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain to the House that this programme was carried out under two methods of financing, and basic to all methods of financing, as I have mentioned previously, the plans for every project have to be scrutinized and approved by the commission. Following the issuance of the approval certificate, the municipality makes a decision. If it wishes to finance, build and operate its own plant, it is free to do so, provided it delivers an effluent that reaches the objectives of the commission. If, on the other hand, a municipality wishes, it can enter into an agreement with the water resources commission and the commission will arrange for the financing, construction and operation of the plant until the debt is paid off, when the plant would become the property of the municipality.

The \$1 billion programme I have mentioned has been carried out under these two methods of financing. However, the government recognized there was a limit to the amount of debts that municipalities would carry, and in order to speed up the programme, it announced a programme in 1964 for building water pipelines. Last August this principle of financing was extended to cover certain water and sewage works, and a new programme was launched whereby the province will finance and own the sewage works and waterworks that come under this programme, will sell water to municipalities at cost and will receive and treat sewage at cost on a unit basis.

Scores of municipalities have made inquiries and some are already entering into agreements with the commission for construction of water and sewage works under this programme.

The municipalities now have three options: (1) They can finance, build and operate their own works provided the effluent meets OWRC objectives; (2) They can enter into an agreement with the OWRC and the commission will finance, build and operate the works until the debt is paid, when the system is turned over to the municipality, unless the municipality enters into an agreement for the OWRC to continue operating the system; (3) They can enter into an agree-

ment with the OWRC where the OWRC will finance, build, own and operate the works and sell the service to the municipality at cost. The municipalities have a free choice of which of the three programmes they wish to follow.

Mr. Speaker, since this third programme was announced, the OWRC is stepping up its programme to bring pollution under control wherever pollution may exist and to provide necessary water supply systems so that our people can have adequate supplies of good potable water.

As I mentioned earlier, over \$1 billion worth of water and sewage works have been approved by the commission. Many of these works were carried out by larger municipalities on their own. Some 340 projects serving some 204 municipalities have been developed by the commission at a cost of over \$133 million.

The vast majority of our municipalities are now treating their sewage. However, there are still some municipalities that for various reasons have not installed sewage treatment works. Some have spent great sums of money building sewers but have provided no treatment. Under the new proposal for construction of treatment works, the OWRC is stepping up its programme and exerting pressure on the municipalities that are not treating sewage.

Mr. Speaker, since this resolution stands in the name of the hon. Liberal member for Sudbury, who is no doubt speaking for his party, I think the OWRC can be assured that it will have the full support of this House when it applies pressure to municipalities and industries that are not adequately treating waste. As we read the press, we are aware that the OWRC at times does receive criticism from municipal officials, and indeed I have had criticism from hon. members of this Legislature. Sometimes we are criticized by the press when we refuse to accept proposals, to delay the construction of needed sewage works.

The hon. member for Sudbury is away off base when he suggests this House is of the opinion that the government has lacked direction and purpose in providing for many thousands of our citizens the minimum requirements for fresh water and reasonable facilities for sewage disposal.

Mr. Singer: He could not be more correct.

Mr. Root: The OWRC has carried out a tremendous programme to provide clean

water in the province of Ontario. The programme is being stepped up, reaching into all areas of our province. Sewage and industrial wastes are rapidly being brought under control. Adequate supplies of water are being developed for people, for industry, for agriculture and for pleasure.

Mr. MacDonald: The hon. member is now doing exactly what he criticized the hon. member for Sudbury for.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: Mr. Speaker, do I have the floor?

Where necessary, pipelines are being constructed. Surveys are being carried out to have an accurate inventory of ground water and surface water in all parts of the province.

The hon. member for Sudbury is critical of our general manager, Mr. Caverly, for suggesting that it might take from 10 to 15 years to provide an accurate inventory of the waters in our northern rivers. I suggest the hon. member's statement displays lack of knowledge of the subject.

I remember that when I came into this House in 1951 we were confronted with very high water levels in the Great Lakes system following a period of high precipitation. Great concern was expressed in many areas about the effect of high water on docks and shore facilities. Then the cycle of nature changed and precipitation dropped below normal and the lake levels went down. Some people were ready to make snap decisions that would cost many millions, yes, even billions of dollars.

The Prime Minister of this province, with his usual calm judgment—

Mr. Singer: Raised the water levels.

Mr. Root:—called a conference that led to the initiation of studies that would lead to the best method of controlling lake levels. In many cases, they had reached an all-time low following a five- or six-year period of low precipitation. During the past year the cycle apparently changed; we have had high precipitation and lake levels are coming back to normal. This is the reason we say that before we go into any wholesale diversion of water from the north we must have an inventory based on sound principles.

Mr. Speaker: I would like to advise the member that his time will expire within a minute.

Mr. Root: Thank you, sir. I realize that part of my time was used up by hon. members opposite and that may have been by design—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Root: With what we have seen in the last 15 years on the lakes, it is reasonable to think that we need a 10- or 15-year period to make a sound inventory.

Let me conclude my remarks by saying the OWRC stands ready to help any municipality to solve its problems with regard to sewage disposal or provision of adequate supplies of water. I have outlined the three methods by which we can be of assistance. We appreciated the co-operation we received from municipal governments. Almost two-thirds of our people are now paying for some form of pollution control through municipal systems, and we cannot refrain from asking other municipalities, who are not treating waste, to move forward and clean up.

With this brief résumé of our work, I hope the House will be unanimous in rejecting the resolutions that stand in the name of the hon. member for Grey South and the hon. member for Sudbury.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, I only want to say three things about the hon. member who has just spoken about his presentation.

The first one is that he should go back to the dictionary and do a bit of studying about what a grid system actually means, so he will understand what we are talking about on this side of the House.

The second is that he has forgotten completely that the government he represents has been in power in this province for over 20 years; that the government's neglect has caused the pollution and the buildup of the very problems he was talking about. And now he is in a position of claiming credit for this government for cleaning up the mess which they themselves have caused.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Well, exactly, for trying to clean it up, then. Or starting to clean it up.

In the third place, the hon. member castigated the hon. member for Sudbury for running over his time in the debate, and we object to that, too—

Mr. Speaker: Order.

Mr. Young:—but then he went on to do exactly the same thing.

Mr. Speaker: Order. Would the member please be seated? I am afraid we are abusing the privileges that go with debating this resolution. All members, I think, to some extent are straying from the principles involved in these resolutions—I would ask the member, as we only have 12 minutes or so left, that he return to the resolution.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Young: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have already said all I wanted to say in that regard.

I will get down to the subject of clean water. I want to pinpoint in the short time that we have left the fact of the Great Lakes and the important part they play in our continental water supply. It was because of these Great Lakes that we had, first of all, the great settlement of people around their borders, and the fresh water in these lakes is a vital factor not only to the present-day civilization here, but in the days ahead. There is danger to this civilization set around these lakes; danger not only now, because of the neglect of the past and the slowness in cleaning up the situation, but across the years before us there is a threat which, unless we face it, can write finish to the life as we know it right here.

A few days ago I asked the hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management (Mr. Simonett) about the United States Public Law 89-2-98. He assured us at that time that there was little danger in this law to the water supplies of Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence river. I would like to call to the attention of this House what this law means, and I quote from it these passages:

The Secretary of the Army, acting through the chief of engineers, is authorized to co-operate with federal, state and local agencies in preparing plans in accordance with the water resources planning Act to meet the long-range water needs of the northeastern United States. And the plan provides for a system of major reservoirs to be located within these river basins in the northeastern United States, which drain into the St. Lawrence and into Lake Ontario, and also those which drain into the Chesapeake Bay to the south.

Second, it provides for major conveyance facilities by which water may be exchanged between these river basins to the extent found desirable in the national interest.

Three, it provides for major purification facilities.

And section B of the Act provides:

For the Secretary of the Army to construct, operate and maintain this system.

And section C says this:

Each reservoir included in the plan authorized by this section shall be considered as a component of a comprehensive plan for the optimum development of the river basin in which it is situated, as well as a component of a plan established in accordance with this section.

Now, it is true that the United States corps of engineers has issued soothing statements to the effect that the plans under way will in no sense interfere with the Canadian interest involved, and if there is any threat of that that they will consult the Canadians before anything is done.

I think two things need to be remembered. The first one is that Public Law 89-2-98 contemplates the development of the river basins flowing northward to Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence, as well as those flowing into Chesapeake Bay to the south, and it provides for interchange of water between these basins when necessary.

The second thing to note is that this law was passed in October of 1965, after one of the most severe droughts in recent history along the Atlantic seaboard of the United States, and it was after five years of drought. I have quotations here showing the desperation of the people in New York city particularly in respect to that water shortage.

It is true that the New York water system is antiquated, it is full of leaks, it needs to be repaired—but the fact is that the people in New York faced this drought, and faced it without too much cheerfulness. The people of New York and surrounding areas spent the summer with very little water. Millions of people knew, for the first time, privation which comes with falling watertables and with parched reservoirs. New York buses carried the slogan: "We do not wash so you can." Dry taps brought frustration and desperation. People clamoured for action on the part of responsible authorities, but nothing could be done to solve the problem in a short time; only rain would help.

Bringing into production new sources of water would take time, and the drought would not wait for the new dams and the new pipeline. By the time the summer ended everyone was agreed that this kind of calamity must not happen again. In northern New York were available sources of the precious liquid, and people who struggled through the hot, long, dry summer, naturally

turned their eyes to these sources. And they told their representatives, Mr. Speaker, in no uncertain terms, that as long as water is available within engineering distance, there can be no excuse for a recurrence of the events of those dry and hectic months.

Out of this background then, came Public Bill No. 89-2-98. If any of us are still naive enough to think that once constructed these works will be used only to conserve water flowing in natural basins, and that in time of crisis, "the conveyance facilities by which the water may be exchanged between river basins" will not be used, then we may be in for a rude awakening. Certainly in a case like this there will be consultation with Canadians, but when those consultations take place, and the machinery for the interchange of water is there, I can hardly see the Canadians saying that 30 million or more Americans must continue a dry and parched existence, when the water might easily be shifted even though it means difficulties on Lake Ontario and along the St. Lawrence.

Just as this bill was born out of a great thirst on the Atlantic seaboard, so with the first reappearance of similar conditions at any time after the contemplated works, the water in that system will flow down to quench that thirst, no matter how Canadians may feel. In an emergency like that, even Canadians will have to agree that it makes sense for it to flow southward.

More than this, I think we have to think of the fact that the populations on the Atlantic seaboard are now exploding. Industry is growing with great rapidity there. The demand for water is growing in geometric proportion every year. It means that more water is going to be demanded and water needs must be met. Present facilities are certainly inadequate.

Last year's crisis was partly because water sources had not been brought into effect adequately to meet the needs of that time. As populations grow, and as industry expands, there must be new sources of water, there must be new places from which this water will come. The one place which ultimately must supply this water is the Great Lakes basin, Mr. Speaker.

These people are going to look to the Great Lakes and the great source of water here, and as our population grows and our demand for water becomes greater, and as the Atlantic seaboard explodes again, that whole complex develops. Then our water takes on added international significance. We have to face that future.

Right now we have to do two things.

One, of which the hon. member just spoke, is speed up the job of curing the pollution, so that fresh water flows into those lakes from our rivers and streams, as it has not been flowing for many, many years. It means works of all kinds, to cure that pollution from our municipalities, and particularly from our industries. I urge upon the hon. member to get busy, not only to write letters and meet with industry, but to put teeth into the situation, because all these years of neglect are now catching up with us. That is important. But the second thing we must do, and I think this House has to face it right now, is speed up the assessment of our water assets to the north. As the hon. member for Grey South put it, we have at our back door great resources, and that is true.

Any of us who were guests on the Lands and Forests trip last summer and flew over the northland and saw that great potential there, realize that we have an asset beyond imagining. That asset must be looked at, must be catalogued, and we must understand just what we can do with it. Then we have to start bringing some of that water into the Great Lakes basin, because this basin is just too small to meet the needs in the days to come. The watersheds are too close to the lake borders. We cannot depend upon rain, as we found out in the last few years. So in the days ahead, we have to look very carefully into the scheme that Mr. Kierans brought to us last year—of diverting water from the Hudson Bay watershed, after it is used up there, and of diverting other water resources from the northwest down to the Great Lakes and using them as far as they are in surplus supply. Failing this, we have to set a limit to the development around the Great Lakes basin—the kind of limit, Mr. Speaker, that none of us wants to see.

I think we have to face this great fact, that water is going to be the key to that development, and the wisdom with which we, in this House, at this time, face up to this problem, is going to determine the shape of the Great Lakes basin civilization for a century to come.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have the good sense to understand the fundamental problem here, the problem not only of this basin, but the problem of the Atlantic seaboard. Inevitably, because of its explosion, it is going to demand the water that we count upon today. I hope this House—this government and this nation—will take the appropriate action that seems called for at the present time.

It being 6 o'clock, p.m., the House took recess.



ONTARIO

Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT—DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Evening Session

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Thursday, March 10, 1966

Estimates, Department of Highways, Mr. MacNaughton, concluded	1389
Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld	1406
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1413

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1966

The House resumed at 8 o'clock, p.m.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order. House in committee of supply. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (continued)

On vote 811:

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): Mr. Chairman, last year when the hon. Minister of Highways (Mr. MacNaughton) introduced into this House the decision that we were going to have a commuter service in Ontario, I think maybe we were all a little surprised when he announced it was going to be from Dunbarton to Burlington. I know when some of us went to our home areas we certainly heard from the people in those areas. Especially in Hamilton there was a lot of dissatisfaction.

I have to agree with them to this extent, that if we are going to have a commuter service and one that we hope in some future date is going to carry itself, we have got to look at actually where the service is going to start. We must feel it has got to start where the people are, such as in Oshawa at the one end and Hamilton at the other end. This is where the large groups of people are and this is where the service, if it is ever going to make any money of any type, will make it.

I could imagine a private group of people deciding to set up a commuter service like this and going, say, to The Department of Economics and Development to get money to start it. I could imagine what they would say if they were told that it was going to start out in the country at one end and out in the country at the other end and run into Toronto. I think the department would have said: "Well, you people should take another look at this. You should maybe go to where the people are that are going to be using this service."

This is the position that I take. The commuter service in the west end should start

in Hamilton. Now I know last year, I think it was November 25, the city of Hamilton presented a brief to this committee. I had the opportunity of being there and listening to the brief. At the time, I thought it was a very sensible brief. The hon. Minister at that time seemed to have the feeling that there were some merits in it. I have noticed since, in some of his statements, he disagrees with it and he may have a reason for this. But I would, Mr. Chairman, like to quote from an editorial in the *Hamilton Spectator*, and I am just going to quote a couple of paragraphs:

It is argued that to give this city a restricted service would involve costly extra trackage. Until convincing evidence to support this proposal is presented those desiring services in the almost railway-isolated city will not accept the view that the tracks between Bayview and Burlington are so congested that they cannot accept one train each hour each way.

This commuter service is to be heavily subsidized by the provincial government. It is an experiment and if private undertaking were to be guilty of such an obvious folly of ignoring its biggest potential user how would you expect it to survive?

I think this is quite right. I was interested on Wednesday, March 2, there was a big headline in the *Hamilton Spectator* and it says: "Won't get commuter line for three years, maybe never", and it is datelined Toronto:

No commuter trains will roll into Hamilton for at least three years, Ontario Highway Minister C. S. MacNaughton said today. The reason: While the experimental 52 mile Burlington-Dunbarton route will cost under \$10 million to set up, it would take nearly four times as much to bring trains ten miles farther into Hamilton. \$36 million. That is a bit rich when you are only experimenting with a commuter service, Mr. MacNaughton said. The high cost lay, he said, in the unanswerable objection of a tremendous railway bottleneck between the lakeshore towns and the city. It has been estimated that sufficient trackage and signals to break this ten-mile bottleneck would cost between \$24 million and \$36 million.

Now, he made this statement to the chamber of commerce in Hamilton, I understand. I would like to discuss this, but I would like to discuss it on the basis of the up-to-date thinking on it. I wonder if the hon. Minister would enlighten us as to what did happen and how he feels it is going to cost between \$24 million and \$36 million to bring it into Hamilton?

Mr. Chairman: Does the member mind if we find out what is the wish of the House in this connection? I understand that there are several members who would like to speak on this particular topic. If it is the wish of the members of this House, that we all speak on it first and then allow the Minister's statement, whichever way—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): No, I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that there should be a dialogue between the hon. member for Hamilton East and the hon. Minister—

Mr. Chairman: I am not suggesting—

Mr. Singer: This is exactly what is being suggested and I think because the hon. member happened to jump to his feet does not mean that he should be able to monopolize it and I would like the floor as soon as the hon. member sits down.

Mr. Davison: I would say that the hon. member could have the floor but we are asking to debate something here in the House that developed a year ago. We have no information given to this House at all, all we have is what we read in the papers. Now the Hamilton brief certainly did not point out that it was going to cost \$24 or \$36 million. I think we have a right to know what this cost is so we can really debate this thing intelligently. And I would hope the hon. Minister could explain this so that we could discuss it in all fairness.

Hon. C. S. MacNaughton (Minister of Highways): Mr. Chairman, with respect to the hon. member I do propose to disclose to the House tonight a fairly well-documented submission with respect to this and I must say I think the hon. member will have no reason to be concerned about how it is done.

I frankly would prefer to do this following all the comments that may well be raised here tonight. Mr. Chairman, I will abide by your ruling, of course.

Mr. Chairman: I notice two or three members have been on their feet at the same time, I recognized the member for Hamilton

East and I recognized the member for Downsview to succeed him and also the member for Oshawa (Mr. Walker) in that order. I think in fairness to all members, we should hear from all members and then hear from the Minister.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, in the brief that Hamilton presented, they were able to—

Mr. Chairman: I wonder if the member would permit an interruption just for a moment? I know that the members of this House would like to know that among the many guests that we have tonight, we have a special group from the international student centre of the University of Toronto, who are visiting from various countries. I thought you would like to know about that.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, I feel in the brief presented by the city of Hamilton that they did make some points that were very important. At the time the hon. Minister quite agreed that they should look into this again. I presume in the meantime he has looked into it, but let us take a real look at what we have in the situation as far as Hamilton is concerned.

We have a station there that could be used for a terminal point for this rapid transit system. It is a good station. We have the trackage to allow the trains to come in and as far as the bottleneck goes I do not think that there is really quite as large a bottleneck as some of the people would like to leave the impression.

We must point out first that the CNR has a responsibility to the people in Hamilton as well as the people in the rest of the province. If they are taking the position that they do not need to bother supplying commuter service to Hamilton, they certainly are not supplying very much train service at the present time. Most of their time is used in freight traffic which actually brings them in more money. But I think the railway systems in this province have a responsibility to the people of the province and I am very sorry to see the hon. Minister take this position just because the railways say that this is impossible. He has got to get in there and fight with these railway people and get the people of the province something they are really entitled to.

Now I presume the hon. Minister in talking to the CNR would likely be talking to the people at the time. I spent some time over the weekend talking to the people who run the trains out of Hamilton—people who handle the central traffic control, people who

work on the freight trains—and they give me quite a different picture.

May I say that the track between Burlington and Hamilton is run by a central traffic control, that is, a control tower in Hamilton that controls all traffic into Burlington and into Hamilton, both ways. They can go as far as Toronto and direct trains from Toronto into Hamilton.

In the old days when a train would run into Hamilton it would come into Hamilton on the north track, if it was going to Toronto it would go on the south track. With this central control system, if there is a freight train at Burlington coming into Hamilton it can leave Burlington and start into Hamilton and at the same time the control tower can also switch a train onto the other track and bring it in from Burlington, too.

For instance, a passenger train and a freight train can both be coming into Hamilton at the same time with this central control tower. These people claim that there definitely is no bottleneck and they do not feel that there is any reason why the CNR cannot supply this commuter service into Hamilton.

At the present time—and I could be one train out per day, but I think I am pretty close—at the present time between Hamilton and Burlington there are seven freight trains leaving Hamilton each day and seven freight trains coming in.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: May I ask the hon. member if he is referring to the T H & B terminal, or the CN terminal?

Mr. Davison: I am referring now to the people who run the tracks here, which is the CNR, so we are discussing the trackage part of it. I am not talking about where it hooks on and goes up to the T H & B.

There are, as I say, roughly seven freight trains per day going each way. This, of course, does not include the shunting that is going on when they are making up their trains. There are roughly six passenger trains each way per day between Toronto and Hamilton.

From the time they leave the station in Hamilton until they leave Burlington takes 14 minutes on their schedule. There are 14 freight trains and 12 passenger trains per day running between Burlington and Hamilton, which actually is roughly six hours running time out of 24. On top of that there is a group of trains—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I hope the hon. member will excuse me for interrupting. I want to be precise on this. Is he talking

about the Canadian National station or the Toronto-Hamilton and Buffalo?

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): He is not talking about either station.

Mr. Davison: I am not talking about any station; I am talking about the number of trains that are running over the tracks between Bayview and Burlington.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Bayview and Burlington?

Mr. Davison: Yes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well, that is established.

Mr. Davison: There is trackage coming down to Bayview from London. There are roughly five passenger trains per day both ways on this track and roughly five freight trains. As I say there could be one more on some days. These trains, by the time they get down to the track at Bayview and until such time as they reach Burlington, take 14 minutes; so that group of trains uses that track for an hour and a half per day. The track usage actually is $7\frac{1}{2}$ hours out of 24 hours.

A few years ago the CNR repaired all this track and has it in first-class condition. They claim the signal setup they have is one of the best in Canada, in fact pretty nearly all over the province that same signal setup is being used and it was put into effect within the last year. They claim with this central control traffic setup that there is no problem at all. They claim that there is all kinds of time that they can have free to bring this commuter service into Hamilton. They spent a pile of money in the last few years in building a new set of trackage between Aldershot and Burlington, which is five tracks wide. It leaves room for a full train to pull in and for trains to pass.

Just outside of Hamilton they have built two new yards on each side of their tracks where they can pull trains in. The people who are running the trains say that it is just a lot of hogwash when railway people say it is impossible to bring these trains into Hamilton, that they are too busy with their freight setup. I think when you look at it on the basis of that track being used for $7\frac{1}{2}$ or maybe eight hours at the most out of 24, their schedules can be worked so that this rapid transit system can come into Hamilton. By doing this they will be able to pick up groups of people who will maybe make the commuter service pay.

Otherwise this is going to be a tremendous cost to the taxpayers of Ontario and it will only be servicing a small number of communities. It will be looking after Toronto and the little area around it and that is all. It certainly will not be touching the two other main areas of Oshawa and Hamilton.

I do hope that the hon. Minister will get together with the railway people again and ask them to bring in some of the running trades, who will talk to him and let him get an impression from the people who are actually running the trains, about the type of service they feel they can give the people by bringing these trains into Hamilton. Their argument is that there is lots of time on this track, that the bottleneck is not there although some people think there is one.

I understand that close to Burlington there are two tracks that might have to be changed. They are at ground level and there might have to be bridges put there so that the road will go underneath or over the top. But those are the only two. For all the rest of the whole trip the train either goes underneath the road or over the road.

This has all been done at quite a tremendous cost and I figure there would be very little cost at the present time to bring this in. Certainly on an experimental basis I think we could at least run some trains into Hamilton to find out first-hand if the system could be made to pay, by using that great large group of people in Hamilton who would be going to Toronto daily, rather than have them go out to Burlington and try to get it there. I do not think that this is profitable.

As I said, if they use the T H & B setup, they are only coming in as far as Bayview. They do not go down to the CNR at all, and we have all this service there for them at the present time. I would hope the hon. Minister would take another serious look at this before he finally decides to stop it at Burlington.

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, I had the opportunity not too many nights ago of watching the hon. Minister of Highways on television. He was out inspecting the commuter service. He cuts as fine a figure on television as he does here in the House, and he was examining the trains and the tracks very carefully and regretting at great length the fact that the commuter service, for the present time, could not go to Hamilton. There were all sorts of technical reasons which the hon. Minister was mentioning as to why it could not go to Hamilton.

I am not a railroad man, certainly, and I am not too familiar with the technical arguments. But it would seem to me that while we are getting our feet wet in the commuter service, there is some logic in population statistics and in the development of the golden horseshoe area of Ontario, that perhaps dictates against this too-hurried decision that appears to have been made.

The thing that seems most sensible to me would be, if there is going to be a commuter service you join up—even though the immediate cost might be a little higher—the two largest cities in southern Ontario; that you do not stop at Burlington, which has a passenger potential of about 1,600, but that you go on as far as Hamilton, which has a passenger potential of from 12,000 to 15,000.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, so many errors have been made in public transit, that before the government becomes irrevocably committed to this halting experiment, it should take into consideration some of the representations it has been receiving.

The hon. member who spoke just a few moments ago suggested that people in the railroad trades have somewhat different ideas than the hon. Minister. The mayor of Hamilton has suggested the use of the T H & B station in place of the station at Burlington. It would seem to me to make some sense, that instead of putting money into the ground at Burlington, when eventually one would anticipate the service is going to be extended as far as Hamilton, that money could be saved—there would be an economic saving realized by not having to construct new buildings at Burlington, acquiring more lands and so on. I think this is the sort of thing that you have to get into. There are facilities in Hamilton that can be adapted much more readily.

I do not think the mayor of Hamilton is on the Minister's committee which has been studying this, and this was one of my concerns when the committee was originally set up. I would have hoped that the hon. Minister would put on some municipal officials from Toronto and some municipal officials from Hamilton, and who could be more logical? He has Mr. Allen on—the chairman of Metropolitan Toronto—but he was the only Toronto man.

It would seem logical to me that the hon. Minister would have put on a senior municipal representative from the city of Hamilton, because he has available—he must have available to him—certain information that would be harder for the committee to get

than if he was there as part and parcel of the Minister's committee, and have him help in making these decisions.

We are committed, and were committed by last year's statute, to spending \$2 million annual subsidy on the line for this commuter service. It would seem to me that if it gets into downtown Hamilton this subsidy could be cut back materially. Does it not make sense, Mr. Chairman, if there are more passengers that more money is likely to be made? If instead of stopping the line at a place where only 1,600 passengers can be looked forward to, why not go on to a place where 12,000 or 15,000 can be picked up? Is this not a more economic venture?

There has been a history of experiments in community service, particularly in Chicago, under private operation. There is an article, I am sure the hon. Minister is familiar with it, in the January *Harper's*, dealing with a privately run commuter service there. It has been a great success because the people who did it, as a private and successful business venture, sat down and studied where the passengers were, the kind of service they wanted and then went out to supply it to them and reversed the North American trend to make commuter service pay. It can be done.

My suggestion to the hon. Minister tonight, Mr. Chairman, is that this requires a lot more study before we stop this line at Burlington.

Hon. J. R. Simonett (Minister of Energy and Resources Management): Studies can be initiated after service is operating.

Mr. Singer: The hon. Minister of Energy and Resources Management, I suppose, implies by this remark that we are arguing that it run from one end of the province to the other.

Let me repeat again, Mr. Chairman, the simple argument that I am putting forward at this time. In the so-called golden horseshoe of Ontario, the two big cities are Metropolitan Toronto and Metropolitan Hamilton. If we do not link up Metropolitan Toronto and Metropolitan Hamilton in a commuter service, it seems to me that we are missing a great proportion of the people available to use commuter services.

I think it is a very simple concept. Even that hon. Minister should be able to understand it.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. Minister of Highways, not too long ago, I am advised, spoke with the Hamilton chamber of commerce and indicated he might reconsider his deci-

sion and extend the line into the downtown area. The chamber at that time, I am told, volunteered to conduct a survey to determine more exactly how many people in Hamilton would use the commuter service. But the hon. Minister, apparently without taking up this offer, or even waiting to see what sort of a survey could be conducted, apparently has made up his mind, and for the present time at least the line is not going to be extended.

Without getting into any, or attempting to get into any of the technicalities, it seems to me to make sense insofar as the service of a substantial portion of the people of Ontario is concerned, to run the train from Toronto to Hamilton. If you have more passengers than less passengers, it is more likely to be an economic success. And it seems to me that the hon. Minister is missing the train unless he does it.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Oshawa.

Mr. A. V. Walker (Oshawa): Mr. Chairman, in rising to my feet to say a few words on this I rather hesitate to do so, because I have heard so much about the two major cities of southern Ontario. But I just wanted to say a few words about—

Mr. Singer: I said two of the largest.

Mr. Walker: —the small city to the east, of some 75,000 very fine people. Last year I questioned the reason with the hon. Minister during the commuter train programme. I questioned the reason for the stoppage of the eastern end of this commuter train at Dunbarton and I suggested to the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman, that it should have gone as far east as Oshawa.

The hon. Minister mentioned the cost of laying additional track east of Dunbarton and he outlined some other points on which the decision to stop at Dunbarton was based. I would agree certainly, Mr. Chairman, that for the very large subdivision areas of Dunbarton and Bay Ridges and West Rouge, this commuter service will undoubtedly serve a real need for the citizens in this area. But it will be, I suggest, of very little use to the heavily populated areas immediately to the east.

In other words I am suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that the present planned programme will do very little to fulfil the transportation needs of the area east of Dunbarton. I suggest it is unlikely that commuters who travel from Oshawa by car to Toronto each day, would drive 15 or 16 miles to Dunbarton, leave their car at the station and travel the rest of the

way, approximately 12 miles, by the new commuter train.

It must be remembered that within this area between Dunbarton and Oshawa there would be well over 100,000 persons, a substantial market for this new method of transportation if it were extended into this area.

One other point that has recently come to light, which I think is a very important point. The morning train from Brockville, which arrives in Toronto at 9:45 a.m., no longer stops at Oshawa and the former train commuters are now forced to travel by road. This presents a new and even more important need, I suggest, for an extension of this commuter train to as far east as Oshawa. I would certainly urge the hon. Minister's consideration that the transportation needs of this heavily populated area should be given more consideration. If we are going to spend \$9.3 million on this commuter train project, then let us spend a few thousand more and provide a much more effective service for a much larger group of citizens.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Chairman, last year when the hon. Minister introduced to the House the proposition of the experimental commuter train service from Dunbarton to Burlington, it appeared to me and, I think, to many in the House that there was a considerable degree of logic in the experiment's ending at those two points. Of course, the introduction of propositions by the government in several instances appear to have logic and merit until one investigates the full ramifications of the situation. I am not sure at this point whether the Minister or anyone on his behalf had investigated the feasibility and economic reasoning to extend it to Hamilton. It appears from what has happened since with the various opinions, the opinions of the brief presented by Hamilton and the opinions of the Hamilton chamber of commerce that this was not the case. But nevertheless, when I listened to the introduction last year I believe I took the floor and agreed with the hon. Minister that there was some logic in his presentation.

I immediately applied the situation to my own riding, which is in the far east end of Hamilton. I knew at that point, even if I argued that the commuter train service should continue on into Hamilton, into the west end at either one of the stations, it certainly would not help those people in my riding who were employed east of Hamilton, say, Burlington, Oakville or Toronto, because of the fact that they would have to take public transportation uptown from the east end, which at the best of times consumes half an

hour. Of course, if you want to make sure you get there, you have to take something like 40 minutes to an hour from various parts of the east end of the city before you would get uptown and then get a train to go to Burlington and Oakville; whereby the employees, and I spoke to a lot of them in the Ford plant, can jump in their car and in 20 minutes, at safe driving, be at work.

This was the approach I took at that time. Now, of course, I have to admit there is a lot of merit in the brief presented by the city of Hamilton.

Many of the submissions have mentioned tonight that it might have been profitable for both the government and the city of Hamilton if there had been a representation on the Toronto regional transportation study so that some of the reasoning could have been presented to all concerned.

I am looking forward to hearing an answer by the hon. Minister in regard to the presentations made in the Hamilton brief. I think he will have to be fairly thorough in his explanation to convince some of us from Hamilton that there is not reasonable justification for reconsideration of the proposition which points out the fact that there is a heavy potential of users.

We understand that the facilities of the T H & B station can be used. It is now almost going to waste because there is very little usage of the station. It is a fine station, in good shape and could handle a lot of customers.

We understand by the presentation made by my hon. colleague from Hamilton that there is a computer-controlled signal system, which will allow the quick rescheduling of traffic from the west down through to Burlington to allow a schedule of fast commuter trains. I hope that the Minister will try to convince us that it is not feasible, economically or mechanically; or else retract and give further consideration to the proposition put forward by the city of Hamilton.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Halton.

Mr. G. A. Kerr (Halton): Mr. Chairman, I would like to take advantage of this vote to ask a couple of questions about the proposed commuter rail service project between Burlington and Dunbarton.

It is probably understandable that I am wholeheartedly in favour of this project. This service will have a tremendous effect on my riding, not only from the point of view from transportation but also in respect to residential and commercial development. Anyone who daily commutes between Hamilton

and Toronto realizes the highway capacity in this area has almost reached the saturation point. The area serviced by the commuter project will substantially reduce travelling time involved, not to mention the release from some of the hazards of modern motor-ing.

There is definitely a need to encourage the use of public rapid transit to relieve the heavy cost of road building and maintenance. The people in the southern part of Halton are looking forward to the inception of this service. We realize the service at first will be limited because of the experimental stage and that patronage will play a decisive part in the future extension of this project.

Certainly this department and this government will want the project to succeed and therefore on this basis it will eventually be extended. I was wondering if the hon. Minister could give me some idea as to the present estimated starting date for the service; what new or improved station facilities that will be necessary, if any, including the establishment of parking and riding facilities.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Essex South.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I had not intended speaking on this particular topic and I am not looking for a commuter service to my riding, although I know a great number of people who would like to go down there.

I think there is an obvious point that has been missed by all the hon. members, from either Hamilton or Oshawa, in that that they seem to be quite concerned about getting people to Toronto. I just wonder if there should not be a reverse picture in order to allow people from Toronto to get out and visit these fine communities and shop in their very fine retail establishments. I just say a word on behalf of the retail merchants in these two communities, and the chambers of commerce, that this proposed rapid transit system be extended to these fine cities and give the people of the Metropolitan Toronto area a chance to get out and visit these fine cities.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I do come prepared to comment at considerable length on what I, of course, regard as a rather major undertaking on the part of the government. I propose to read a documentation of the position of the government and The Department of Highways which department is now charged with the administration, implementation and eventual

placing into service of the commuter rail operation that has been rather widely acclaimed. Before I do that I think I would like to suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that I will read to the House the material that has been prepared on the basis of considerable careful research. I would like then to be provided with the opportunity to make some further comments.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, I may add a little bit as I go through this material. Then, of course, I will be quite happy to answer any specific questions which may arise.

I am very anxious, Mr. Chairman, to put this on the record. I am very anxious to evince, not only to the hon. members of the House but to the people in the entire study area that is involved, the extent to which this matter has been pursued and investigated as thoroughly as it is possible to do so.

Before I commence to read to the House this information I may say to you, sir, and to hon. members, that up until a number of weeks ago, by actual count, 1,200 individual decisions had been made with respect to this commuter service and we have not finished by a long way.

Mr. Chairman, if I may try to document this and go back to September, 1963, when the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) announced in a preliminary report on the rail feasibility study that service could be provided on tracks between Dunbarton and Burlington.

The statement said, and it is recorded in *Hansard*:

East of Dunbarton and west of Burlington, which are junction points with the new access line the CNR—

the Canadian Nation Railways:

—is constructing around Toronto. These lines are to get to the new marshalling areas that we are all very familiar with. The freight traffic will be too heavy to permit operating more than one or two commuter trains a day on railway tracks.

On November 28, 1963, I personally said, in announcing the results of the feasibility study, that increased freight traffic beyond Burlington and Dunbarton would not permit commuter operations unless there were heavy expenditures on trackage and signalling facilities. This is a matter of record.

In reporting on the development of Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study during the last session, sir, I made reference to the investigations into the rail

commuter service and these are recorded in *Hansard*.

These references, as a matter of fact, included the following statement appearing on page 770 of the *Legislature of Ontario Debates* of February 24, 1965. I will repeat them for the House now:

Because the findings—

of an economic feasibility study:

—would be related to a probable experimental service to provide data on actual operating conditions, officials selected for study a line that would serve the greatest population, one that would provide a broad measurement of results under various conditions, so that the data could be used to assess other rail commuter possibilities. The line chosen was one serving the lakeshore corridor from Burlington to Dunbarton. I might explain that the eastern and western terminals were not the choice of the study but were dictated by the availability of trackage. Although there is a decline in rail traffic on the major part of the line, because of transfer of the marshalling yards from the downtown Toronto area, two sections of lines from Dunbarton to Oshawa and from Burlington to Hamilton, a total distance of more than 20 miles, will have too high a volume of railway traffic to permit frequently scheduled commuter rail operation.

I depart from the text of this statement here at the moment and point out to the House, as has been said on a number of occasions, that during peak periods we propose to operate these trains on a 20-minute headway—every 20 minutes during peak periods there will be a train leaving the two terminal points and arriving at Toronto Union station.

On May 19, 1965, when the hon. Prime Minister and myself jointly announced the government's decision to implement a rail commuter service, the hon. Prime Minister outlined a recommended alternative that was offered to the government by the consultant. On page 3092 of the official report of the *Legislature of Ontario Debates*, he said:

Before making its decision, Mr. Speaker, the government was presented with a number of proposals of the type of service that could be implemented. These proposals offered alternatives with restricted operation and correspondingly sizeable savings on capital expenditure and operating costs.

The alternatives were: 1. an operation which did not have a special off-peak service—

in other words, it would operate at peak periods only. I continue:

—2. a service between Oakville and Dunbarton only; 3. a service that would operate between Oakville and Guildwood only; 4. a service between Port Credit and Dunbarton; 5. a service on the eastern sector only, between Union Station and Dunbarton; and 6. a service restricted to the western sector only, between Union station and Oakville.

Again, I depart from the text of these remarks to point out to the House that probably in a minimal way, any one of these would have provided the information that the government needed for experimental or trial purposes. Now, when I make reference to the words "experimental" or "trial," I would like to repeat with emphasis what I have said on so many occasions, that the words "trial" or "experimental" should not be construed as meaning that at the end of the trial period the service is to be abandoned. It was felt that it would take two to three years—more likely three—of actual operation to determine positively from operations themselves what, up until that point, can only be projections and nothing else, and I repeat this.

With any one of the alternatives that I have made reference to—and which, as I say, are in *Hansard* as of last May—any one of these minimal services would probably have served to provide us with this information.

I continue, Mr. Chairman:

Since the rail lines, we believed, could provide a valuable addition to regional transportation, it was felt that the project deserved a bold and imaginative approach and that a trial service based on any of these alternatives would be less than adequate. We wanted it to operate under the best conditions within our power, so that it could have the fullest opportunity to prove its function and potential.

In a supplementary statement on the same date, I said—and it may be found on page 3093 of *Hansard* of May 19, 1965:

The transportation study's experts selected the CNR line primarily for three reasons:

1. It passed through the most populated area of the region.

2. The lakeshore corridor contained widely differing community and transportation characteristics to provide a variety of data that could be related to other parts of the region, and the line itself offered considerable savings in capital

investment because it did not require expensive changes to adapt track, signal and other facilities.

Now let us stop there and go back to the opening remarks that I made, and point out again that at Burlington on the west and Dunbarton on the east, the junction points, or the terminals of the new line rebuilt to take freight traffic out of Toronto and into the marshalling yards of Toronto stop at each end of this corridor; these are the points where this traffic is rerouted around the city of Toronto.

On page 3094 of *Hansard*, I stated:

Although there will be a considerable reduction in the number of freight trains using the line, the remaining volume of traffic and limited facilities for passenger handling at Union station will prevent a higher frequency and more extensive service. Indeed, an increased volume of railway traffic between Burlington and Hamilton, and Dunbarton and Oshawa, is expected as a result of the changes in the marshalling yard location. This rules out any possibility of rail commuter operations on these sections, unless more than 20 miles of new lines are built and equipped with advance signalling facilities. This would be a very expensive proposition and one that could not be considered justified at this time.

Again I depart from the text to say that to serve the purpose for which this trial operation was originally intended—and it was intended, and I repeat it with emphasis, to provide us with the data, the experience of actual operation that might make it possible; we hope it will enable us to consider whether the cost of extension of the service is warranted, whether the additional patronage that might accrue would warrant the heavy expenditures that were required.

This is all a matter of record and it has been said many times.

Mr. Singer: That does not make it right. A decision by the city that you could run it from Mimico to Scarborough—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, I listened very attentively to the hon. member because I am quite prepared to listen to every piece of sensible advice that I can get on this subject. That is the type of importance we attach to it and I am trying to tell the House exactly the difficulties and the limitations of doing it.

The survey also disclosed that there were very few regular train commuters expected

from Hamilton and the majority of present commuters patronize long-distance express trains. These express trains will continue to be available to serve them; or if they wish, Hamilton passengers can use the parking facilities at Burlington and board trains there.

I am quoting from last year's *Hansard*:

Because the survey also indicated that a somewhat lower level of patronage can be expected from the Burlington and Bronte areas, service to these two stations will consist of four peak-period trains daily throughout the work week. It would be the same as the present CNR commuter service which will be discontinued. But travel time would be from ten to 20 minutes faster.

All these statements, Mr. Chairman, received wide publicity in the Hamilton press and other press within the region. On November 25, 1965, the Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study, after several months of advance notice, held a hearing at Hamilton on various aspects of transportation on a regional basis. Briefs were invited on the following themes:

1. The type and location of transportation needed in the future.
2. The degree to which transportation availability and flexibility affects economic development and land use.
3. The policies of the different levels of government needed to resolve transportation problems.

Mayor Copps presented a brief on behalf of the city of Hamilton. His opening statement said:

Although the terms of reference of this committee of the Metropolitan Toronto and region study embrace the various means of transportation, our submission will deal only with the proposed railway commuter service. We appreciate this opportunity to make a submission to the committee and wish Hamilton had been given this chance sooner, before an announcement was made that the railway commuter service would be from Dunbarton to Burlington and would not come into Hamilton.

Now let us examine that, Mr. Chairman. That was last November, 1965. Our earliest statements were made in the previous November, subsequently in May in the House. I suggest to the House that the opportunity existed over a long period of time, but nothing was submitted to any branch of The Department of Highways or

to the Metropolitan Toronto transportation study, until the hearing took place last November, and this submission was made. It was not even among the terms of reference that were suggested for the hearing.

But be that as it may, I am quite willing and prepared to understand the concern of Mayor Copps, as far as the city of Hamilton is concerned. That is quite natural. If he is not concerned as the mayor of Hamilton for transportation facilities for his city, then of course he should be and I am confident that he is.

Now then, he went on to say:

We are very pleased that you are the chairman of the executive committee of Metropolitan Toronto and region transportation study because your knowledge of Hamilton traffic problems makes you aware of the eagerness with which we awaited fast and frequent railway commuter service between Hamilton and Toronto. I am sure this knowledge of our problems gives you some idea of the shock to this community of the news that the long-awaited commuter service would terminate at Burlington and not come into Hamilton.

Again, that was on November 25, 1965, and it was announced repeatedly from a year previous November, right through until May in the legislative assembly.

I point out with respect that Mayor Copps was well aware of the government's decision and the reasons for not extending into Hamilton. He says the decision was a shock. It was a shock last November, why was it not a shock a year from last November? Why was it not a shock last May, when all this was disclosed to the House and widely publicized?

Mr. Singer: It was a year before you got around to having a public hearing in Hamilton. That was the first time you invited him.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I have public hearings in my office every day of the week, public, private or otherwise. At no time from 1963 when he took office, through a series of announcements that repeated the prospect that the service would not include Hamilton, did Mayor Copps, or any Hamilton authorities, communicate with the government on the matter. If the shock to this community was so great, it is submitted that it was his duty to his people to make representations on their behalf earlier than last November.

Mr. Singer: So it is going to rise or fall on the day the representations were made—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Mr. Chairman, how would the hon. member like to keep quiet for a moment until I get something on the record? He has a congenital yacking ability.

Mr. Singer: Exceeded, however, by the hon. Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Perhaps the mayor's true reason for the present approach to the matter was revealed in his brief at the hearing, in which he proposed as a solution to the problem that the Hamilton station for commuter service should be the T H & B station in downtown Hamilton. I want that to be underscored and I would like the House to remember it, the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo terminal. I hope the hon. member for Hamilton East makes note that the mayor's entire proposal at the hearing was the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo terminal.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman—and this is a quotation from the brief in support of this proposal:

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to introduce some plans of a proposed building that is to be erected adjoining the T H & B station in the city by private developers because it is to provide for some 250 enclosed parking spaces which would be nearby and which would be used by people using the commuter service. The problem of usage of track facilities between Burlington and Hamilton does not appear to be as serious as indicated. We realize that there is very heavy freight traffic on this stretch of track but if the T H & B station were used as a terminal, the pressure on the use of the track would be reduced from that part between Burlington and Hamilton, to that part between Burlington and Bayview, from which point trains would proceed over the T H & B track to this station. Surely it would be possible to schedule commuter trains at least on an hourly basis into and out of Hamilton so that they would not interfere with the freight traffic on both the CNR and CPR, which use the tracks between Burlington and Bayview. While there should be no need to reroute via the CPR line through Guelph junction, consideration might be given to the greater use of the CNR beach strip line which might ease the pressure between Burlington and Bayview. We have discussed this arrangement with railroad people informally and understand from them that

this plan is quite practical and workable as a means of bringing a commuter service into Hamilton. Mayor Copps suggested that the study officials should convene a meeting of representatives of all the railway companies to explore the proposal.

I assured the mayor that this would be done. As a result of such a meeting, and further research by the study group, I informed the mayor in a letter dated January 21 this year that an extension of service into Hamilton could not be entertained in the early stages of the experiment because of time and cost.

Now I repeat that at the hearing I committed myself to receive the representatives of the three railroads, and I did, and then based on the information that they subsequently made available to me, we reached this conclusion.

Subsequently, on January 21, I wrote the mayor and I said:

I would welcome your views on the proposition that the Burlington service, which will be limited at the outset to two trains at morning and evening peak periods, might well be augmented with additional services if the city of Hamilton would consider a trial feeder bus service between downtown Hamilton and Burlington.

I said I would welcome the views. I have not received them yet, other than by newspaper, television and radio. Mayor Copps' response to the letter was to quote a *Globe and Mail* report, angry and bitter words. It is interesting to quote further from the *Globe and Mail* report on February 3:

Mr. Copps termed nonsensical and ridiculous Mr. MacNaughton's proposal that Hamilton institute a feeder bus service to link the city with the service's western terminus in Burlington. He chastised the provincial committee headed by Mr. MacNaughton, which met there in November to listen to Hamilton's plea to be made a part of the service. Mayor Copps accused the committee of "coming here under a pretence that it intended to do something when in fact all it was was a lot of window-dressing."

And I point out we never went down to discuss this matter at all. These were not the terms of reference that were assigned to the hearing.

Mayor Copps said that the province's feelings towards the city should have been obvious because it took the committee six months to come to hear Hamilton's proposals.

But we had indicated as long as a year ago what the proposals were, and we did not hear from him until a year following.

These are statements from the same man who admitted in opening his brief that the transportation hearing in Hamilton was for purposes of general transportation, not specifically the rail-commuter problem. The hearing was never arranged to hear Hamilton's proposal on commuter rail as there was never any indication up to that point that Hamilton had an alternative proposal. From a radio source, the mayor is quoted as saying that Hamilton should be included in the three-year experimental service and if it is found that there is insufficient patronage then it could be dropped.

Now when I proceed a little further and tell the House what it would cost to do that, and contemplate a statement that anybody should undertake the expense of providing the service and consider even remotely abandonment at the end of three years if it does not work, I suggest to you this is wanton expenditure of somebody else's money.

The problem that is faced by the government is this: As railway officials and engineering consultants warned, the volume of freight traffic on the Bayview-Burlington section of the Oakville subdivision has increased with the opening of the marshalling yards in 1965; and bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, if you will, sir, that you cannot get from Burlington to the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo station unless you go over this section from Bayview downtown.

Prior to the opening, there were 75 trains using this section on an average day. In 1965 the volume had increased to 96 trains. Next year it is predicted the average daily volume will be about 110 trains, a train every 13 minutes of the day, and not including any additional commuter trains. There is no way to increase the service to Hamilton even on an hourly schedule, as was suggested in the Hamilton brief, in the face of this volume of traffic if the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo terminal is considered. The only alternative is to construct new facilities.

Here are the costs for accommodation of a full service including a 20-minute peak period schedule as given to us by railway officials who have studied all aspects of the matter. Now, let me depart from my text here again and say that while it has been suggested we should talk to the running trades, I simply indicate to the House that we have had many meetings with the vice-president and all the people at that level

who I think know what goes on in the operation of a railway just as well as the people who operate the trains. I have to submit that the vice-president of the Great Lakes region and the executive vice-president at Montreal know something about it.

Mr. Davison: May I ask the hon. Minister a question?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I wonder if the hon. member would mind if I finish this and then I will be available for questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. J. H. White (London South): The hon. member for Downsview has not even been listening. He has been talking to his neighbour.

Mr. Singer: I shall ask the hon. member what sign I must give to show I am listening.

Mr. White: Stop talking!

Mr. Singer: Would the hon. member send me a memo on that, please?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: If I may go on, Mr. Chairman.

I repeat, the only alternative is to construct new facilities. Here are the costs for accommodation of a full service, including a 20-minute peak period schedule as given to us by railway officials whose advice we must rely on and who we are confident have studied all aspects of this matter: For constructing double tracks and signal facilities from Burlington to the existing station area, \$25 million; for constructing new trackage and signal facilities between Burlington and Hamilton junction, excluding any costs on the CPR and T H & B sections that give access to the T H & B station, \$16 million.

In order to accommodate an hourly service, the minimum costs for the construction of a single track from Burlington to Hamilton junction where it would join CPR and T H & B trackage to the T H & B station would be not less than \$12 million. If a second track were to be added later, the cost would be almost the same, a total of \$24 million; and this is where the figures that the hon. member for Hamilton East referred to came from.

These figures do not include the cost of additional rolling stock that would be required to provide any extra service beyond Burlington. A minimum estimate is in excess of \$1.6 million, almost incidental after the cost of constructing new lines.

Mayor Copps said that his discussions with railway representatives indicate that the use of the T H & B station was both practical and workable. There is no arguing this point. What he did not add was that it would also be costly.

As to his proposal that Hamilton should be included in the trial service and dropped if there was insufficient patronage, I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to consider the situation when the same proposal was last put to the railways in 1962. Representatives of the city of Hamilton and the Hamilton board of trade requested that a service be inaugurated to get businessmen into Toronto around noon. Because the railway had not sufficient time to research the patronage for such service, it started on April 29 on the understanding that if it was not patronized it would be discontinued. The service remained in operation from April to June 24 and carried an average of four passengers a day. The peak load for any one day was 16 persons.

This was a comparatively inexpensive gamble to the one that Mayor Copps is now proposing when he suggests that we run this at the cost that I have indicated to the House and if it does not work abandon it.

Hamilton is presently serviced with ten trains daily to Toronto: Two early morning commuter trains at 6.15 and 7 a.m.; two other trains at 8.45 and 10.54 a.m.; two mid-afternoon trains at 2.48 and 3.05 p.m.; and evening trains at 7.35 p.m., one at 9.53 and another at 10.10 p.m. There are also ten trains from Toronto; seven into Hamilton proper and three into Dundas with connecting bus links to the city. These trains are at 8.00 and 8.30 a.m., 12.45 p.m., 4.20, 4.25, 5.20, 6.15, 6.20, 6.50 and 11.10 p.m.

The average passenger volume for all trains per day is 50 persons or an average of five persons per train; and these are up-to-date statistics.

Hamilton is also served with extensive bus connections that total 84 trips daily both ways between that city and Toronto. The total daily passenger average by bus is 747 people on 84 trips. More than two-thirds of these people use 18 express buses that operate between the two cities.

It cannot be said that Hamilton lacks public transport with Toronto.

The judgment of the government in not extending the commuter experiment service into Hamilton on the base of cost alone, I think, is a justifiable one, remembering that this service is being inaugurated to test the acceptability of this form of transportation by a travelling public that is strongly oriented

to automobiles. The rail corridor between Burlington and Dunbarton has been considered by experts as more than adequate to carry out all the tests that are required for the experiment to prove the things in actual operation that we simply must know before we contemplate the expenditure of funds that I have described here tonight.

In all reasonableness, and conscious of our role as a responsible authority dealing with public funds, the additional cost of going into Hamilton, to the Toronto, Hamilton and Buffalo terminal as proposed by Mayor Copps, would be unwarranted in the full light of the circumstances, until the rail commuter project has adequately proven that it merits the considerable capital expenditure that would be required in expanding it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to make reference to a few of the questions that were proposed. On the matter of expenditures at Burlington to handle the commuter service that is contemplated and that would be put into effect, there will be no expenditures because the existing facilities are adequate.

Reference was made by the hon. member for Downsview, I think he made reference to the Chicago Northwestern rail experiment in Chicago, and I can tell him that we went down and spent two days watching that operation and examining it in careful detail. It was that efficient experiment, now a full-blown operation, that had more effect on our decision to implement a trial service in this 52-mile corridor than any service we saw on the North American continent.

Mr. Singer: Did you speak with Mr. Heineman?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes, we spoke with Mr. Heineman, a very able, interesting man. I must say his advice to us was that we were on the right track.

Now the premise that more passengers make it an economic success is not a fact. How many more passengers would you have to have to make an economic fact out of the required expenditures to which I have made reference tonight? I have pointed out to the House before that we never contemplated this to be a profit-making operation. If it succeeds in making a profit, so much the better. If it does, it will help us to expand the service, maybe lower the fares. This has been done for purposes of determining the extent of the economy that can be accomplished in attracting people to use public transportation instead of using the roads, this was basic to it. When you consider that close to the total capital cost and operational

deficit over the trial period will not cost too much more than a mile of the elevated section of the Gardiner expressway, I think it is a sensible exercise in good economy.

Now then, in answer to the hon. member for Halton, Mr. Chairman. The starting date; we hope to start as early in 1967 as possible. The equipment is on order, the locomotives were ordered some time ago, the rail cars, both locomotive-hauled and self-propelled will be delivered we expect in December or January. It will take a trial run—a dry run, if you like—over a period of some time to adapt to proper schedules, all those things that are necessary, before you put a service like this into operation, to ensure that it will be effective and efficient before we ask passengers to board it.

Proposed station locations: these are still under consideration. I would say with respect to this matter, Mr. Chairman, if I can find the information that I have, I will keep looking and come back to it.

This matter of station locations, Mr. Chairman, has been under consideration for quite some time and I would like to point out to the hon. member that some of them are very closely spaced. Some of them are less than a mile apart. Some of them are a mile and a half, or something along that line.

Let me say this then, to the hon. member for Halton: in order to provide a satisfactory commuter rail service, the maintenance of schedules and the maximizing of train frequency during peak periods is vital. The limitations placed on the trial commuter rail service due to friction with normal train operations and physical restraints at Union station, have established a maximum frequency during peak periods to be at 20-minute intervals.

Surveys have shown that a service with a lesser train frequency would be unacceptable in our view. In order to maintain a schedule with a 20-minute frequency during peak periods, limitations are placed on the number of allowable stops and station spacing is most important. The following factors were considered when deciding on station locations for this trial service.

1. Number of dwelling units within catchment area of a station, in order to determine potential patronage. A catchment area is defined as an area within a five-minute walk, or a ten-minute drive from a station.
2. Number of persons presently using commuter trains at each station.
3. Distance to nearest station.
4. General accessibility.

5. Minimizing nuisance value of noise and vehicle activity in adjacent residential areas.

It has been suggested that we could introduce a skip-stop service. In other words, stop at one station on one run, skip it the next time and pick up another station, and vice versa. The effect of introducing a skip-stop or alternate-stop type of operation would be to reduce the train frequency at alternate stations during the peak periods, creating a 40-minute service. Minimum 20-minute headway permitted and additional equipment would be necessary.

Now with respect to particular stations, and this is tentative, all station locations are still under consideration.

Clarkson: dwelling units in the catchment area, 3,600; present rail commuters, 120. Clarkson station is presently in, by the way.

It has been proposed that Lorne Park station be dropped: Dwelling units in the catchment area, 1,900; present rail commuters, 90; distance to nearest station, 1.6 miles.

Port Credit station is to be maintained, it will be in the service: Dwelling units in the catchment area, 8,200; present rail commuters, 215. We expect these figures to rise sharply.

Lakeview station, at present we would say that it is out: Dwelling units in the catchment area, 2,400; present rail commuters, 60; distance to the nearest station, 1.7 miles.

It is also considered that we would drop the Dixie station. Dwelling units in that catchment area are 3,200; present rail commuters, 80; distance to the nearest station, .9 miles.

Long Branch station will remain in the service, as presently contemplated: Dwelling units in the catchment area, 19,000; present rail commuters, 120.

Now to move east.

Scarborough: Dwelling units in the catchment area, 23,000; estimated commuter rail passengers, 940.

Eglinton: Dwelling units in the catchment area, 11,000. Estimated commuter rail passengers, 640.

Guildwood: Dwelling units in catchment area 6,300; estimated commuter rail passengers, 680.

Now to go back to this matter of station spacing, Mr. Chairman, I would say this to the hon. member for Halton and to the House, to maintain a 20-minute peak period simply means that you have to have enough

time to accelerate to a certain speed and decelerate to a certain speed, and this is difficult, if not impossible, in short distances between stations such as I have made reference to, 1.6 miles, 1.7 miles, .9 miles.

It just is not possible to get up enough speed on the one hand, and slow down sufficiently, to stop at these stations so closely spaced, and maintain a 20-minute period service. And of course, I think the whole success of the proposed operation hinges on at least a 20-minute peak service.

So I hope I have explained these questions satisfactorily to the hon. members. I will do my best to answer any more.

Mr. Kerr: Mr. Chairman, I was just wondering if there was any change west of Clarkson?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: West of Clarkson? No, the proposed stations are all east of Clarkson.

Mr. Walker: Is Scarborough the last station going east?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, actually not. I think Guildwood is east of Scarborough, if I am not mistaken and then, of course, there is Dunbarton.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, may I first say that in a lot of the discussion by the hon. Minister, he has been talking about Mayor Copps at Hamilton. I would just like to say that we are discussing this for the first time on the estimates here in the House, and whether Mayor Copps has been playing politics for a year or two years in Hamilton is his problem, not ours. We are discussing this on the basis of what we feel is needed for the people in Hamilton.

I would like to point out a few things here. Even taking the figures that the hon. Minister has presented, the top figure of 96 trains per day going in, he would discover that he still has eight hours free time on the tracks.

I do not know where the hon. Minister got his schedules from, he told us about ten passenger trains per day between Hamilton and Toronto. Well, let me point out to you, Mr. Chairman, I have the new schedule that is in effect now and from Toronto to Hamilton there are six trains and from Hamilton to Toronto there are five trains.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Is this total, T H & B and CN?

Mr. Davison: No, this is the CN. With the T H & B I think there are two trains. The

figures I gave were six and five, now where the hon. Minister gets ten trains, I do not know. The hon. Minister was talking about the good type of service the trains give in Hamilton, well, he should take a look at the schedule and see when you can catch these trains.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: See what?

Mr. Davison: See when you can catch the trains. You can get one at 6.15 in the morning, another one at 7, another one at three in the afternoon, and then another one at 9.15 at night from the CNR. Now if you call that a schedule, a good commuter service schedule—

Mr. Singer: It would be all right if you sleep in.

Mr. Davison: Yes, if you sleep in, it is all right.

Mr. Singer: If you work at nights on the graveyard shift.

Mr. Davison: The hon. Minister was also talking about the cost of the service coming in, having to build another track. Well, taking the hon. Minister's figures, if you have eight hours free time in 24, why would it not still be possible to bring the commuter service in on the track they have? You cannot argue that the signal setup is not good, it is one of the best in Canada. Why would they not be able to run their commuter service if they have a free track eight hours out of every 24? Even taking the hon. Minister's figures.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Of course, Mr. Chairman, I thought I had explained that. First of all, to get back to the figures I mentioned about trains. Obviously the hon. member left out those trains that go in and out of Dundas, and I made reference to them. I included those because they do serve Hamilton. This is how I made up the ten trains that are actually serving the Hamilton area. I have gone to Hamilton myself and gotten off at Dundas and went in by bus, and it is not too bad.

But in any case, the hon. member says that there are eight hours a day left over when he multiplies 96 trains by something or other. But it should be a rather obvious fact that you cannot run trains without some headway between them, you cannot run just feet or a mile behind each other, there has to be a spacing, particularly for freight trains. I can tell you that 96 freight trains a day leaves only 13 minutes between trains.

Now you cannot fit or mix fast-frequency commuter trains in between freight trains that run on a 13-minute headway, it is a physical impossibility. It is two different types of rail operation entirely. I point out to the hon. member too that that volume is anticipated to rise to 110 trains in 1966. So I think the hon. member in calculating his time, has forgotten the necessity of headway between trains and particularly headway between commuter trains and freight trains must be maintained. I submit to the hon. member that the board of transport commissioners would insist on it for safety purposes if nothing else. So I think perhaps he should put that calculation into his time factor figures.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, may I point out that the schedule in Hamilton—and this is for freight trains—from the time they leave Hamilton until they get to Burlington and leave the Burlington station is only 14 minutes.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, Mr. Chairman, it is not. It is not, and I made that quite clear. It is the time schedule of those trains from the time they leave and cross at Hamilton junction to get to the marshalling yards to the north of Toronto.

This is what clogs that section between Hamilton junction and the T H & B terminal. I would point out to anybody a chain is just about as good as its weakest link and there is a very extensive mileage. This is the mileage I am talking about, Mr. Chairman, this is where the traffic is, this is the bottleneck. So that the only trackage that is free is from that junction point east to Dunbarton. That is where the rail line to the marshalling yards breaks to take the freight traffic off the corridor that we propose to run the service on.

If that had not happened, we could not have contemplated this service at all, it would have been impossible. If the former freight traffic had been still on this lakeshore corridor, the whole operation that we propose to introduce a year from now could not have even been contemplated. This is where the problem arises.

Mr. Gisborn: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. Minister has given a very full explanation of some of the problems in extending the service beyond the points mentioned. I understand now from his remarks that this is an experiment to determine the operational experience—

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The acceptance too, I would say.

Mr. Gisborn: I would have thought that if this was the case that perhaps the carrot should not have been held out and extended to Burlington, it should have been confined to maybe Oakville and Scarborough.

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: I would like to interrupt the hon. member if I may, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to intrude but I think I said repeatedly when I was reading from the text that we have said on any number of occasions that for the reasons I have just outlined here within the past few minutes, this service could not be extended beyond these points. I do not think we ever held the carrot out, we have never held out the carrot that this would go into Hamilton, never have. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member probably has some more comments to make.

Mr. Gisborn: Yes. Well, one would think that Mayor Copsps of Hamilton was grasping for the carrot anyway. He certainly appeared to put up a good case. I cannot agree with him 100 per cent, I have to admit that the hon. Minister has presented a very, if I can say, sound case.

Without the extensive investigation necessary to verify some of the statistics that he has given as to cost—I am sure I am not in a position to do that and I think there would be very few hon. members in a position to investigate and to verify the cost that the hon. Minister has given—certainly we will have to take it for granted that there has been some very expert advice.

But I would just like to deal with one or two realities now that we have had this explanation.

I understood the hon. Minister of Highways to say that there is no need for further facilities at Burlington. Does this include parking facilities for the present experimental project?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, we are speaking of terminal facilities.

Mr. Gisborn: Oh, but there will be an extension of parking facilities?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Parking will be provided to the extent that it is required. Mr. Chairman, it might be of interest to the hon. member to know that we have surveyed most of the station areas to determine parking requirements. We have had approval by order-in-council to purchase land requirements for either four or five station locations as of today, and we are proceeding along. We hope to have all the property required

for station locations within the next very short period of time.

I have some more comments to make but I want to hear from the hon. member, if he has anything more to say.

Mr. Gisborn: Just one, I believe. The hon. Minister mentioned the fact that he invited the mayor of Hamilton to consider providing a bus service from uptown Hamilton to Burlington to fit in with the present plans. Receiving no commitment or submission from the mayor, I wonder if the hon. Minister has considered or would consider asking the mayor for a franchise for the province to establish a bus commuter from uptown Hamilton to Burlington?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Well I say, Mr. Chairman, I would have some doubt about that and I might read to you from the letter I addressed to the mayor on January 21.

I made reference in the first two paragraphs to the hearing and the commitment that I made to receive the representatives of the three railroads, and then indicated the conclusion that I had reached as a result of that, and went on to say then:

—as a result of these efforts I am obliged to conclude albeit reluctantly that an extension of the full service cannot be implemented during the trial period at least, certainly in the early stages. However, while it is difficult, if not impossible, to be specific about time periods I would like to state that the desirability of such an extension should not be discounted for the future.

It occurs to me that this is a very fair submission. I further pointed out that there are several factors influencing the decision, the important ones being time and cost. We have proceeded up to this point on the assumption, until we recently heard from Hamilton, that the service would be from Burlington to Dunbarton for the reasons that I have explained to the House rather exhaustively tonight, and consequently our budget has been set up on that basis.

We have ordered sufficient equipment to do it on that basis. Our whole scheduling has been based on the introduction or implementation of the service early in 1967. So when I say there are two factors involved, time and cost, I make reference to the additional time that would be required, if a further extension was to be considered.

Now I went on to say:

I have stated on a number of occasions that the service for the first three years is

to be regarded as experimental, not that it involves a decision at the end of three years as to continuance of the service, but rather it is the opinion of those who are knowledgeable about these matters, it will take three years of operation to determine the myriad of things that require to ensure that the service is the best that could be devised.

I say the best that can be devised first of all to attract patrons and also to retain them: running schedules, fare structures, station and parking facilities, feeder bus lines, to mention a few, will require a process of adjustment. These are among the great number of things to be determined during the trial period. Reference has also been made on a number of occasions to the important matter of presently available track capacity—I mean trackage that lends itself to commuter rail operations, with a minimum of costly charges. This capacity exists now only between Burlington and Dunbarton in the degree required for the operation and for the trial purpose of the project.

I would hope that you and the good people of Hamilton, in whose interests your proposal has been quite appropriately made, would view our trial endeavour as an undertaking which, if as successful as I am enthusiastic enough to believe it will be, will recognize that it may now be only the beginning of broader operations in the field of commuter rail operations. On the other hand, enthusiasm is one thing, but proof and final results are another.

Now, I may be wrong. I regard those as sensible statements. We have chosen three years as the full trial period. It may very well transpire that it will not take this long to determine many of the matters we hope to resolve. You may accept my assurance that an extension of the proposed service into Hamilton will continue to be one of the priority matters that will be under close scrutiny.

Then I said:

I would welcome your views on the proposition that the Burlington service, which will be limited at the outset to two trains at morning and evening peak periods, might will be augmented with additional services if the city of Hamilton would consider a trial feeder bus service between downtown Hamilton and Burlington. The distance is short, the time factor is not great. Probably you already have a service that could be modified.

Now, I have already told the House the reaction I got to that. It seemed to me that it might have been as good a way to determine effectively some of the potential that existed in Hamilton for a commuter service as any. I may have been wrong. Obviously in the minds of the people that were so critical about it, I was wrong. So I am not too sure whether we should provide a service. There is, I am sure, a very efficient bus service presently in existence in Hamilton. I do not think it would involve too much cost or modification to give this a fair trial and see what develops, but then, that is only my opinion.

Mr. Walker: I just want to ask a question if I might. Are we talking, Mr. Minister—through the chair—are we talking about the track that runs south of Highway 401? Is this the CNR track?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes! Along the lakeshore.

Mr. Walker: Then has consideration been given to, let us say, the building of the necessary roads to get from Dunbarton into this track? I am thinking that all the people coming out of Bay Ridges area—practically the only way to get out that I know of, is to come up to Highway 401 and go west to Toronto. You cannot go to the Dunbarton station on Highway 401 and I am wondering, have all these things been worked out?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: Yes. And if they are not all completely worked out, sir, they are in the process of being worked out. We have visited most if not all of the municipalities involved. We visited the council and the elected representatives, shall we say, in Oakville, in Clarkson, in Mimico and certainly the reeve and council of the township of Scarborough. Now we are very much aware that we cannot implement this service unless patrons can get to it. So all these matters of peak street patterns and requirements for accessibility to these stations has been very, very thoroughly investigated. I can assure the hon. member that full provision will be made for accessibility to the stations. We have talked to a number of the communities about feeder bus services to these station areas, and as I say, full parking facilities will be provided. But of course, it is obvious to us, as it is to the hon. member that these station areas are no good if you cannot get to them. So we are pursuing all these things.

Mr. Davison: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure whether I heard the hon. Minister right or

not, but he was asked, if the city of Hamilton did not supply a bus service to Burlington, would the government then take a serious look at supplying a bus service?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: No, I did not comment on that. That has never been a matter of consideration. We have never really considered the necessity of it. I go back to what I said to the hon. member for Wentworth East. I am sure there is a very good bus system in Hamilton and, as I repeat, a little modification of it, it occurs to me, would not involve too much difficulty and it might have provided us with some information that would have been useful. We have never contemplated doing that ourselves.

Someone asked me a moment ago as to the source of the figures that I used in the fairly lengthy report that I gave and I simply point out to the House that I have a letter from Mr. D. V. Conder, vice-president, Great Lakes region, Canadian National Railways, dated February 8, addressed to me, that provides the figures that I used in the submission to the House.

Mr. Davison: From?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The vice-president, Great Lakes region, Canadian National Railways. I might point out to the House that I think he has to be accepted as an authority.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 811 carried?

Mr. Gisborn: One question, Mr. Chairman to the hon. Minister. It is a brief one. I might have missed his presentation in this regard. The purchase of the running equipment, the locomotives—are they all Canadian purchases?

Hon. Mr. MacNaughton: The locomotives are being manufactured at General Motors Diesel in London and the rail coach equipment is being made at the plant of Hawker Siddeley in Fort William.

Vote 811 agreed to.

Mr. Chairman: This completes the estimates of The Department of Highways.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): **Mr. Chairman:** Before going into detail regarding this department's plans for the fiscal year 1966-67, I would like to refer for a moment to the year just

past. That year, 1965, saw the tourist industry make a major advance in Ontario. During the calendar year, travel spending in Ontario from all sources rose to a record level of \$1,484,000,000—a remarkable six per cent gain over the preceding year.

I submit that this is further proof of the dominant role played by the tourist industry in Ontario's economy—a role that was underlined by the tourist industry committee report tabled recently by the Ontario economic council. The report states that tourism is the largest single factor in international trade; that foreign tourist spending alone accounted for 6.8 per cent of Ontario's gross provincial product as far back as 1963; that the jobs of some 300,000 people in Ontario stem from this spending; that, and I quote from the report, "Its growth potential is as great as any major industry within Ontario."

This is not idle speculation. These figures demonstrate that tourism is an industry which will increasingly demand the close attention of everyone in Ontario so that its full potential can be realized. Tourism is an industry very broad in its scope. Its impact is province wide. It touches the lives of every resident of our province. It is, quite literally, everybody's business. But, because it is so large, so diverse and so omnipresent, it is almost impossible to deal with in specific, tangible terms. Until very recently, development within the industry was a hit-and-miss proposition. Research was virtually non-existent and guidelines were based purely on experience rather than foresight. But in an industry where competition was, and is, so keen and where so much is at stake, chance had to be eliminated wherever possible. Research, hitherto an industry orphan, became all-important.

We in The Department of Tourism and Information are very proud of the fact that we took the lead in this field with the establishment of Canada's first travel research branch in 1963. From its very inception, this branch played a key role in formulating plans and policies of the department. In 1964-65, the travel research branch conducted a study of the travel habits and expenditures of residents of Metropolitan Toronto. Portions of this study are still being analyzed but it has already yielded so much valuable data that in the coming year we plan to expand this study to include all of Ontario.

Also, in order to understand fully the importance of tourism and recreation as a spending sector of the economy, a study will be made of spending by Ontario residents on travel and recreation.

Other studies to be made during the year will include:

A detailed inventory of recreation facilities, tourist accommodation of all types and present land use.

A critical examination of tourist promotion and industry services to determine whether Ontario is entitled to a larger share of the travel market in our prime U.S. areas which include Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Minnesota.

A study of what motivates U.S. tourists to visit Ontario.

Two years ago, an early study in the U.S. showed that Americans were well aware of Ontario's outdoor and sporting attractions, but knew little of our cities or our modern way of life. That study dictated an immediate change in our advertising policy.

Since then, our advertisements in the U.S. have tried to balance the outdoor image of Ontario with the province's more sophisticated attractions: Our good highways, bustling cities, cultural events and historic sites. In the current year, our "Friendly, Familiar, Foreign and Near" campaign will continue in the U.S. with full-colour, full-page, multi-picture advertisements. I would just like to mention that at a recent Canadian tourist association meeting Mr. Garth Hite, publisher of *Holiday* magazine, singled out this Ontario headline as stating most clearly and succinctly our attraction for Americans—and we didn't use *Holiday* magazine last year.

To measure the highest level of impact of each individual advertisement, we have undertaken extensive testing to determine what pictures and copy generate the most interest with readers. We feel this is extremely important in today's increasingly competitive and crowded travel advertising field. To meet this competition for the growing disposable incomes enjoyed by North Americans—a market that includes not only new travel advertisers such as Singapore, increased promotional efforts by individual U.S. states, Canadian provinces, European and Caribbean countries, but also the expanding leisure time industries such as boating—Ontario's budget for advertising directed to the tourist market has increased from \$445,000 in 1962-63 to \$575,000 in 1965-66, an increase of more than 25 per cent.

I am asking for a further increase in this programme not only to maintain our share of this market but to increase it.

The combination of Canada's Centennial celebrations and Expo '67 will present Ontario with both unparalleled opportunities and problems in the field of tourist promotion. People who may never before have considered a Canadian vacation will be made aware, through both editorial coverage and advertisements in their own media, of the attractions and events taking place in Canada in 1967. For Ontario to reach the maximum number of these new, potential visitors will mean even greater advertising and promotional efforts by this department.

Ontario advertising designed to encourage travel within the province by other Canadians and its own residents, will feature a single region in each advertisement. This approach will allow us to mention specific attractions and, as in the United States advertising, to depict the diversity of each area through a number of photographs. A coupon inviting the reader to write for additional information will be included, and these inquiries will be serviced with the specific 24-page handbook describing that region.

A modest direct mail campaign to a selected group of first-time visitors to our reception centres in 1965 and to those who sent us mail inquiries in that year will be initiated in 1966-67. It is hoped that a detailed analysis of the results of this campaign will provide us with a valuable guide in assessing the feasibility of using similar and larger programmes in the future.

In 1965-66 a programme was initiated to redesign all of the department's promotional literature. Awareness of changing tourist needs and interests has resulted in several publications being discontinued, others amalgamated, and many new ones planned. Among our new publications for 1966-67 will be special promotion pieces for use by travel agents and motor clubs, and one designed specifically for use in the United Kingdom. New books covering the Champlain Trail from Montreal to the French River, and the Voyageur Route from the French River to Lake Winnipeg are scheduled. In addition, many of our current publications are being revised and updated for distribution in 1966-67.

A major undertaking in this field will be the publication jointly with The Quebec Department of Tourism, Fish and Game of a bilingual booklet describing North America's most popular tourist route, leading from Niagara Falls to Quebec City. This booklet will be ready in late 1966 for distribution to the many motorists who will be

heading for Expo '67 and will be distributed by the Canadian government travel bureau as well as the two provinces.

This co-operation with the federal and Quebec governments will be displayed in another major project during the coming year: the hosting of the annual convention of the society of American travel writers. Responsibility for Ontario's share of this convention will rest with the department's publicity branch.

The society of American travel writers is an organization whose membership list is composed of writers, editors and photographers from the major newspapers and magazines in North America. In addition, most of the continent's best known freelance travel writers belong to the organization and will be participating in the convention. The group will be visiting parts of Ontario and Quebec, with the cost being shared by the federal government and the two provinces. Also, many of the other provinces will be visited on pre- and post-convention tours. We were successful in obtaining this convention despite bids from Turkey, Hawaii, Florida and Costa Rica. It is particularly appropriate that we should be the host in 1966, the pre-Centennial year, as we will have an opportunity further to acquaint this influential group with greater personal knowledge of an area that will be the continent's greatest travel target in 1967.

The press relations section will continue its programme of specialized mailings to newspapers, magazines, house organs, and so on, and will provide specially requested articles. Material is also prepared for special projects occurring within the department and in co-operation with other government departments.

The photographic section will continue to photograph Ontario's chief tourist attractions and events for use in the department's advertising, publications and publicity programmes. Also, this photographic service is provided to other government departments, as requested. The motion picture section will co-ordinate production of two 16 mm motion pictures during the current year, one to replace the Trent waterway film, produced several years ago, and another on fresh water fishing in Ontario.

The Trent waterway film, now in our library, has been one of the most popular travel films produced in North America, and because of the greatly increased interest in boating, the new developments along the waterway, and the tourist areas traversed, it is essential that the film be updated. To

date, no fresh water fishing film is available and the success of our film, "Let's Talk Hunting," which covers a variety of hunting possibilities, indicates that there is a definite demand for this type of fishing film.

In 1965-66 we completed our first French version of a department film, the award-winning "Upper Canada Village." This version is now in distribution and it is expected that the translation of other of the department films into French and German will be undertaken.

The expanding role of the special promotions section will include the aforementioned society of American travel writers convention. In addition, in co-operation with the federal government, we will be welcoming travel trade missions from Great Britain and Europe during the year. It is estimated that at least 150 individual writers, photographers, broadcasters and travel agents will visit Ontario through arrangements made by our department throughout the year.

A programme to improve and expand the effectiveness of personalized travel information by mail service was implemented in late 1965. The ultimate objective is to provide a faster and more efficient process, capable of answering inquiries about all aspects of Ontario's tourist industry through the medium of a personal letter to the inquirer. Full utilization of the one automated letter-producing unit indicates we are not totally dependent on paid advertising to generate an extensive literature distribution. A more selective audience can be reached through the medium of a direct mail campaign which, because of great flexibility in style and approach, enables us to increase the effectiveness of our travel counselling services.

A new special group of travel counsellors to increase our competence in that field is under development. University educated, as a qualifying standard, these young ladies are knowledgeable, personable, sophisticated and well mannered, capable of adding to the prestige of this department and this government by discharging their duties and assignments with a high degree of perfection. Two members have now been recruited and have been assigned to the new ultra-modern travel information centre at 185 Bloor street east.

This centre utilizes the most modern techniques in travel counselling facilities. Again, as in our personalized letter campaign, the prospective vacationer is given recognition as an individual, and accorded personal service. As travel plans are discussed with the travel counsellor, a colour slide presentation enables the visitor to become acquainted with the

particular area of interest. In addition to Ontario literature, the literature of all Canadian provinces is available at the centre.

A programme to improve the scope and effectiveness of the inquiry list service has been implemented. Inquiries received by department staffs at sports and travel shows are now available to tourist operators, regional councils and recognized tourist organizations throughout Ontario on a day-to-day basis. For example, inquiries received during the Kansas City sports show a few weeks ago were in the hands of the trade before the show ended.

However, all the promotion in the world will go amiss unless we have a strong and effective tourist plant to back it up, a plant that includes the 14 development offices and the 17 tourist information reception centres of the department's tourist industry development branch. Ontario is perhaps unique in the tourist industry in that the encouragement and improvement of accommodation services and facilities is an integral part of the entire departmental programme. Many of the states in the U.S. and most of the other provinces do not have the close co-ordination among their advertising, development and promotional efforts and the businessmen who are directly involved in the tourist industry.

Our field officers will continue to provide operators with all possible assistance and advice on the operation of their business. This may range from suggesting a promotional and publicity campaign to helping to plan the layout and design of new rooms or cottages. This year we plan to expand our programme of training seminars. There will be at least 24 across the province, conducted in conjunction with the Canadian tourist association, regional tourist councils and chambers of commerce. These will be aimed primarily at staff, and include expert speakers on such subjects as:

What the tourist industry means to our area; how to meet and greet guests; salesmanship techniques for retail clerks and waitresses; putting area resources to work to build up tourist attractions; staff selection and training, hospitality skits, budgeting and many others.

A pilot project this year will provide instruction to students of selected high schools with a view to the possible inclusion of tourism as a curriculum item in years to come. This programme, if successful, will be expanded in the immediate future.

The programme of grants to regional tourist councils continues on the same basis as last year. While there are certain problems in-

herent in the organization of regional councils, we find that this has been outweighed by the optimism created in areas where smaller tourist organizations, chambers of commerce and individual operators had never attempted to work together before.

The improvement of food and food counselling is an area in which the department intends to expand its activities by: Menu planning; kitchen layout; waitress training; food preparation techniques.

The operation of the 17 tourist reception centres maintained by the department at the border-crossing points continues to improve and expand. Some time in 1966, we expect to have four new buildings of an outstanding and distinctive design at locations where we have been forced because of highway changes and other factors, to use trailers. At the reception centres this year, we will again register our guests on individual electronic data processing registration cards. From this we have an immediate picture on the origin of our tourists, the volume coming through at each border-crossing point and their destination.

Our programme of inspection, licensing, approval of new construction, investigation of complaints, and enforcement of legislation continues. From our activities and plans, you will realize, Mr. Chairman, that we are dedicated to providing an atmosphere in which private enterprise may expand and flourish. Unfortunately, there will always be, it seems, some businessmen who will defy good business ethics and whatever rules and regulations exist. In this respect, we have been forced, reluctantly, to embark on a number of prosecutions this past season and have obtained convictions against six operators with a few others still pending.

Another project on which we will be working is the establishment of tourist or travel-generating attractions, on a sound economic basis. The procedure of this is fairly simple and will, we expect, produce some excellent results.

Each community or tourist area will be surveyed by our staff to determine whether or not enough travel business comes into a community or an area to warrant the capital expenditure on an attraction. This programme has been applauded by the research branch of the industrial development bank and, as the techniques improve, we expect that a whole new series of businesses will be created.

The souvenir promotion programme will continue this year as a result of the success achieved in generating interest in production

and sale of marketable gift items emblematic of Ontario.

Mr. Chairman, I have already referred in passing to the tourist potential of 1967, Canada's centennial year. But, if we are to realize this potential, Ontario must offer the visitors a sustained programme of events and celebrations. The encouraging and co-ordinating of these is a large and complex task, a task being carried out with great efficiency by my department's centennial planning branch.

A major part of the work of this branch in the coming year will be the finalization of planning in the 748 communities which now have active centennial committees. To aid in this task, the branch will hold a series of 26 workshops across the province in April and May in order to work on problems at the local level and assist in the completion of individual community programmes. The urgency in completing plans in 1966 will be stressed, as will the need for vigilance in sustaining centennial year excitement following, and prior to, July 1 celebrations.

A special programme of celebrations and events is being prepared for Queen's Park throughout the 1967 calendar year. Particular attention will be devoted to July and August when the summer tourist season is at its peak. We already have received promises of assistance and participation in these events from The Department of National Defence.

A concentrated effort will be made by the branch to have those communities without centennial committees, at the present time, organize and plan programmes for 1967. A series of meetings with women's regional and area representatives and groups is being undertaken across the province to keep this important sector well informed and to ensure their enthusiasm is sustained.

As final results of a successful year of events will depend on the widest involvement of people themselves, a concentrated effort will continue through the branch's newsletter, newspapers, committee meetings, and by a corps of speakers to enlist more and more citizens in the actual events and celebrations. Performing arts, visual arts, and folk art presentations, scheduled throughout the province, will create a cultural impact that will continue in the years to follow. An all-out effort is being made to assure that this phase of the celebrations will be a major highlight.

During the coming fiscal year the department of public records and archives will expand its existing programmes and initiate new ones. Public interest in history, histori-

cal attractions, and historical research has increased greatly in recent years. This interest has been stimulated by the planning for the forthcoming centennial commemoration, by major historical reconstruction projects, by an increase in the establishment of local museums, by increased university enrolment, and by the founding of new historical and genealogical societies. The number of persons doing research in the archives and the volume of inquiries received by mail has grown very rapidly, and we are requesting increases in staff to keep up with this demand.

The basic function, of course, of the archives proper is to acquire, preserve, and analyze non-published records of enduring value relating to Ontario's past. In the case of privately owned manuscripts, the continuing loss through destruction and deterioration is undoubtedly great. In the coming year the services of one archivist will be used exclusively to seek out and transfer to the archives, through donation or purchase, documents of this nature. In instances where it is not possible to obtain the originals, efforts will be made to microfilm them. Apart from manuscripts, the archives will make a special effort to acquire or microfilm scarce copies of 19th century editions of Ontario newspapers.

Under an agreement with the federated women's institutes of Ontario, the archives will also undertake the microfilming of the Tweedsmuir histories, which have been compiled by local institutes throughout the province.

A new project of particular interest to the hon. members, which is being carried out in conjunction with the legislative library, involves the microfilming of the pre-*Hansard* debates of the Legislature as recorded in contemporary newspapers from 1867 to the 1940s. It is expected that this project, which will include a partial index, will be completed early in the coming fiscal year.

It is expected that a start will be made during the next year on the publication of a series of inventories covering the larger and more significant record groups and manuscript collections stored in the archives. The archives is working closely with the recently established Treasury board records management committee to organize a more systematic scheduling and disposal of the records of all government departments. It is hoped that during the coming fiscal year a central records depository for seldom-used departmental documents will be in operation.

A second museums adviser has recently been added to the archives staff. She is an expert on display and design; and, during the coming year, an increased effort will be made to assist Ontario's 140 local museums to raise their standards in these fields. I might note here that the practical value of such assistance may be gauged by the fact that it has been estimated that over five million visits were paid to Ontario's museums in 1965.

The archives will also undertake directly a special programme involving the establishment of a permanent display in these Parliament buildings illustrating, by documents and other means, the growth and evolution of our parliamentary system. That display, we expect, will be opened in 1967.

The historical marking programme, one of the most active on this continent, will be continued next year with the addition of at least 40 plaques. It is expected that, in the coming year, the archives will continue and increase their support of certain projects of archaeological field work connected with the commemoration and marking of historic sites. In addition to sites on land, we intend to assist in the preservation and identification of artifacts of historical significance recovered by underwater salvage.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express again my appreciation of the public service rendered by the archaeological and historic sites boards of Ontario. This advisory body, whose members include professional historians and other persons noted for their interest in historical development, has been most helpful to our department in connection with our programmes in the historical field.

Ontario's newest major historical attraction is Ste. Marie-Among-the-Hurons, currently being rebuilt on the original site near Midland. As you know, Mr. Chairman, this is a unique project in that the work is being carried out under the guidance of the University of Western Ontario with funds and administrative work being provided by my department.

Remarkable progress was made on the reconstruction during the past summer and it is expected that the European compound will be completed this year. This would mean that the entire area enclosed by the palisades will be ready for the centennial year. A start also will be made this summer on construction of an interpretive museum at which visitors will receive a comprehensive backgrounding before touring the site.

It is expected that the Wye river park,

across the river from the site, will be completed this year as will the dredging of the river. The latter task, being undertaken by the federal government, will allow pleasure craft to sail up the river to the site.

The Centennial centre of science and technology, Ontario's official centennial project, is progressing steadily. Twenty-four outstanding citizens from across Ontario accepted appointments to the centre's board of trustees. The board's full-time chairman has set up an industry committee whose primary function is to enlist the support of the business and industrial community.

The staff, under the director, Dr. George MacBeath, now numbers 88. Donald K. Crowdis has been appointed associate director and Robert M. Hume, assistant director.

A leased building in Don Mills contains 52,000 square feet of floor space devoted to storage and restoration of articles for display, design and preparation of exhibits, a woodworking and metalworking shop, and administration offices. This temporary headquarters is only a few hundred yards north of the actual site of the centre at Don Mills road and Eglinton avenue east.

Outstanding items are being acquired as gifts or on indefinite loan. Some of those already in hand are the first Cobalt-60 beam therapy unit to be put to work against cancer in a Canadian hospital; a rare, early Jacquard loom; Miss Supertest, world champion powerboat; steam locomotives CNR 6167 and CPR 1057; and models of steam engines of historical and scientific importance.

Of the centre's purchases, the most important and comprehensive has been the Matthews collection. It contains thousands of items significant to Canada's earlier days, ranging from steam traction engines to stage coaches, from hearses to locomotives, and from high-wheeled cycles to early sewing machines. Registration, photographing and compilation of data has been completed for more than 1,700 items, and restoration work is under way on many of these.

Preparation of exhibits is likewise moving ahead. Small-scale models of the three exhibit halls have been built, along with a large, quarter-scale model of the orientation centre, a type of rotating theatre with audio-visual and other sophisticated equipment.

In the junior museum, 40 exhibit units have been researched in outline, 15 are in the design stage and seven are in production. Other exhibits, both indoor and outdoor and covering the fields of technology and health, are in the planning process.

An advisory committee for exhibits is being set up. Its personnel will be drawn from industry and the academic world and its function will be to review exhibit proposals for accuracy and suitability. It will also recommend expert consultants for development of specific exhibits.

The interest of business and industry in the centre is growing rapidly. The industry committee is actively encouraging individual corporations and groups of companies to sponsor specific exhibits or "packages" being put together by the centre staff.

In recognition of the importance of making the centre an effective instrument of education, a liaison committee has been set up by Mr. John G. Crean and the hon. Minister of Education (Mr. Davis) who is serving as vice-chairman of the board. This committee is advising the board of trustees and the hon. Minister of Education on the planning of the centre's educational activities, and on staff requirements.

Mr. Chairman, I trust it is obvious from what I have said here today that The Department of Tourism and Information is maintaining its place as a leader in the field of tourism. Ours is a rapidly changing and rapidly developing industry. In order to keep abreast of these developments my department in recent years has reorganized and expanded. I feel that the changes that have been made have proved extremely worthwhile and that the many new programmes and policies now under study will lead to even further successes in the future.

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, I have a prepared text of some 45 minutes but in view of the late hour, with your permission I have seven or eight minutes of comments on the report that was tabled by this department, if you would like to clear these out of the way this evening.

Mr. Chairman: I think it would be quite in order for the member to take a few minutes.

Mr. Paterson: Yes. First, on commenting on the annual report of the department, I might make one suggestion, that the hon. Minister might include some comparative figures with other jurisdictions in relation to various statistics pertaining to the tourist industry.

In the report, the hon. Minister indicates that there has been an increase in our tourist industry of some six per cent over the previous calendar year. I would like to point out to the House tonight that this is about half of the percentage increase as it pertains

to world travel. In fact, in most retail businesses if you do not expand somewhere between five and eight per cent, you are actually going behind. So I would state here tonight that possibly our tourist industry is still just in the marking-time stages.

On page four of the hon. Minister's annual report, subsection 4, stating that the department has done certain things to create an effective programme in relation to reception centres, operation, maintenance and planning of new locations and buildings—I would hope that in the hon. Minister's reply to my criticisms he could indicate where some of these new reception centres will be located.

I was very pleased to read that part of the report concerning the activities of the industrial development bank and the Ontario development agency in relation to the tourist industry. I have spoken on this area at quite some length several times. It reports that this year some 2,600 persons were interviewed about the possibility of starting into some segment of the tourist business and through these interviews some 385 have gone into the tourist business on a fairly solid foundation. I would commend the hon. Minister and his associate, the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) for moving into this field and I hope they will move even a little further before the session is concluded.

The report states, concerning enforcements, that there were six hearings and two prosecutions. I recall raising a question regarding the Peterborough area last year and I believe the reply was that, if there had not been any prosecutions in our province there were 146 formal complaints.

I would like to comment briefly on the new programme of giving exclusive stories and releases to certain of the major papers in our jurisdictions to the south. In essence, I think this is good, but I just wonder if there is a possibility that we are alienating the affections of rival newspapers or whether they are given exclusive stories on Ontario that they can run at a future date. I would hope that the hon. Minister could verify this point with me.

In relation to the ethnic press—and I think these tours with editors are certainly worthwhile—I am just wondering if these people are preparing things to send overseas in their native language so that we might encourage overseas travel from their articles. And I might question too the circulation of these various papers. I think this is an interesting experiment and worthwhile but it should be followed through to the ultimate end.

The hon. Minister reports on films and the showing of them through the national film board and other centres, but I just wonder what is the estimated viewing audience that sees these films and projections. I wonder if there is any attempt to get these films into our movie houses. Often we have "Canada Reports" and so forth; has there been any effort in the department to get these into our movies in the various locales, not only in Ontario but other jurisdictions? We seem to get a lot of American tourist films clips in the movies and I would hope there would be some attempt at getting Ontario's in.

On page seven the report relates to the Muskoka study. I think this is a most interesting study and I wonder if this particular study will be tabled in this House. I would further ask the hon. Minister what was the cost of conducting this study and survey; and possibly what new policies will be evolved from it?

On page eight the hon. Minister reports concerning the number of persons escorted here in the building by our very efficient staff of girls and I would certainly pay commendation to them here tonight, because I think they are an excellent group of ladies and they do a very commendable job on behalf of this government and the people connected with this building.

I think that pretty well summarizes my remarks, other than one last item: I note in

the annual report that the hon. Minister is making grants to assist with underwater archaeological investigations in the Manitoulin area. I just wonder if the Huey passage, which has been very famous—or notorious, I guess is the word—for wrecks in the past, dating back to our earliest history, if some consideration could be given to that area.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks up to my prepared text.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report a certain resolution and ask for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will proceed with these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.30 o'clock, p.m.



Legislature of Ontario Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT — DAILY EDITION

Fourth Session of the Twenty-Seventh Legislature

Friday, March 11, 1966

Speaker: Honourable Donald H. Morrow

Clerk: Roderick Lewis, Q.C.

THE QUEEN'S PRINTER
TORONTO
1966



CONTENTS

Friday, March 11, 1966

Estimates, Department of Tourism and Information, Mr. Auld, continued	1418
Motion to adjourn, Mr. Robarts, agreed to	1441

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO

FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1966

The House met at 10.30 o'clock, a.m.

Prayers.

Mr. Speaker: We are pleased to have, as visitors to the Legislature today, in the Speaker's gallery, members of the travel trade mission from Great Britain and Ireland; and in the east gallery, students from Gracedale public school, Toronto; and, in various galleries, students from Sunnyview public school, Toronto.

Petitions.

Presenting reports by committees.

Motions.

Introduction of bills.

Mr. R. Gisborn (Wentworth East): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Rowntree). It was presented before the orders of the day yesterday but the hon. Minister was away on business. I wonder if I could put the question now and if the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) can answer it, fine. If not, we will wait until we can get an answer.

The question is: In view of reports that industries in Hamilton and the Ford plant at Oakville will not accept job applications from workers laid off by Studebaker who are over 40 years of age, will the hon. Minister, without delay, consider passing through the House Bill No. 35, An Act to prevent discrimination in employment because of age, and bring forward the commencement date?

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am not in a position to answer the question this morning as it has just appeared. I understood the hon. member to say that he had a question yesterday as well; I will arrange to have these questions answered on Monday.

Mr. F. Young (Yorkview): Mr. Speaker, would the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. Dymond) inform the House as to the extent of the occurrence of infectious hepatitis in the Thornbury area?

Hon. M. B. Dymond (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, no hepatitis has been reported thus far in 1966 from Thornbury town, or Collingwood township in which the town is situated; but St. Vincent's township, which adjoins Collingwood township to the west, has reported five cases in January, two cases in February and four in March.

Mr. R. M. Whicher (Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Prime Minister. As there were only 155 weekdays in the fiscal year, 1964-65, on which the Legislature was not sitting, would the hon. Prime Minister explain to the House how the government arrived at the allowances paid to the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin (Mr. Root), for his services to the Ontario water resources commission, of \$10,175 plus \$2,059.39 travel expenses?

Hon. Mr. Robarts: Mr. Speaker, in the first place I would say that the government does not arrive at the allowances paid to the members of the Ontario water resources commission. These amounts are arrived at by the commission itself. This is going to require some statistical research from the water resources commission, so I will take this as notice and produce the answer when I am able to get it from the commission itself.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Speaker, I have a question that I was going to address yesterday to the hon. Minister of Labour. He was not here then and is, I understand, ill today, but perhaps I can put it on the record: Has the hon. Minister been given any assurance by the publishers of the three Toronto dailies that if Mr. Elmer Brown, international president of the ITU, comes to Toronto to resume negotiations in the printers' strike, they will be willing to sit down around the bargaining table?

Mr. Speaker, I wonder in this connection if I might ask the hon. Prime Minister whether or not the government would be willing to table the correspondence they have had with the O F of L on this issue? I think it would answer, and let the public know, the exact position on both sides and perhaps

avoid a series of questions. And I think the public is entitled to know. Would the government consider tabling that correspondence?

Hon. Mr. Roberts: I would be very happy to go into that and see if this might be the answer to your questions. The hon. Minister of Labour is not here this morning, but I will see that this is dealt with, the same as for the hon. member for Wentworth East.

Mr. MacDonald: My other question, Mr. Speaker, is to the hon. Attorney General (Mr. Wishart). Is the hon. Attorney General in a position to confirm or deny the statement by Dr. W. G. Prueter, immediate past president of the London board of education, that there is a black market for birth control pills operating in that city and perhaps elsewhere throughout Ontario?

Hon. A. A. Wishart (Attorney General): Mr. Speaker, I learned this morning that there is an article in the *London Free Press*. I have not seen a report of the statement made by Dr. Prueter and I am therefore not really in a position to comment on something I have not read. I know that the article has been published, but to answer the question: "Am I in a position to confirm or deny the statement?" I must say I am not, at the moment.

Mr. Speaker: Orders of the day.

Clerk of the House: The 12th order; House in committee of supply. Mr. L. M. Reilly in the chair.

ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND INFORMATION

(continued)

Mr. D. A. Paterson (Essex South): Mr. Chairman, before I commence my remarks, I would just like to clear up a little misunderstanding that was alleged here in the House the other day. An hon. member of the House castigated we Liberals for not doing any research concerning our estimates. I would just like to draw to the attention of this House that, in these particular estimates, our people have studied the province of New Brunswick, the province of Quebec, the state of Vermont, the state of Michigan, and one of our western provinces—as well as the various facets of our internal industry. And I would just like to underline this before I commence my remarks.

Last year, in the hon. Minister's (Mr. Auld's) remarks concerning this department,

he indicated that there were two principal techniques being used to increase our tourist business: one, utilizing the most modern methods of communication; and second, to create an environment in which tourists can converge. The hon. Minister further stated that his department had not made a full and balanced impression for our province, but that he was initiating steps to correct this situation.

These two principles were to be expanded into four principles in the advertising for our province. (a) to balance our image; (b) to create an impression for our province; (c) to direct information to bona-fide prospects; and (d) to extend our tourist season.

I do not think any of us can argue that these are not a good set of principles on which to base our tourist programme, but I would like to point out to this House that this government has failed the tourist industry in our province this past 23 years—and has still failed to fulfil the needs of our industry during the few years in which this department has been reorganized.

It has failed to develop a provincial image. It has failed to keep pace with other jurisdictions competing with us. It has failed to preserve and interpret, into an operative programme, the many facets of our history. It has failed to stimulate development in the less fortunate economic regions of our province. And it has failed to meet the financial obligations confronting our expanding and changing tourist accommodation business.

I would like to deal with the problems of balancing our image and creating an impression for our province. The report of the economic council on the tourist industry states that:

It is largely impracticable to build a tourist image on behalf of all our province because of our size and variety.

As I stated in a comment on this report, I believe it can be done—with correlated planning of all government departments, with related advertising and promotional efforts around a basic theme. I do not think we should take a fatalistic approach to this problem.

"Hospitalité" is spoken all over the very large province of Quebec, and everything is the "biggest and the best" in the state of Texas. For many years we promoted Ontario as the "great vacation land" for hunters and fishermen, but our game has diminished and our lakes are becoming fished out and this has somewhat of a lacklustre appeal to many dissatisfied sportsmen. We still have the

potential to rejuvenate these two great assets to attract thousands of people and exploit this resource in the pre- and post-summer holiday periods, which would help extend our tourist season.

Then we had the campaign to "know Ontario better," and I always thought of these as beer-type advertisements. Possibly this encouraged some travel within our province, but I really do not think that it was effective. And now we have "friendly," "foreign," "familiar" and "near."

It is no secret that the name "Ontario" prompts at most a "ho-hum" from Americans generally, and usually a quizzical look. Ontarians are regarded in many quarters as Eskimos, and in others as lumberjacks wearing mackinaws and probably speaking French.

Hon. G. C. Wardrope (Minister of Mines): There is nothing wrong with that! I am proud of our miners and lumberjacks.

Mr. Paterson: There is nothing wrong with that—I agree. They are very fine people, but this is the impression we have left on the jurisdictions of the south.

Hon. L. P. Cecile (Minister of Public Welfare): The hon. member does not travel much.

Mr. Paterson: I travel as often as I can. I would hope that the hon. Minister does a better job of selling his department to his colleagues on the Treasury benches than he does in selling his province in the United States.

An hon. member: And you travel at your own expense, too!

Mr. Paterson: Yes, I travel at my own expense.

Our image in the United States could not be described as "dreadful," it cannot be described at all—for we have no real image. In the USA we are a faceless province. I point directly to the economic development survey which says that Canadians are regarded by Americans as "respected strangers, first, and as slow Americans, second." "Strangers"; "slow Americans"; that is how Canadian nationalism and Ontario provincialism express themselves in the United States.

Personally, I am not an advertising man nor am I a great ideas man—and certainly not a sensational promotional agent—but I do have an idea that could give our province a theme, a special image, an identifiable image,

that will not only enthuse our own population and give people pride in our province, but give an image that will attract millions of visitors from neighbouring jurisdictions and, in fact, from countries all over the world.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Paterson: We have had these symbols—the artifacts—the potential for this theme—for almost 100 years, 99 to be exact—and yet we have never recognized it, never utilized it to the fullest. We have not even tried to capitalize on this most obvious asset to our province—that we are the Royal province in the Dominion of Canada. What better theme could we merchandise than: "Come to Ontario to be treated royally—to see pagantry." Our American cousins would see and experience something that is not available in their own country. Why do I propose that we are the Royal province? Why should we adopt such an image? Well, basically the time is ripe; it could not be more opportune as we go into our Centennial celebrations. What more perfect staging could be envisaged to create and perpetuate this image?

First of all, we have a Queen; we have the nation's capital within our boundaries, complete with changing of the guard and the red-coated Royal Canadian mounted police; we have the Royal conservatory of music and the Royal Ontario museum; the Royal winter fair; the Royal military college; the Royal York hotel; and many other centres of accommodation, in various centres, that denote royalty.

An hon. member: What about Crown Royal?

Mr. Paterson: Crown Royal? I forgot to mention that.

In Guelph, we have the Royal city—the College Royal; and in many of our centres we have regiments such as the Royal Canadian dragoons.

Our imaginations could run rampant on this particular theme, a theme that has not been utilized to give our province a distinctive image. I might comment that even the pith helmets, worn by the city of Toronto police officers in the summer, help establish this image; but possibly the most effective role in establishing this image could be played by our sadly neglected office of the Lieutenant-Governor. This is a symbol of the Crown; of royalty; the same crown that appears on our licence plates; the same system that denotes our highways systems. Let us

follow this theme and have our Lieutenant-Governor appear regularly, in full regalia, at as many major events as possible throughout the breadth and width of our province.

I personally do not feel that this would be an intrusion on the dignity of this office; it would be a utilization of this office and would create an esteem in the mind of the general public, and an envy of Ontario in the eyes of our visiting American friends. I would certainly hope that this high office will be used in as many places throughout our province, and as often as possible, during our Centennial year. One could expand on this theme even further—for hours on end—but I have merely introduced this particular theme to point out to this House that we in Ontario can develop an image, that we can make a lasting impression on our American visitors that will make them want to return to Ontario year after year. And, just as important, it will give us, the people of Ontario, a real sense of pride in our own province.

Closely related to this theme is another fundamental advertising method to further enhance our province in the eyes of the general public, both within our province and throughout the world. This is publicity by association, a technique that never grows old. In what better way could we raise the stature of a vacation in Ontario than by having, say, Prince Philip as our guest to hunt moose in Kenora? To have the Royal yacht "Britannia" cruise the Great Lakes and pay courtesy calls at many of our ports. Or we could bring other international figures in sports and entertainment on a holiday in Ontario.

Can you imagine the impact and lasting impression left by an Ontario holiday, having seen Bing Crosby spend a weekend playing golf at one of our summer resort hotels? Or possibly Bob Hope taking the railroad to Moosonee. Terrific publicity! This subtle advertising policy has never or seldom ever been used by our tourist promotion department. It could be, and it could pay handsome dividends.

In conclusion on this problem of creating an image for our province, I again reiterate that this can be done. We have the symbols, we have the tools and, most important, we have the ability to project Ontario as the foremost area in North America for tourist travel.

The next area with which I would like to deal is that of highway tourist centres. On page 15, the economic report deals with the large category of tourists, classified as sightseers, who come by car. It states that they like to be led, hour by hour, off the thruways

to see attractions of every type. It further states that we must keep teasing them on, revealing further interesting things to do and see. To me it is at our border information centres, and more especially at our semi-operative information centres along Highway 401, where we could sell the real Ontario to our sightseeing tourists.

For the past two years I have spoken regarding the lack of real involvement of this department in the operation of the information centres that are required in the service centres along Highway 401. I have brought to the attention of this House the financial problems of the Ontario travel council, a group formed from the regional tourist councils to finance and operate these information booths. And I understand that, possibly, this council is floundering. In my comments on these booths I have stated that the theory behind their establishment was to get the people off 401, to get them to travel to other parts of Ontario, and to extend their stay in Ontario.

On page 61 of the economic report is the following paragraph:

Directly fronting on our thruways and on our major two-lane arteries are few tourist attractions which offer visitor opportunities to spend time and money. One has to get off the main roads. The shun-piker is potentially our most profitable and most satisfied tourist.

Any government sponsored diversionary programme must of course always be governed by considerations of safety and realization that there are travellers who do have specific targets and want to get there as quickly as possible. But thruways need little or no advertising. They readily find their patronage. What we must merchandise are our off-highway attractions. In so doing, we assist in distribution of traffic more equitably and reduce somewhat the impact on bypassed communities.

In my opinion, these information centres—and I believe there are 30-odd along Highway 401—which were required to be built by this government, which could be a great selling point for their immediate area as well as other areas in Ontario, have been a failure.

They have failed because the government has failed them. This government has failed to finance them adequately. This government has failed to give a specific course of training for these attendants, as confirmed by the hon. Minister in last year's *Hansard* on page 1070. These information booths stay open only a part of the day during the height of

the tourist season. They are closed for almost ten months of the year, which is certainly no encouragement to extending our tourist season.

The following are comments from newspaper reports concerning the regard in which they are held by members of one sponsoring body, and I quote from the October, 1965, *Windsor Star*:

Removal of support from Highway 401 tourist information centres will be proposed at the next meeting of the Essex-Kent regional tourist council because of alleged misuse of council funds. "I am going to recommend that we have nothing further to do with the centres," said the president of the council. The president said the council had no say in the hiring of the staff and that literature placed in the centres was put away in locked cupboards by Department of Highways staff.

He said that girls who staffed the booths did not have nearly enough knowledge about the area. The girls had been chosen by a representative of the travel council from Toronto, and members of the area council were not consulted about the interviews with potential employees. They were supposed to contact us and have us sit in the hiring session, but this was never done.

The president said he would recommend the government keep its grant to the tourist councils instead of giving it with one hand and then taking it back with the other and doing a poor job.

On December 14, a director of the Chatham chamber of commerce made the following statement that is reported in the *London Free Press*:

He charged that some members of Highway 401 information centres during last summer were inadequately trained. He said he asked girls staffing an information centre between London and Woodstock test questions on Kent county. He found the staff members had to resort to a map when he asked for directions to Kent county.

"Is Chatham in Kent county?" he asked. "I think so," was the unsure reply.

I think this clearly points out the inadequate job that these information centres have done for us in the past. It is surely a condemnation of the lack of direction and planning by this department of government.

The reason tourist councils are discouraged—I would certainly think the staffs at the service centres are very discouraged with

the inattention given to all the space that they have been required to provide; and certainly area business interests are suffering because traffic is not being sent off Highway 401. And I can imagine many Department of Tourism officials are in a real quandary about what to do with these seemingly useless selling tools.

I would like to make the following proposal to this department, a proposal which I feel would make these centres sell Ontario 24 hours a day, 365 days per year. Now I have formulated this idea from visits to Williamsburg, Virginia, and visits to Greenfield village in Michigan, and have had my thoughts further confirmed at a recent visit to this department's new offices on Bloor street.

I would recommend that at each of the information centres along Highway 401, and at our border information centres at Niagara Falls, at Upper Canada village, and at many of our provincial park administration buildings, this department instal a series of free, pushbutton mechanical viewing screens, complemented by a sound track which would sell: first, the many area attractions and the route to drive to each; and second, sell what is ahead in the areas through which 401 passes—or sell our major tourist attractions in other parts of the province.

This way we can sell our seasons, we can sell our historic attractions, our little-known, out-of-the way places. The adaptation of this selling tool would be unlimited with a little imagination. It could operate with no attendant 24 hours a day, 365 days per year; and at the same time could be supplemented by an information attendant during our heavy vacation period. This method could be used to pinpoint accommodation areas, especially those that have been bypassed.

Supplemental to this, area tourist councils or the department itself could erect area map boards at these service centres. I believe this is occurring in some of them. These would do another selling job for those persons who are just stopping for gas and who do not take time to go into the actual service centre itself.

I trust that this department will give this suggestion some consideration. We have the service centres, we have the booths, and I think we have the technical know-how; so let us make these service centres work for us in all parts of Ontario.

Another complementary proposal to assist the auto tourists has come to my attention. I believe that there is a business group—in fact,

I am aware of it—about to be formed to undertake to sell this proposal to our major oil companies. It is somewhat like the Acoustiguide system at Upper Canada village. This particular group, about whom I am speaking, has the following plan: to have inexpensive tape recorders at our border points for rental by a tourist and sell him pretaped recordings that will describe the country, the farm crops, and the important sights and attractions along the route the tourist wishes to travel. The tape machines can be turned off and on at the pleasure of the tourist, and thus he can set his own pace for travelling through our province.

I understand that such systems are being used in France and England. The Canadian National Railways had a similar arrangement away back in 1928. In Europe the recordings come in as many as nine languages, and sightseeing buses are equipped with a console of recordings for the convenience of their passengers. I do hope that this enterprising firm can get this selling tool into our tourist trade.

I would now like to switch to another area in relation to statistics and advertising of this department. One of the department's press releases reads as follows:

Cleveland, Ohio, January 28—"Being host to some 22.8 million U.S. visitors last year was an all-time high for the province," Ontario Minister of Tourism and Information, the Hon. James Auld, said here last night.

In a speech to Cleveland's woods and waters club, Mr. Auld predicted that the total would soar to 23.4 million this year, a figure which exceeds the entire population of Canada.

Pointing out that Ontario is friendly, familiar, foreign and near, Mr. Auld added that "it is gratifying that many visitors to this province this year, as in the past, will be from the state of Ohio. The number will be an estimated 1.2 million in 1966."

I would like to, at this time, question some of the statistics used by the hon. Minister. The Minister of a department responsible for tourist promotion has unusual opportunities, possibly, to mislead and evade his critics as well as the general public, and I hope that he will correct me if I am away off base on these next few remarks.

The hon. Minister has taken full advantage of his opportunities. We have had lengthy explanations of just about everything his department does except attract tourists, and we have been given no convincing evi-

dence on which to base his department's performance in that area—which is its reason for being. Is it possible that the hon. Minister himself does not know just how well or how bad the province of Ontario rates in the travel promotion field? He is certainly ingenuous if he accepts his own figures on the tourist movement as either satisfactory or informative.

For example, the remarks that I just gave on his speech in Cleveland, if true, would mean an astonishing, successful performance—although one would wonder just where one would put 22.8 million people in Ontario, even if they spaced their visits throughout the travel year. Since the average stay of U.S. visitors to Canada is from four to five days, and since tourist revenues for all Canada from the United States will not reach \$800,000 until 1967—at least that is what the Canadian government travel bureau hopefully projects for the centennial year—one must assume that the average visitor to Ontario was able to limit his expenditures, taking 60 per cent of entries as coming to this province—I believe these are the statistics—to less than \$1 per day. These are, of course, absurdities; and I feel that the 22.8 million figure that the hon. Minister has solemnly announced is also an absurdity.

The truth is that less than 11 million U.S. visitors came to all of Canada last year and I think that the hon. Minister is quite aware of this. What the hon. Minister is doing is taking the DBS statistics on border crossings, which are very different from tourist entries, although they include them, and is distorting them to show how successful his tourist promotion must be. These border-crossing figures count every crossing for any purpose and for any duration of time. A single person working one side of the border and living on the other—as many do—will add some 300 units to the figure every year.

Let us take an equally specific look at how the rest of the world's travel business is doing in comparison to Ontario's increase—and I did make mention of this last evening. In a single year, the world increase—and these are based on statistics I have received from a large travel organization in New York—in a single year the world increase in tourist movement was 13 per cent, and U.S. travel to Europe increased by nine per cent; the Bahamas showed an increase in 1964 of 10.7 per cent; and the hon. Minister concludes that in 1965 we had, roughly, a six per cent growth here in Ontario.

If the hon. Minister concludes that there is no use in trying to compete with the giants of

the travel world, let us remind him of reports that there were some 500,000 families in the United States, with incomes of \$15,000 a year or more, who took no trip of any kind in 1965. Is it really too much to ask that the most prosperous province in Canada, with a wealth of tourist facilities and natural attractions, fulfil its responsibilities to the tourist industry to which it pays so much lip service?

Earlier I mentioned the regional tourist councils, and reorganization was hinted as likely to occur—I believe that will occur this coming session. What the hon. Minister has not revealed is that the present system of regional councils was an administrative blunder, since they were set up in such a way that meaningful travel statistics could not be obtained from them—although that was one of their principal reasons for being. When the councils have been reduced from 32 to a much smaller number, with realistic boundaries in relation to the travel movement, and adequate financing, then perhaps they will work as intended.

The hon. Minister has reported that the annual tour of visiting U.S. editors cost the province about \$10,000, plus the cost of much hospitality from private and municipal organizations. Each time this tour occurs—and I believe it has been an annual event for more than a dozen years—the department seeks to imply that this is a massively rewarding exercise in publicity promotion. I should like to challenge the hon. Minister to tell this House how much actual readership is represented in the combined circulations of all the publications whose editors came to Ontario for the tour in 1965. I would dare guess that the readership would not be any greater than that of one Ontario paper, the *London Free Press*.

These visitors are not primarily travel writers; their stories and editorials must give the hon. Minister an impressive group of clippings from publications in a number of states—this I will concede—but would the hon. Minister, for the first time in the history of these tours, tell us the circulations of the papers represented, and their totals? Would the hon. Minister also tell us what his department does to provide the thousands more grass roots weekly newspapers in the United States, which can be receptive media for print and photographic publicity, with information on Ontario's travel attractions?

We should like to know also what specific efforts are made to include leading travel writers of the stature of Horace Sudden and Richard Joseph, whose columns are read by millions, to visit Ontario. I read in the annual

report that some efforts are being made to attract a great many travel writers this coming year.

It is obvious that it costs the same to provide travel and hospitality for one person whether his readership represents a few hundred or several million prospective visitors. The editors tour each year requires considerable planning, much staff, and expenditure from both public and private funds. It is circulation in readership, not clippings alone, that count in travel communications. Let us have this information, after so many years of investment in these annual tours.

The hon. Minister, as mentioned before, has a habit of being casual, or even careless with his tourist figures, I feel, especially the ones that really matter. To add a postscript and reminder to my earlier remarks about Ontario travel advertising, the hon. Minister manages to spend less than the Netherlands and much less than India, in the same market that is our greatest source of tourist income. In the debate on this subject nearly a year ago, in March of 1965, the hon. Minister said, and I quote:

I think there is tremendous potential and we have not done much more than scratch it.

Surely, in some 20 years of tourist promotion activity, underwritten by fairly generous public funds, The Department of Tourism and Information, under its new name and its former one, should have been able to do more than scratch the potential? Pretty expensive scratching, the taxpayers and the tourist operators of this province are entitled to think. What will this budget be when the hon. Minister's people really get down to work? Since the increase in salaries and salary expenses requested by the hon. Minister in his estimates for the year ahead amount to substantially more than his usual advertising outlay in the United States market, we can expect the department to be remarkably successful in possibly furthering the expense account travel among its own army of employees. If only we were equally competent in persuading travellers to visit the province.

The hon. Minister is accustomed to say in his many public utterances how much he welcomes new and imaginative ideas to promote further travel in Ontario. I would suggest that one way would be to enlist the travel agent, long devoted to selling international air and steamship tours—which have benefited our competitors abroad, but contributed little to Canadian or Ontario travel

—to marketing intercity package tours by private automobile in the province of Ontario. Hotel or motel accommodation, meals and all other facets would be included, in order to reach the millions more tourists who might come here, but are unfamiliar with our hospitality resources.

Perhaps I should explain to this House that the same proposal was made by a worldwide travel organization to the hon. Minister's department several years ago. It was rejected, on the grounds that the province could not provide the sum of \$3,000 to assist in printing the necessary informational brochures for distribution to travel agents who would market the tours to the travel customers. "Too much money," was the comment by the then Deputy Minister. And a travel project that might have been truly rewarding to this province and to its hotel and motel operators, never got off the ground.

Since such intercity automobile trips have been successfully packaged and sold in Switzerland for over 30 years, this cannot be said to be a truly new idea, but it was new to North America. The hon. Minister's department would have none of it however, and no attempt was made to investigate its possibilities.

Scratching the potential? Ontario is not scratching very hard.

A few comparative statistics on three areas of the state of Vermont, who have done a very excellent recreation study: I would just draw these to the attention of the House. Since World War II, overnight accommodation in Vermont has increased by 113 per cent. The greatest increase in towns where recreation is important. Now in Ontario, the greatest increase has been in the Kitchener tourist region, the Windsor one into Bruce peninsula. Not really in our true resort regions.

In Vermont, 43 per cent of their recreational business studied in Vermont were planning to expand within the next five years. I do not feel we have such information in our development branch and they should get this information to co-ordinate our planning and advertising.

The northeastern United States has 25 per cent of the total population of the United States, but it has only six per cent of the total land and water area, and only four per cent of the total recreational acreage. Ontario with all its resources, should capitalize on this fact.

I would now like to switch to the centenary and make a few remarks in this regard.

Through lack of imagination and lack of co-ordination between departments—same old story—Ontario is missing, in fact has missed, a magnificent opportunity to relate the centennial celebration of our nation's birth with the potential of the tourist industry in Ontario.

The centennial is, in one sense, a private kind of Canadian celebration, but even though we are undoubtedly most interested in congratulating ourselves that we have survived for 100 years, nevertheless it must be recognized that 1967 is a year which can produce a bonanza for tourism in Canada.

We could, and Expo '67 will, attract literally millions of Americans and even overseas visitors to our heartland of Ontario and Quebec. These visitors inevitably will spend very substantial sums of money during their travels in Canada.

Now the Ontario economic council's report on Ontario's tourist industry makes it perfectly plain that we are not doing as well by our tourists as we should. In certain respects it is true, our performance is improving. The hon. Minister is spending a great deal more public money than he used to, to encourage people to visit Ontario. Whether he is spending it wisely or not, this is what we are debating.

It is true as well that certain tentative efforts are being made timidly to encourage people to smile at tourists, resist the temptation to cheat them, and learn to feed and accommodate them distinctively and pleasantly, and possibly to treat them royally.

But as the economic council's report makes perfectly clear, we are not doing enough to develop special attractions in this province. We are blessed with what is probably the widest range of climate topography of any comparable political area in the world. Our climate ranges from almost sub-tropical at Pelee Island and Point Pelee, in the great riding of Essex South, to the Arctic, up at Moose Factory. We have more and more greatly varied inland waterways than any other territory in the world. We have a burgeoning metropolis, sleepy towns, and even the nation's capital within our borders.

We have farmlands that are as peaceful and as quiet as the Home Counties in England, and we have still wilderness areas that are as bare of human habitation as any place on earth.

Nature has given us everything we need to provide a paradise for vacationers of every taste. But we have done precious little to develop the potential that is here. Private initiative has done a great deal in its inevit-

able helter-skelter way. Ontario has more summer cottages than all the rest of Canada put together and private developers are rapidly demonstrating the potential of our ski resort areas, to just give two examples.

But there is little evidence in any of these of any sense of real planning, of any sense of orderly and effective development, and I do hope that this will come. Because, as the economic council report points out, tourism is a vastly diversified industry. Such overall planning must inevitably come directly from government, or at least from government-sponsored bodies.

It is poor marketing, I would remind the hon. Minister, to attempt to sell a product that has not even been designed. It is a very tough job. It is inefficient, I believe, to attempt to promote tourism in Ontario and very little is being done to encourage the development of tourist facilities and attractions. And I hope in this session that such encouragement will be forthcoming.

But this is just what this department is trying to do. It has had no plan of action, it has provided no real guidelines for the tourist industry, it has done abominably little to attempt to upgrade the facilities available for visitors to Ontario.

The emphasis, as far as I can see, is almost totally on the propaganda function of the department. Tourism takes second place to information. It does not appear to be recognized by this department that a pleased and satisfied visitor is a better advertisement for our province than is a four-colour ad in the *New Yorker* magazine. Nor, according to the economic council report, has it occurred to the department that government publicity can be tied in with specific and concret attractions.

I must digress for a moment to say that I would exempt The Department of Lands and Forests from most of these criticisms. Ontario's park development is, I think, one of the few real achievements in which this tired government can justifiably be proud. True the economic council report points out that our parks are being run uneconomically, nevertheless they are fine parks and we should be proud of them.

The contrast with Tourism and Information is very noticeable.

Rather than encourage tourism, it often seems as though this government is determined to destroy the industry. Now, not all the blame can be laid at the feet of the hon. Minister directly. It is not totally his fault that the livelihood of independent operators is destroyed when new highways are put

through and food and service concessions are given to the giant oil companies. It is not totally his fault that pollution and contamination of our waterways frightens away potential visitors. It is not totally his fault that the food and service provided by private tourist operators are often below any reasonable modern standards.

But he and his department do have the responsibility of speaking out about these matters. They do have the right, for example, to urge a modernization of The Innkeepers Act—and I am glad to see that this is now on the statutes, now that stables for visitors' horses and so on are less important than they were a century ago. Clean washrooms and good food are relatively more important.

They also have a right to make representations to The Department of Highways with a view to ensure that highway planning takes into consideration the needs and the potential of tourism. They also have the right to point out in no uncertain terms what pollution can do to our image as a land of water sports.

But let me return to my major theme of missed opportunity. I believe that the centenary has been bungled by this government, I believe that the government has failed totally to provide any significant leadership to local communities in the implementation of the centennial grants programme. And I would just compare this to the province of Quebec in their fine publication showing diagrams of all their major undertakings.

I believe that the government has thereby deprived the citizens of this province of a golden opportunity, not only to significantly increase the province's attractiveness as a tourist designation, but also to significantly improve the quality of life for all of us who live in the province.

We have had enough experience in the last decade or two to know the kind of places people will visit. We know that the Stratford festival brings visitors in the tens of thousands, we know that Upper Canada village does the same, we know that Ste. Marie-among-the-Hurons will perform the same function, we even know that racetracks, such as our new Windsor raceway, brings in countless visitors and the much-needed U.S. dollars. These are things we know. There is no conjecture here. Visitors can be counted, the jobs they create measured, their contribution to our provincial economy and our country's balance of payments computed.

Now, knowing these things it would seem obvious to me that an effective, an imaginative Department of Tourism might somewhere have suggested that projects under the

centennial grants programme might conceivably have been related to our urgent need for more and better tourist facilities and attractions.

Let me say just in passing that Ontario's own citizens are tourists within our borders as well. If we forget this fact then it might be argued as suggesting we spent our centennial money to make Americans happy. This is not the case at all. When I speak of tourism, I am speaking of all travellers within our boundaries. It is, I think, more important for Canadian youngsters to have access to places like Upper Canada village than for visiting Americans.

To continue, a large number of Ontario municipalities would have welcomed suggestions from Queen's Park on suitable projects under the centennial grants programme. I know they did send out a check list of reasonable things that could be done. They would, I am convinced, have listened attentively and even enthusiastically to suggestions from The Department of Tourism and Information about ways in which centennial funds could be spent, not only to make the community more attractive to the local residents, Mr. Chairman, but also more attractive to visitors.

They were looking, in other words, for a little leadership, a little imagination, from the provincial government. But did they get it? I say no. The evidence is there for all of us to see in the lists of grants for projects released by The Department of Municipal Affairs. And there is one thing I object to in the press releases concerning these, the headline often reads such-and-such a municipality "wins a grant for such-and-such a project." They are entitled to these grants, they do not have to win them.

A great many of our communities, all in fact who are participating in this programme, have come up with projects which will make them better places to live in.

But how dull so many of them are, a fire-hall, a works garage, a burial vault or chapel, a clock in the town hall, a myriad of additions to the town hall or township buildings, an avalanche of artificial ice plans for the community. All very nice, Mr. Chairman, but they really do not help the tourist industry as such.

There are, of course, significant exceptions and I hope there will be many more. Hamilton has restored Dundurn castle. Iroquois is restoring an historical house into an historical museum. Chapeau is creating a museum and information centre. Other communities are doing comparable things, under-

taking projects which will interest visitors and enrich the knowledge and community pride of local citizens. But unfortunately the exceptions stand out among the artificial ice plants and construction of cement walls.

Our centenary should be an occasion for us and for our visitors to appreciate the depth and drama of the history that lies behind us. It should be an occasion for us to create buildings, parks, exhibits and facilities which will tie Canada's first century to its second, which will make this province a better place to live and a better place to visit.

I would now like to speak briefly concerning a problem confronting our water-borne tourists which I believe accounts for the second largest travelling group of tourists entering our province.

I am aware that The Department of Lands and Forests has compiled a directory of facilities and lack of facilities in our province. In the field of boating, we have the greatest potential in the world, with more lakes and rivers, interesting canal systems—all combined with rugged beauty, reasonably good fishing and mostly crystal-clear waters, but as yet we have not begun to tap this resource.

I might first begin with our Great Lakes system and this is possibly where we have fallen down the worst. We do have many federal harbours that are mainly concerned with commerce but with very little emphasis on recreation and the needs of the small boater. Other jurisdictions have created harbours of refuge every 20 to 30 miles along their coastline. In fact, it was reported just in the last edition of the regional development folder, the following:

A chain of small craft emergency ports were built every 15 miles on the coast of our Great Lakes in Wisconsin, to make small craft boat operations a safer, more popular and larger part of the recreational economy. Financing suggested is three quarters of one per cent of state motor fuel tax receipts.

This past August, Prime Minister Pearson announced that the federal government was prepared to invest substantial sums on the provision of facilities for pleasure craft where there are economic qualifications, and a firm commitment from local interests to build shore facilities.

In my own area, there are now several proposed sites being studied and applications have gone into Ottawa to take advantage of this legislation. The economic council

report, on page 71 states the following and I quote:

It may well be that the provincial government will nonetheless in the not-too-distant future have to assume a large measure of marine development and enforcement responsibilities and presumably at that time assume at least a substantial part of the four cents per gallon in tax revenue which currently goes to the federal Treasury.

I would ask the hon. Minister and hope that he will answer this question later in his remarks; has this government approached Ottawa in this regard of assisting in the development of marinas or harbours of refuge in our Great Lakes and other waterways?

Has this hon. Minister approached the Ontario Treasury, asking that a portion of our gasoline tax be appropriated for the construction of harbours, small docks and launching sites?

I know that the hon. Minister is a keen yachtsman, and no doubt he himself would appreciate more and better facilities. The state of Vermont appropriates a portion of the revenue derived from the sale of fishing licences for the development of launching ramps and small docks, for the benefit of visitors who bring in their boats by trailer. Possibly such further aid of this kind could be developed by the hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Roberts); I suggested this yesterday at a committee meeting.

The largest concentration in the world of pleasure craft, or second largest, exists along the borders of the Great Lakes, but we offer very few facilities in Ontario—facilities that are too infrequent for safety, facilities that are not adequate to attract the great numbers of tourists who are floating right on our doorstep. Let us build "welcome mat" harbours along the Great Lakes shoreline and encourage these floaters to not only visit these ports but to tour our inland water systems.

Possibly boating, as such, should be part of an overall transportation plan for our province, to include both facets of accommodation and shoreline use. Boating has become one of the fastest growing recreation uses; and in the Cleveland to Port Huron area, in the United States, there are over 500,000 small craft capable of visiting our province.

These are mainly affluent people, who could be well above the average spenders as tourists. From this economic viewpoint alone, our shoreline from Sarnia around to Rondeau provincial park is possibly the most econo-

mically suited to take immediate benefit from the creation of more and better marine facilities. I would hope that the studies initiated in this province are now far enough advanced so that concrete proposals and action can be taken by this government in this neglected sector of our tourist industry.

I would like to pass a few comments in relation to historic sites. During these departmental estimates of the past two years, and on numerous occasions through questions in the House, I have pressed for an operative programme for our many historic sites. I have asked that funds be made available for responsible organizations to acquire and operate these historic sites, as living and interpretive museums. I have been supported by many hon. members from all parties of this House, and I believe the hon. Minister may initiate legislation to assist in this. But I would point out to this House, Mr. Chairman, the second most important reason for tourists coming into our province is to see, study and enjoy our historical heritage.

Emphasis and development on this sector of our tourist industry could be a big advantage in extending our tourist season, well before and well beyond the two holiday months. The economic report on page 37 says there has been no overall, provincially financed pattern of development for our historical resources; and, further, it may well be that we have now reached a level in public appreciation of this problem so that the province would at least be justified in introducing legislation comparable to The Parks Assistance Act to provide for, say, up to \$25,000 in matching grants toward the capital cost of historic restorations and developments.

I think the new bill hints at this, and I hope it fulfills this request. Further, on page 78 of the economic council report, the following statement is made, and I quote:

Such investments of tax funds in historical reconstruction can over a period of years become self-supporting if they are economically engineered imaginatively merchandised and if—

and this is vital:

—they are used to sell each other to the mobile tourist trade.

To follow on the same theme, farther on this page, under a picture of the hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Robarts) and the hon. Minister of Tourism and Information at a historic site—and I did look very closely at this picture to make sure it was not one of our 1963

election photos with the caption "Done" under it—the following paragraph appears:

It would appear for example that the time has come for the establishment of an Ontario historical or heritage trust in which private and public funds might be enjoined to save at least some of the physical evidences of our historical heritage, and the government departments themselves might seek out, as is done in older jurisdictions, the possibility of locating offices in historic structures which otherwise would be allowed to go into disrepair. Mortgage funds of the Ontario housing corporation, or central mortgage corporation, might be used for such a purpose and an economic return gained.

At the beginning of my remarks I stated that this government had failed the tourist industry of this province in this area of historic preservation and in offering an operative programme. This government stands indicted; it has failed the people of our own province; it has failed to provide an atmosphere of historic importance in our province, in which our children can be taught our history and enjoy it and, at the same time, be instilled with a pride in our historic past.

I understand that the Ontario chamber of commerce has presented resolutions on this theme for many years and, currently, the tourist committee of this body is studying this particular problem with a view to making recommendations for action on major sites in our province. I would like to read into our records, and draw to the attention of this House, the specific recommendations of the Ontario chamber of commerce in this regard—and with which I wholeheartedly agree. I do hope that new bill concerning this, in its broad interpretation, will allow for this type of action. I quote from the Ontario chamber's policy statement:

An increasing number of Ontario communities are developing a proper appreciation of the potential value of historic sites and historical themes in relation to our important tourist industry. This growing awareness has been heightened by the approach to Canada's centenary and associated programmes and publicity. However, this increased knowledge will be unproductive unless translated into restoration and celebration programmes which are solidly based on accurate historic research and expert guidance.

Such expert knowledge and guidance is not always readily available to communities wishing to restore or promote

historic sites or to organize special festivals and pageants of historic significance. Therefore there is a need for central co-ordination of such programmes, and an added need for the provision of expert knowledge and assistance wherever required.

Recommended, that The Department of Tourism and Information be empowered to acquire, develop and operate historic sites and structures, co-operate with other governmental agents in such actions, co-operate with private persons, corporations and organizations in such undertakings; furnish expert consultant service without charge in the restoration of historic homes buildings and sites to the owners of such structures or sites, on the understanding that buildings to be so restored for historic considerations be designated as a prerequisite for aid by the historic sites board, and I trust that the survey in this regard has gone far enough in order to enable you to do this. And finally, that buildings to be so restored by reason of architectural significance to be first certified by this same architectural board and to make available to Ontario communities the services of experts in the planning and performance of special festivals and historic pageants.

I would call upon this government to take some specific action in this regard in order that we can have our centennial year as a base for launching an integrated, co-ordinated and operative historical programme for our province.

My final remarks deal with the St. Lawrence parks commission and I have several questions here that I would ask of the hon. Minister.

In *Hansard* of February 26, 1964, at page 973, the chairman of the St. Lawrence parks commission made the following statement to this House, and I quote:

I was keenly disappointed to find a substantial reduction in our budget for 1964. Eventually our parks, which are government built, owned and operated, will be a revenue producer. We will be called upon this year to run a project, still only 75 per cent completed, with a sum inadequate even to cover operating expenses much less provide a reserve to complete the job. In 1963 we were unable to meet the demand for campsites. More of these should be readied at once.

Now to date, according to figures I have received, this government has spent many millions of dollars on the development of this area of the St. Lawrence parks commission.

I would ask the hon. Minister how soon he expects the completion of major capital expenditures in this commission and how soon he expects the commission to break even in its operation and carry itself?

This past year, I understand, the commission had a revenue of slightly over \$1 million, an increase of \$180,000 from last year, but at the same time suffered a net loss of approximately \$250,000, and according to the *Globe and Mail* this morning, there was a decline in the number of people patronizing the parks, because of the poor weather.

It was reported at the recent meeting on commissions, that the commission has a permanent staff of 130 personnel, which increases to 500 in the summer holiday period. Would the hon. Minister give us a breakdown of the classification of this permanent staff of 130 persons?

I understand further, that during these winter months when the operation is closed, many of these men, including supervisory personnel, are kept busy merely cutting wood for next season's operation. Can the commission not consider some type of winter operation that would utilize this large staff to better advantage? Apparently the commission, in its many parks, which are operated for only five months and Upper Canada village which is operated for the same length of time, seems to be burdened with the staff that they have to carry for seven extra months. It would seem to me that there should be some attempt to lengthen the season in the village and in these parks.

I was very distressed when the commission reported that the centennial project would merely be a barn-raising over a protracted length of time. Surely the commission could do better than this. Here is a prime opportunity to capitalize on the many millions of people going to Expo at Montreal, only a few hours drive from the village and parks. Surely the commission has plans for enlarging its accommodation for trailers, for tenters and for persons who want deluxe accommodation in this area. Surely here is a chance for a series of pageants, of special events, denoting the history of our province, a series of lectures as was suggested by the hon. member for Sudbury (Mr. Sopha). Let us take another look at our projected accommodation needs in this area; take another look and see what sort of programmes we can devise to capitalize on Expo, and pyramid the St. Lawrence parks commission into a money-making and self-sufficient operation. Let us not just settle for a mere barn-raising!

There are several questions of the hon. Minister that I would like to ask in this same

area. Since Upper Canada village authentically denotes life in this area of Ontario some 100 years ago, I would ask the hon. Minister in the historical research for this area: Was this a dry area in our province at that time? If not, I would suggest that to complete the authenticity of this village, a special licence be granted by the LCBO. I would ask the hon. Minister if it is true that there is special accommodation right at the village for MLAs and friends of the commission at no monetary charge; I would ask the hon. Minister if the commission is not interested in acquiring more historic sites to be moved to the village and that if this is true, is the commission giving any consideration to preserving these buildings with a view to collecting them and setting up another operative programme in the area? What is the intention of the commission regarding the two sites that have been acquired within the city limits of Kingston?

I am sure that hon. members are pleased with the success of the operation of Old Fort Henry. At the recent commission meeting, the director, Major Brett, reported that at the present time he and his assistants were out picking the Fort Henry guards from among the finest young Canadians enrolled in our universities. I would ask the hon. Minister if these men are chosen without any reference to race, creed or colour—and I trust that this is so—and if so, could the hon. Minister assure this House that this policy has been in effect and will continue to be in effect?

I see that there are plans to recruit a second set of Fort Henry guards; I think that this is very good and I would ask if they will be available to take part in the many centennial celebrations throughout our province?

Further, I understand that there is some dissatisfaction with the St. Lawrence parks commission in the city of Kingston, in that many residents do not feel that this city is adequately represented on the commission, and I also understand that in spite of the untiring efforts of the Quinte historic sites and parkway association, that this commission is not recommending the development of the Quinte parkway. I spoke on this during the estimates of The Department of Highways and I shall delete any further remarks in this regard, but I do hope that the commissioner from the Niagara parks commission can relate to this House the stand of the commission in this regard.

Finally, to sum up, in my initial remarks I mentioned that this government has failed to develop a provincial image; it has failed to keep pace with other jurisdictions; it has

failed to save our history and utilize it properly; it has failed to stimulate our tourist industry, and I trust that the criticisms and suggestions that I have made and offered and those that will be given, will assist this most vital industry in our provincial economy.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear!

Mr. N. Davison (Hamilton East): The study of Ontario's tourist industry, published by the tourist industry committee of the Ontario economic council in December, 1965, points out that:

Rising educational levels and growing urbanization coupled with technological change are the three prime economic and social factors which will influence tourist trends in the quarter century ahead.

It was stated in the study that the higher education standards now attained have resulted in the intellectual stimulation of the individual. Today's affluent society has made travel possible for ever-increasing numbers to indulge the curiosity aroused by our higher educational achievements.

The study concluded that:

Attractions geared to historical or cultural themes are thus of growing importance in tourist development. Canadians and Americans go in growing numbers to visit such historical sites as Williamsburg and Upper Canada village.

Interest in the ways of our forefathers is very high because not only do we have our Upper Canada village, but right here in Metro Toronto there is a pioneer village at Jane street and Steeles avenue which provides a peek into the past and ideal picnic facilities as well. A similar page of history is being unfolded near the village of Rockton and probably in many other places across Ontario.

Hamilton's Sound and Light, shown in the summer evenings at Dundurn Castle, reveals the life of its early occupants and Hamilton will restore that fine historical building as its centennial programme. The Stratford festival was cited as a cultural interest that would not have been successful 20 years ago.

As the result of technological change and/or automation, the worker of tomorrow will have ever-increasing leisure time and there is no doubt in my mind that people will use a great deal of this new leisure to travel and satisfy at first hand their curiosity about the rest of this country, this continent and this world.

In 1966, The Department of Lands and Forests published a booklet prepared by the

forestry study unit on the "Multiple use of forest and related lands." Among many other interesting facts contained in the booklet, was one which would, I imagine, have a direct bearing on the tourist industry. In 1901, only 27 per cent of Ontario's population lived in cities, towns and villages of 5,000 or more. Sixty years later, in 1961, the trend toward urbanization had completely reversed this situation and only 27 per cent lived outside these cities, towns and villages. In Ontario, the booklet says: "It is estimated that 73 per cent of our citizens already live on less than one per cent of our land area."

This metropolitan way of life will lead to increased tourism with, I would think, emphasis on the back-to-nature type of vacation, such as the individual summer cottage, the summer resorts and the winter sports resorts, as well as on cultural and historical events and sites. Tourism has grown and expanded until it has become the largest single element of international trade. In recent years, receipts from the foreign visitor to Canada have been rising twice as fast as our merchandise exports. Tourism is paying a fairly high share of the cost of our high standard of living in this country and of our municipal, provincial and federal taxes. Our provincial Treasury receives in taxes from foreign tourist expenditures alone well over 20 times its total tax-financed investment in travel promotion.

All this gives us a comfortable feeling of well-being and all would seem to be well in our tourist industry. Actually, Canada has been losing ground as an area for U.S. tourist travel. In 1961 residents of the U.S. spent more than \$2.5 billion in countries around the world of which \$440 million was spent in Canada. If we had maintained the same relative position in 1961 as we enjoyed in 1952 total receipts from American expenditures in Canada would have been in the neighbourhood of \$800 million, or \$360 million more than we actually received.

It is estimated that the jobs of over 300,000 Ontario residents arise out of tourism and therefore we must not underestimate the importance of the tourist industry to our employment picture. Each net addition of \$2,100 per year in direct foreign tourist expenditures is said to create a new year-round job in Ontario. More than likely this job would be in what we term the service industries. Lately it is the service industries that have provided the main source of new employment of our growing labour force and it would seem to be the area of the greatest employment opportunities for those

newly entering the labour force. Last December, Dr. W. R. Dymond, federal assistant Deputy Minister of Labour, spoke to a seminar of the technical and vocational training branch of The Department of Labour in Ottawa. He said that during each cycle of economic activity there had been a considerable shifting of employment between industries. A long-run change was a notable shift of labour away from the goods-producing industries to the service industries.

Reference to DBS employment figures indicates that, while total Ontario employment increased by 4.6 per cent from September 1964 to 1965, the service industry enjoyed a 9.5 per cent increase in that period while employment in manufacturing industries increased by only 3.9 per cent. That is to say there was a 5 per cent employment increase in the service industries and a decrease of .7 per cent in manufacturing industries as compared to the average gain in employment in Ontario. While it is reassuring to note that the slackening in employment in the manufacturing industry is more than met by the increased employment in the service industries, it does have its undesirable aspect.

Although Dr. W. R. Dymond points out that many of the job openings in the service industries required a fairly high level of education, sometimes salaries and wages were low, while on the other hand, those displaced from the manufacturing industries often had less education but were used to higher wages and their experience might be of little value in the service industry. An examination of the average weekly wages and salaries in the two industries confirms his remarks. As at September 1965, the average weekly wage in manufacturing was \$94.75 and in the service industries only \$65.55. These are Canadian figures; I do not have the Ontario figures but the comparison would be similar. So that the undesirable aspect of this change in the employment pattern is that we have this rather large shift in employment to an area paying about one-third less in wages. This puts a cloud over the economic picture in Ontario that will not be lifted until a higher level of wages is gained in the service industries. Even so; it becomes obvious that it is desirable that we realize the maximum potential of tourist trade and I do not think we are.

Ontario seems to have become the gateway to Canada for the American tourist, perhaps because it lies next to one of the more heavily populated areas of the United States.

Gateway is a good term to use because it implies further travel and it would seem that this further travel is taking place—right out of the province. While millions of American tourists enter Ontario, they do not stay long.

In 1963, 58 per cent of auto-borne U.S. tourists spent one day or less in Ontario. A further 24 per cent were here for two days and only 4.4 per cent stayed more than a week. Less than 250,000 American cars stayed in Ontario in 1963 for more than one week.

Now then, how will we interest the American tourist in spending more time in Ontario? For one thing, it would no doubt be necessary to spend more money on promotion. Only two provinces—Alberta and Saskatchewan—in Canada spend less than Ontario on tourist promotion and, although Ontario's share of U.S. travel expenditures in Canada rose from 50 per cent in 1957 to 56 per cent in 1961, it would appear that Ontario could realize still greater returns.

Perhaps it might be advisable to beam our promotions to groups or individuals not now being reached, such as:

Greater emphasis on specific appeals to women.

Organization of student group tours would be a sound economic target and teachers, as a category, could be more specifically approached.

Journals read by business and professional people and by skilled personnel in the production, technical and sales fields may offer a useful medium for promotion.

Publications of labour unions.

Inducements to lengthen the American tourist stay in Ontario must be found. Perhaps these five suggested improvements could be considered:

1. Promotion for the cottager, who is a taxpayer for us and yet demands nothing in the way of services in return and promotion of foreign ownership of vacation home sites.

2. Scarcity of tourist establishments of the resort hotel types only breeds further scarcity.

To encourage the further development of resort areas, there should be some measure of assistance in the form of tax concessions, and so on, through the construction via public funds of ancillary attractions of a nature designed to draw extra patronage, or through a greater provincial emphasis on natural or historical attractions which will feed patrons to such resorts and hotels.

Also an expansion of hunting and fishing resorts capable of developing international patronage provided government policy ensures to certain areas sufficient continuing supplies of fish and game.

3. Lack of scheduled airline facilities in most of our major resort areas has made this type of tourist trade less available to more remote districts. The benefit of trade shows is also sometimes overlooked. Despite the absence of major first class physical facilities for such, Toronto in 1964 attracted over 25 such shows with an investment of close to \$40 million. This volume could be increased by half.

To encourage the hotels and resorts of Ontario to increase their marketing research and sales promotion and to upgrade their standards of convention accommodation should be prime objectives of all departments of government, federal and provincial.

These resorts and hotels can be a major source of increased "export" sales, in terms of import dollars. We should do everything we can to lengthen their season of economic operation, to assist them in selling their wares and to formulate our tax, liquor and related policies to encourage the attainment of adequate international standards.

4. The multi-faceted tourist industry—for example the "rock hounds"—geologists—goose hunters, hikers, antique hunters, visitors to religious or historical shrines, pleasure craft owners, golfers, campers, trailer-campers, trailer-boaters, skiers, and so on—is particularly valuable to us since these groups are not restricted to the summer months only.

These areas have not been too thoroughly tapped to date. Merchandising in this market, both public and private, has suffered from both a lack of local research and a lack of sufficiently pointed advertising.

This market would respond excellently to direct mail and specialized media. We must produce leaflets pointed in depth to specific themes. For example, The Department of Mines and The Department of Tourism and Information should co-operate in a special publication for "rock hounds."

Certainly we can and should be doing more about selling the literally tens of thousands of pleasure craft owners in the Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit areas on cruising our waterways.

5. Each activity of government which could be put on view as a sightseeing attraction should be so promoted. This might well include fish hatcheries, seed extraction stations, arboreta in reforestation areas, displays

of native animals and birds, perhaps even organized tours of experimental farms and agricultural colleges.

In addition, it has been recommended in almost every public hearing that a major educational programme on the significance of tourism in our provincial economy should be undertaken jointly by public and private agencies at all levels from the school up. This is an industry in which we are all shareholders, all salesmen, all involved in the production lines.

These were all recommendations included in the study of Ontario's tourist industry and I have brought them to the attention of the hon. members today to underline their value.

But there is another inducement that is lacking. We are very shy people. It almost seems we bend over backward to hide any points of interest that might tend to induce the tourist to linger and, while lingering, to provide financial benefit to Ontario citizens.

As I said before, Ontario has become a gateway to other parts of Canada. Large portions of our budgets are allocated to building highways designed to speed the motorist right through and out of our province. We carefully skirt our cities in the interest of promoting rapid through traffic. There is nothing, except the necessities of life and reaching his destination, to cause the tourist to leave our good highways. While our neighbours to the south have these same superhighways, they have no reluctance whatever in promoting stopovers.

First of all, I must compare our method of providing needed services on our multi-lane highways with the American freeways. Perhaps this might better be raised under Highways estimates and yet it has a direct bearing on this Department of Tourism and Information.

Every 50 miles on the American freeway, you are advised well in advance of the coming service area. When you arrive, you find a service station on either side of the highway to serve the motorist travelling in either direction. A building is constructed over the highway in bridge fashion which houses a restaurant, personal comfort facilities, and tourist information, and souvenirs are displayed and sold.

These buildings are of a common design and would appear to be government constructed. The food is good and reasonable in price and again the common standards would indicate some type of government supervision, all of which is sadly lacking in Ontario's approach.

We have, I suppose by accident of planning, developed a hit-or-miss approach to this type of tourist service. Some of the restaurants serving our superhighways are good and some quite the opposite, some are reasonable in price, some quite expensive, notably the 1867 restaurants. When the restaurants are expensive, they should provide a lunch counter service at lower rates so that the traveller is not forced into unplanned expenses.

Many people travel on a daily food budget and when they enter such a place they must either upset their budget or be placed in the embarrassing position of finding they cannot afford the service and leaving, which does not create a good impression in their mind of Ontario.

Quick service is essential and some of our highway restaurants are lacking in this quality, which is annoying to the tourist.

I am not suggesting that we go into the restaurant business but I do suggest most urgently that we do follow this American approach; that we build these service centres as part of our highway construction and that they be leased to individuals and firms prepared to meet certain standards developed by this government and that we employ inspectors to see that these standards are adhered to.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, our places and events of interest are not publicized. Hamilton is very upset because it was omitted from the federal publication "Invitation to Canada" and quite rightly so. However, I think Hamilton's points of interest, as well as those of other places, should be publicized right along our highways so that the motorist is aware of the diversions available in the particular area where he is driving, not just as he enters Ontario.

If you are handed a booklet at a tourist information centre it is of interest, but it would be additionally effective to publicize area attractions by easy-to-read highway signs. These signs should be tastefully executed and should not be of the garish type that spoil the beauty of the countryside—we have far too many of these now.

If I may use Hamilton as an example, because that is the area with which I am most familiar, we have, as I mentioned earlier, an event at Dundurn castle called Sound and Light. As far as I know, and I think I am right, this is the only event of its kind on the North American continent.

The castle itself, together with the early battle history of the area, is noteworthy. Even

the cemetery that is located across from it has historical significance because there is still evidence of the defensive earthworks that were created in the War of 1812. And of course there is the Stoney Creek monument that commemorates that battle of the War of 1812 which would be of interest to Americans since time has healed the differences that existed between our two countries at that time.

Our Royal botanical gardens are show-places, particularly the rock gardens, but the average tourist would not know about them.

Rochester's lilac gardens are well known here—special tours are arranged—but I wonder how many people in Rochester know about our gardens? Every spring our Royal botanical gardens conduct a maple syrup exhibit. This year the exhibit will be in operation during the last three weekends of March.

Well, there are many other attractions in Hamilton. We are not just the Canadian Pittsburgh and we will soon have others, a new planetarium and of course the football hall of fame and so on.

It is these types of interesting events and sites that will lure the tourist into spending additional time in Ontario. It is something to do and see that is different from his native land and home town.

It is true that this type of advertising is not the sole responsibility of this government. But it is our responsibility to elicit from the municipalities the points and items of interest to tourists in their area and then to develop an overall government programme and to urge the municipalities to co-operate.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that their co-operation is a foregone conclusion because they all want a share of the tourist dollar that is presently whizzing past on our superhighways.

Hon. J. A. C. Auld (Minister of Tourism and Information): Mr. Chairman, I think if it would be your agreement and the agreement of the hon. members who have spoken, I would prefer to answer the specific questions which they raise when we come to the votes that relate to them, so that we can keep in order.

I might make one or two general comments. Frankly, of course, I would find it very hard, Mr. Chairman, to agree with my hon. friend from Essex South that the department has failed. I think actually that our department is doing as good a job, if not a better job, than any comparable jurisdiction and I think that the results we have had thus far would substantiate this.

I was very interested in his comment about the theme that we might use for our provincial promotion, the royal theme, and I would just like to ask him, perhaps rhetorically, whether he has discussed this with the hon. member for Sudbury and the hon. member for Parkdale (Mr. Trotter) and perhaps the hon. member for Bracondale (Mr. Ben), who might perhaps be able to give us some further suggestions in this connection.

Mr. Paterson: I think this topic was well caucused and I did not go quite as far as suggesting that Tory blue become royal blue. I could not bring myself to that position.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, that is an interesting suggestion, we will certainly study that one. Just in the matter of promotion, seriously, Mr. Chairman, there are many agencies at work in this field. I think that the Canadian government travel bureau is doing a good job for all of Canada and for the provinces which make it up. For this reason, we have stayed out of international promotion, which we feel is their job and which they are doing very capably. We are making use of their travel offices which they have opened in the States and in Europe and the co-operation which we are receiving from them is excellent and I think they feel the co-operation we are giving to them is excellent.

The same holds true for the other provinces. The work which is being done jointly is being done even more effectively because it is being done jointly.

As far as our own responsibility is concerned, it seems to me that this is of course the promotion of the province as a whole. It is for this reason that some years ago the department encouraged the establishment of the 32 regional tourist councils which now exist. I think that each year they are becoming more effective as they are able to get the various groups in their own regions together to work together to promote the whole region.

I think this is the way we deal with problems such as have been mentioned about traffic on superhighways and getting the traffic off the highway into the various regions which the highway serves. As for the work which has been done between provinces jointly, I mentioned in my remarks last night the programmes that we are working on with Quebec, and we are also working with Manitoba in a couple of specific areas, Mr. Chairman.

I think this is the way we will make general improvement, but the point really is that everybody in the province, as has been

pointed out both by myself, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. members opposite, everybody in the province benefits from this industry, everybody needs to be more aware of its importance than they presently are. This is one of things we are attempting to do and I think doing with some success. Everybody in the province has to take part in the promotion, both the financial part of such promotion and the actual work in their own communities.

The hon. member mentioned hospitality. I think this is extremely important and this cannot be imposed by any government, it is something that people have to realize is important and then practise. But I think the department has given excellent leadership, together with the Canadian tourist association, in the hospitality seminars which we have been running now for two years and which we have expanded each year.

As a matter of fact, there are two of them that I can think of at the moment taking place this coming week. I think this is the field in which we have to work and the field where we will get results.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that probably will be all I want to say just at the present time on general remarks. Perhaps we might get into the specific votes. I have made notes of all the matters I think that have been raised thus far and I will attempt to deal with those on specific votes.

On vote 2001:

Mr. A. E. Thompson (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, under vote 2001, I would like to talk to some extent about some of the policies, some of the effects, of United States laws and the representations which I feel should have been made by the Ontario government.

I would like to say at the outset that no one can dispute that the development of the tourist industry is vital to the economic health of this province, and the hon. Minister has pointed out that it affects everyone in this House, as well as all the people across the province. The Ontario economic council report on the tourist industry points out that the tourist dollar accounts for 6.8 per cent of the province's gross national product. This was emphasized, I think, by the hon. Minister and by others. It represents a great number of jobs. I noticed in that report there was a suggestion that 160,000 people were affected by it. And of course it benefits, as the hon. Minister and my hon. friend in my party have pointed out, and affects every area of the province.

Mr. Chairman: I was wondering if this would constitute a second general speech for the party?

Mr. Thompson: No, no; it is the very vital subject of policy—the policy of administration which, I think, is most important to the people of Ontario. I was just showing the importance of decisions by the hon. Minister with respect to this industry and underlining and underscoring the effect it has on the economy and the number of people. It is just a gentle little preamble to move in and bolster the importance of this to the hon. Minister across the aisle, which I know he and his department will appreciate.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There must be something wrong here.

Mr. Thompson: No, I do not think so. We realize very much the importance of the hon. Minister's job and we are trying to help him through constructive criticism. The amount of money that the Ontario public Treasury receives from foreign tourists is 20 times its total, tax-financed investment in travel promotion. In other words, for every tax dollar invested by the government in foreign tourist promotion, a minimum of \$20 in tax revenue is currently being generated. Thus tourism is not only good for the economy, it is a good public investment.

But the council, Mr. Chairman, said some very frank words about the way in which the province of Ontario is taking advantage of this investment, and I would like to quote from this report:

In 1961 residents of the United States spent more than \$2.5 billion in countries around the world. Of this amount about \$440 million was spent in Canada. This is not a figure, however, that should be pointed to with pride. Canada has been losing ground as an area for United States tourist travel. If it maintained the same relative position in 1961 as we enjoyed in 1952, total receipts from American expenditures in Canada would have been in the neighbourhood of \$800 million, \$360 million more than we actually received.

Let us look at those figures, Mr. Chairman, in terms of what they have meant to the province of Ontario. First may I say I regret that the Ontario economic council did not see fit to do this itself, but in the absence of such a breakdown we can make certain assumptions based on figures and statements elsewhere in this report.

Let us assume that, during the period mentioned, Ontario's share of American

expenditures in Canada remained within the 50 to 60 per cent range. On this basis then, Ontario should accept its fair share of the blame for the fact that Canada has lost ground.

Then, by simple arithmetic, it can be pointed out that if Ontario had kept pace with the worldwide competition for the American tourist dollar, the province would have brought in an extra \$200 million during the period from 1952 to 1961. And, using the economic council's own estimate of a 3.5 multiplier effect—that is, an increased effect from the tourist dollar—we see that the total effect of the tourist dollars which have been lost to us would have been about \$750 million for the Ontario economy.

In turn, sir, this would have produced approximately \$140 million for the provincial Treasury. In other words, this is the price that Ontario has had to pay—\$750 million—for the failure of this department to have kept up with the rest of the world. I think this is a serious indictment of this administration. It is clear that the \$140 million in lost tax revenue is haunting us today through the imposition of wide-ranging tax increases which we have just had during this session.

There is another very vitally important matter facing the Ontario tourist industry, and I think it is a matter that has received far too little attention from the government of this province: the fact there is hardly a secondary industry in Ontario whose employees do not manufacture at least a portion of their output for persons directly or indirectly engaged in tourism.

In other words, manufactured goods produced in Ontario are vitally affected by the tourist industry since tourism is one of the fastest growing industries in the world. The economic council said that the receipts from foreign visitors to Canada in recent years have been rising twice as fast as our merchandise exports and it is unfortunate that Ontario has failed to see the growth potential of the tourist industry. There are millions and millions of dollars worth of these goods being turned into export items in the hands of American tourists—a flow of goods which is vital to the economy of the province. And yet—and this is the point I want to make, Mr. Chairman—when the United States government took action to affect that flow of goods, there was not even a whimper from the government.

The reduction in the duty-free allowance for American tourists returning from Canada was a major step in the American campaign to improve its balance-of-trade position, but

in view of the major impact that it will have on the Ontario economy the province's leaders should have been lobbying strongly about it in public. And I think, if you look at press clippings which I have here, that some of the defenders of Canada in the United States were somewhat surprised that we did not lobby. The American democratic system expects legitimate representation on matters which affect the people of other countries.

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry to have to interrupt the leader of the Opposition. I know that he wants to adhere to the rules that have been set down, by having a lead-off speaker from the Liberals, a lead-off speaker from the NDP, and then having our Minister reply to them. I have gone over the series of votes in connection with this and I do not see where, so far, what the leader of the Opposition has to say comes under vote 2001. I think it is a general statement that would be included by the lead-off speaker from his party.

Mr. Thompson: I think, Mr. Chairman, that this is on the whole question which is affecting the economy of the province; it certainly very much relates as—

Mr. Chairman: The last thing I want to do is to interfere—

Mr. Thompson: It is not a lead-off speech at all; it is in one particular area and that is the United States laws in connection—

Mr. Chairman: That is not before us under vote 2001; I think—

Mr. Thompson: But it is under administrative policy.

Mr. Chairman: A lot of things are included in the main office—

Mr. Thompson: May I say, sir, under main office, that I know that one of the great concerns of the hon. Minister is to encourage the tourists from the United States? I congratulate him on what he has been doing, but I am saying that there are laws in the United States which can affect the export of goods from this country and from this province, and this is the point that I am making. I feel that I have an obligation, as leader of the Opposition, to make this point in these estimates. I am sure that the hon. Minister will want to reply to them, because Senator Smithers of Florida would have exempted Canada—there was no representation in Washington from the Canadian tourist industry—

Mr. Chairman: I am sorry, this is not properly before us at this time.

Mr. Thompson: Would you tell me when this would be before us? This affects the general administration and I suggest to you, sir, that it is one of the most important aspects of the department to encourage American tourists—it is a question which should be brought up on the floor of this House, and it should come under the first item.

Mr. Chairman: The leader of the Opposition has opportunities in the Throne debate and Budget debate—

Mr. Thompson: Surely, Mr. Chairman, when we are talking on tourism, we are thinking particularly of our neighbours to the south; we are thinking of the balance of payments, and this is of vital concern. The hon. Minister is fully aware of this and I would think that this is very definitely a subject that must be discussed at this time.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

The last thing that the Chairman wants to do is to stifle debate. I am trying to carry this on in the principles that have been established and it was established earlier that there would be a lead-off speaker in connection with it, and I think that these remarks should have been included by your lead-off speaker.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the lead-off speaker cannot cover the whole waterfront. There are—

Mr. Chairman: There is no restriction whatsoever as far as I am concerned—

Mr. Thompson: All right; then assuming the lead-off speaker had spoken on this subject, there is a further opportunity, surely, to bring it up as each estimate comes and I suggest to you, sir, that if I am barred from saying this, you are barring me from bringing up a subject in this Legislature which is of vital concern to the tourist industry; and the tourist industry is of vital concern to the economy of this province, and I not only have a right to bring this up, but I have an obligation to.

Mr. D. C. MacDonald (York South): Mr. Chairman, speaking to a point of order, for once I agree with you completely.

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. MacDonald: Usually I agree with you; but for once, with great emphasis, I agree with you completely.

I am not denying for one moment what the hon. gentleman is raising may be of vital concern to the tourist industry but we have certain rules in this House where the lead-off speaker gives a general, overall picture of the particular estimates that is before the House. If anybody can get up, as the hon. leader of the Opposition is doing and use words to suggest that it comes under the main office, it would be a gross abuse of the rules of the House. We must recognize the rules and if we want to come in with something later, consider it under—I can give the hon. leader of the Opposition a suggestion: It might conceivably go under tourist promotion, if he thinks we are not promoting it adequately in the United States.

Heaven forbid that I should be telling the hon. leader of the Opposition how he should handle it, but I agree with you, sir, that at the moment he is out of order. Furthermore, I think it is about time that we quit abusing this particular privilege or we are going to destroy the opportunity we have for full debate on the estimates in this House.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I simply say this, that as the presentation is made by the critic from each of the Opposition parties, to bring forward a number of suggestions, there are some of them which require more detailed discussion by other people. Surely, after the critic has brought forward suggestions other members of the Opposition are unable to enlarge on certain points brought forward. I will state some points and I will be quite happy to move this to another estimate if you think it is the estimate that is wrong.

Mr. MacDonald: That is your job, not his.

Mr. Thompson: You are suggesting that the whole thing is out of order and I, sir, do not agree with you.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, it is out of order at this time.

Mr. Thompson: Would you then clarify for me when I can bring this up? Under the next estimate?

Mr. MacDonald: That is your job.

Mr. Thompson: My job! You are ruling me out of order and initially you said that I am not able to bring this up. I now ask you, can

I bring this up? You suggested that I bring it up in the Throne debate.

Mr. Chairman: I would suggest to the leader of the Opposition that he check the votes in connection with this—there are nine votes altogether; the one under the tourist industry is vote number four.

Mr. Thompson: I will bring it up, Mr. Chairman, under the next vote.

Mr. Chairman: Vote 2001!

Mr. B. Newman (Windsor-Walkerville): Mr. Chairman, may I bring up the topic of licence plates under this vote and the suggestion of—

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, there is no place in this estimate for licence plates.

Mr. Newman:—or would you prefer me to bring this up under administration or information and promotion?

Mr. Chairman: From the standpoint of licence plates, I do not understand—

Mr. Newman: I would think that the hon. Minister would exert all effort possible to convince his hon. colleagues to see that the province adopt the idea of having some type of slogan on licence plates. We have hammered at this year after year. The hon. Minister is most receptive to it but he cannot jog the heads of the Treasury benches and the Cabinet at all to adopt something. We are losing an excellent opportunity here.

Mr. Chairman: I suppose you could speak to it under The Department of Transport; I do not think that there is any money in this particular—

Mr. Newman: I would like it as a tourist promotion device. I will take it up under 2003 then.

Mr. Chairman: Yes, fine.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, on vote 2001, there is a specific point that I want to raise and I assume that it would be as appropriate here as anywhere.

I have never been able to get clear in my mind and keep it clear, the relative function of this department and the public relations and publicity wings of all the other departments across the government. A few years ago I can recall when the Opposition launched a concerted attack on the government for an excessive—an alleged excessive—number of publications and the Prime Minister at that time got up and said that it was

going to end. With that generous gesture of his, it ended, and a great number of publications were cut out. In my view, some of them were rather good publications. I think, for example, of one, "Sylva," a little publication that was put out by The Department of Lands and Forest and covered a range of issues including conservation. I think it was not only a superior publication, but—

Mr. V. M. Singer (Downsview): Is this in 2003?

Mr. MacDonald: Yes, this is in 2003, and a clarification—

Mr. Singer: You are as much out of order as was the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. MacDonald: If you want to be an obstructionist, you go ahead! The Liberator of the Liberal Party who wants to get up—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: Order, order!

Mr. MacDonald: I am dealing with a specific item, not with a general dissertation that should have been included in the lead-off.

If you want to abuse the rules of the House—

Interjections by hon. members.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the member to address his remarks to the chair, please.

Mr. MacDonald: I am on the main item, Mr. Chairman. Now my question to the hon. Minister or to the government as a whole is: If a few years ago it was appropriate to take a look at the range of publications, some of which came under—

Mr. Singer: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Under vote 2001 there is no mention of publications and it is my submission that that comes under vote 2003, information and promotion division.

Mr. MacDonald: Mr. Chairman, I am raising a question of policy, which I submit, comes under the main office—

Mr. Thompson: So were we, my hon. friend.

Mr. MacDonald: I am raising a question of policy. What is the relative position of this department, The Department of Tourism and Information, with regard to publications of this overall government?

Mr. Chairman: Do you not think under the circumstances that we would properly discuss this under vote 2003?

Mr. MacDonald: If you want it to go under 2003, fine, I will repeat the last five minutes that I have had and then go on to finish it.

Mr. Chairman: I think it would be better if it were discussed under 2003.

Mr. M. Gaunt (Huron-Bruce): Mr. Chairman, on a point of clarification, I wanted to talk about something dealing with the centennial as it relates to the CNE. I presume that would fall under vote 2003 as well, information and promotion division, but I just wanted to make sure at this point that I did not miss it.

Mr. Chairman: Well, it certainly does not fall under 2001. Is there anything under 2001?

Mr. Gaunt: I realize that, but I did not want to miss it.

Vote 2001 agreed to.

On vote 2002:

Mr. K. Bryden (Woodbine): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. Minister specifically what are the functions of the administrative branch?

Mr. Chairman: I cannot hear the member for Woodbine.

Mr. Bryden: It is not usual that people complain that they cannot hear me. I have heard opposite complaints from time to time.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister, Mr. Chairman: What, specifically, are the functions of the administrative branch as distinguished from those of the main office? I would also like to ask, it is really a quite separate question, but I might as well ask both questions at once—I would like to ask him for a breakdown of item one of vote 2002, that is the item relating to salaries. I would like this in terms of classifications, rather than of individuals. In other words, how many people are there in such and such a classification at such and such a rate?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, the administrative branch carries out certain functions for all branches of the department: central files, personnel, accounting services, purchasing, inventory control, mailing, shipping, warehousing, printing, and addressograph. There are four sections in the branch: the accounts section, the warehouse section, central files, and personnel. As for people,

there is a complement of 41, which is made up of the director, a departmental accountant four, a commercial artist one, a clerk one general, driver one—does my hon. friend want the exact civil service definition or just the general categories?

Mr. Bryden: The general categories, I think, are sufficient.

Hon. Mr. Auld: There are 18 clerical staff, one driver, one internal auditor, two operators for equipment operations, and three in personnel.

Mr. Bryden: Did I understand the hon. Minister correctly—that this branch has some responsibility with respect to printing? Is that one of the duties you outlined?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, the office printing, for office forms and so on. The main printing of the departmental promotional material is under the next vote.

Mr. Bryden: This material for your own internal use; would you arrange for printing that yourself, or do you get it through the Queen's printer?

Hon. Mr. Auld: The majority of it is done through the Queen's printer, although we have an addressograph which makes some small run forms, and so on, that are in general use. Excuse me, a multilith.

Mr. Chairman: On vote 2002.

Mr. Paterson: Mr. Chairman, I have two brief questions I might ask of the hon. Minister.

Could the hon. Minister tell me, possibly at a later date, how many personnel of this department over 50 years of age have left the service during the last, say, three or four years?

Hon. Mr. Auld: I might be able to give it to him a little later on in these estimates, but I can give him the information in a day or two.

Mr. Paterson: All right. I was just wondering: Is there any thought of moving these regional area offices of your department? I know a lot of the territory of, say, the Kitchener district has been taken away from that district, and I wonder if these will be more centrally located? Is this the situation in other areas?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, if I understand my hon. friend correctly, he is talking about the change of the regional boundaries for our own administrative purposes and the chang-

ing of the locations of a couple of offices. At the moment there is no plan to make any further changes. We have made two changes, as I recall, in this current year; in both cases, we felt, to improve the efficiency of the administration. But there is not any thought at the moment of making any further changes.

Vote 2002 agreed to.

On vote 2003:

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, recognizing and always appreciating your decision—

Mr. Chairman: Would it help if I were to try to clarify some things under 2003?

Mr. Thompson: No, well perhaps I would clarify for you, sir. I am going to speak under promotions.

I think, of course, that one of the difficulties of promotion—encouraging United States tourists to come into the country—is that you may get a law in the United States which will prevent tourists coming into Canada from taking out a certain amount of tax-free items. When this law was being presented in the United States, there was no representation in Washington from the Canadian tourist industry. In fact there appears to have been little Canadian knowledge, or no concern, about this allowance rule. As a matter of fact, there was very little attempt being made to get in touch with the allies within the United States Senate who were wanting to exempt Canada from this rule. And again, from the newspaper clippings, there were two of them who—one from Oregon and the other from Florida—were asking for the reaction of Canadians towards the need for an exemption.

The U.S. law went into effect on October 1. It makes the maximum duty-free allowance, for American visitors returning to United States, a flat \$100 on a retail basis—instead of the previous \$100 maximum allowance on a wholesale basis. It has been estimated that the \$100 wholesale allowance represents about \$167 retail. That means that every tourist returning to United States from Canada, who wishes to bring back goods duty-free up to the allowable maximum, will be spending about \$67 less in Canada this year than he would have last year before October 1.

This represents, Mr. Chairman, millions of tourists—and, for Ontario, many millions of dollars in lost revenue. In the Sault alone, it has been estimated that the American duty allowance law will result in a \$750,000 reduction in spending this year over last year.

This impact will be even greater in Windsor and Niagara Falls, and it is going to ripple across the entire province.

Probably the most seriously affected areas will be those in northern Ontario, because they have already suffered from a decrease in tourist industry development. The hon. Minister himself has revealed that a survey of tourist development covering the tourist season in 1965, from June 15 to August 15, indicates a 3.2 per cent drop in tourist bookings in northern Ontario, while southern Ontario had a 6.5 per cent increase in renting accommodation. The north of this province can ill afford the further erosion of its tourist industry.

Ontario has more at stake than any other province in Canada and it is up to the government, to the hon. Prime Minister, to apply pressure on Ottawa to negotiate a phasing out of the new American duty allowance law in Canada. I think that this government and the hon. Prime Minister neglected their responsibility for too long.

Fortunately, the projected increases in American tourist spending in Canada, leading up to and during the centennial, likely will more than offset the effects of the law; but unless there is a phasing out during that period, unless Canada is exempted, the impact of the law will come into sharp focus again in 1968. I, sir, through you, would like to ask the hon. Minister what kind of representation was made either to Ottawa or to the United States in connection with Ontario's concern about this law?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Mr. Chairman, of course it would be quite improper for myself, or I think this government, to make representations to the United States government. As a matter of fact, it was not too long ago that there was some concern about this sort of thing from another province. But the Canadian tourist association, I understand, made strong representation to the government of Canada, I think, through the Canadian government travel bureau, which is part of The Department of Trade and Commerce, on behalf of all the tourist industry in all the provinces. I believe that the hon. Minister of Economics and Development (Mr. Randall) had some comment to make through the proper channels in the same way.

I do not think the hon. leader of the Opposition is suggesting that either this government, or sections of the industry of this province, should make representations directly to Washington. There are channels set up which have worked over many years, and this is the proper way to do it.

Mr. Thompson: I was implying, Mr. Chairman, to the hon. Minister that it should go through Ottawa. Looking at the news report—

Mr. Chairman: If the leader of the Opposition will permit an interruption for a moment, I know that it was the wish of this House that we follow through in sequence under each item under 2003. I do not want to interrupt the leader but I think if I am to follow the rules of the House we should follow them through on that basis. He may finish off what he has, but I think I should tell the members of the House—

Mr. Thompson: This is a policy basis, Mr. Chairman, it overrides. It would affect salaries and everything else. I would like to point out through you to the hon. Minister that the Florida Senator, George Smithers, offered the exemption amendment and the Canadian government apparently made no effort to encourage the Senate report of the Smithers amendment, nor did the Canadian tourist industry.

In fact, neither knew much about it before the matter came up in the Senate. Furthermore, there was a feeling among Canadian authorities, unlike most other nations, that encouragement of the amendment might be considered as interfering in U.S. affairs. That was written on July 17, 1965, I note in Nash.

I think we may be a little too sensitive in some of these areas. It seems to me that Ontario should very aggressively approach the federal government when there are such situations as this. I think that in view of it having passed now, the law having passed in the States, I would hope that you would still approach the federal government with respect to phasing out of this, because there is obviously sympathy towards Canada being exempted by a number of senators.

Hon. Mr. Auld: I do not think it is my job to defend the government of Canada, but I understand that the government of Canada made representations. In fact, the final regulations which were adopted in the States were less severe respecting Americans returning to the States with Canadian goods than was originally planned.

Mr. Chairman: Under 2003, item No. 1, salaries.

Mr. Newman: May I ask under salaries then if Mr. Fred Boyer, who was brought on the staff got his employment through the civil service or not?

Hon. Mr. Auld: That is right, Mr. Chairman, he has a certificate issued by the civil service commission as is the case of all employees on permanent staff.

Mr. Chairman: Item No. 2; on item No. 3?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, could I have a breakdown of item No. 3, maintenance? This is a recurring item in the estimates and the public accounts committee has complained that it should be stated more precisely. There is no particular reason why I pick on this hon. Minister and this vote for a breakdown but the term by itself is really quite meaningless. If I may just for one moment raise the matter in general terms—I will take it up later with the hon. Provincial Treasurer (Mr. Allan)—I think the government should start making a practice of giving us greater information on this amorphous and vague term “maintenance” as a regular course.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, the breakdown of the total of \$63,500, Mr. Chairman, is as follows: \$4,000, the office of the executive director; the publicity branch, \$6,500, which is further broken down into weekly newspaper stories, \$5,000; and a general increase of stories of all kinds for all papers, \$1,500.

Mr. Thompson: I am just interested in the \$4,000 to maintain the office of the executive director. Is that for the cleaning of the office or for what purpose?

Hon. Mr. Auld: Oh, no. If I may give all the amounts then I think perhaps it will be apparent. I was giving you the increases, let me give you the totals. The office of the executive director is \$4,000, the publicity branch is \$26,500, advertising is \$4,000 and information is \$29,000.

Mr. Bryden: That much we have in front of us, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Auld: That \$4,000 is made up of \$500 for communications, which would be telegraph and telephone and what-not, \$1,500 for furniture and equipment, \$1,500 for printing and stationery, which would be for that office, and \$500 for miscellaneous.

Would the hon. member like the same information for the other items?

Mr. Bryden: Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to wait until Monday or whenever we return to these estimates to get the rest of this.

Hon. Mr. Auld: If I might finish these amounts for this question: the publicity branch \$26,500 is broken down into \$1,000 for communications, \$4,000 for printing and stationery, \$8,000 for furniture and equipment, \$10,000 for information services, \$6,000 for miscellaneous.

Mr. Bryden: Skip the advertising branch and just take the last one, the tourist promotion and information branch—

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, while the hon. Minister is looking at that, I would just like to underscore, I think, the principle which the hon. member for Woodbine is emphasizing, and that is that we want a better breakdown. The public accounts committee has asked for this and we are hoping that the hon. Provincial Treasurer will finally concede the report that was done by Professor Schindler. This pointed out the fact that there is not a satisfactory breakdown for the people of Ontario. It is not your department alone, it is every department. I think that is the point I would like to get across.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking a little while to find these details, but I am very happy to give the breakdown at the moment.

Mr. Chairman: The member for Woodbine has indicated that he is willing to wait until Monday to get this.

Hon. Mr. Auld: Well, perhaps it might save the time of the House until we get this sorted out here.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister) moves that the committee rise and report certain resolutions and ask for leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee of supply begs to report certain resolutions and asks for leave to sit again.

Report agreed to.

Hon. J. P. Robarts (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on Monday we will continue with these estimates.

Hon. Mr. Robarts moves the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 1.05 o'clock, p.m.

JOURNALS AND PROCEDURAL RESEARCH BRANCH
DIRECTION DES JOURNAUX ET DES RECHERCHES EN PROCEDURE
ROOM 1640, WHITNEY BLOCK
QUEEN'S PARK, TORONTO, ON M7A 1A2

